# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 27, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We are grateful for so many gifts, O God, and this day we remember with thanksgiving the gifts of the family and our sense of community. We recognize the positive relationship that can exist between families and in communities where mutual support and appreciation bind us one to another in respect. When we are weak and dispirited, their blessing brings joy; when we feel alone, their presence inspires and encourages. With praise and gladness we thank You, O God, for the trust of family and community and we pray that we will be worthy of that trust. In Your name, 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.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 160, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—160

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clay
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hayes

NOT VOTING—30

Bateman
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Chapman
Collins (IL)
Crane
Dellums
Dornan
Edwards (TX)
Hoyer
Kennedy
Lancaster
Livingston
McNulty
Menendez
Myers
Pickett
Rangel
Royce
Sanders
Schumer
Skelton
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Torres
Washington
Whitten

□ 1221

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOLDEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1308. An act to protect the free exercise of religion.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill earlier today:

H.R. 2403, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that pursuant to instructions of the Speaker the 1-minutes will be limited to 15 per side.

## THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT

(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, today is a historic day—President and Mrs. Clinton came to the Congress to present the details of their plan to overhaul our Nation's health care system. The Health Security Act is the most detailed, comprehensive, and responsible health care reform proposal ever offered. It is a historic piece of legislation and it may be the most important piece of legislation any of us will ever work on. Let us get it right.

The President has already demonstrated that he welcomes new ideas to improve this plan. The legislation introduced today includes significant changes from the original plan that will increase confidence in the plan and increase public support.

To answer concerns of small business owners about costs of employer-based insurance, the President has expanded the health package to offer more small business discounts. The President has also reshaped the plan to allow for greater choice of health care plans by every American.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to an enlightened debate here in Congress, not a partisan debate. And, while it is natural that we will not agree on every detail of this legislation, one primary goal should guide our debate—to guarantee every single American comprehensive health benefits that can never be taken away. Let us get to work.

## WHERE IS THE BILL?

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just double-checked with my staff who talked with the White House staff and, as I understand it, after all of the circus fanfare of this morning, there is no bill being introduced today. And while there is various legislative language, it is not yet in a form which the Democratic leadership is comfortable putting into bill form.

Now, come on. We have now had a major speech to the entire country. We have had 5 weeks of testimony about a nonexistent bill by people who do not know what they are talking about. We have had a White House task force that broke the law in a way which would put every small business in America in jail, if they did it. And the defense was that they were too busy to fill out the technical, legal forms required by the U.S. Government, a defense which I hope every small business will try out when it has a problem with the IRS.

Now we are told, after this morning's circus, there is still no bill. The serious business of government should require genuine legislative effort with a specific written document, because this is not about personality. This is not about quality of testimony. This is not about effectiveness of speech. This is about a written legislative bill that would become law.

## WHAT HAPPENED TO BIPARTISANSHIP?

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I just simply could not resist commenting on what a departure that last speech was from the decorum and the bipartisanship that existed in Statuary Hall.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and Mr. DOLE joined bipartisan Members of both Houses in setting a goal, not a partisan goal, specifically not a partisan goal, to put in place by the end of this Congress a comprehensive national health care bill that all of us hopefully will be able to support. I get the impression there are some Members who simply cannot imagine that they could support a bipartisan product.

I think the evidence of those who turned out today to join with the President and the First Lady to put something together that all of us want to see accomplished, I thought, for the American people, is really the message that ought to be taken home by the American people. I really find it very regrettable that our leadership on the Republican side would put a discordant note into what otherwise has been a very effective beginning today.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should not be reading a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That point of order is not sustained.

## ACT NOW ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

(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, we do have an historic opportunity this Congress. We can take action to reform our Nation's health care system and improve the lives of millions of Americans. Or, we can just continue to do what our critics say we do best—talk, argue, and pontificate or we can rush to adjournment and forget about health care reform until next year.

But Mr. Speaker, there is another option on health care reform. Let us act now on consensus health reform.

There is no objective reason why Congress cannot take action this year on administrative simplification, malpractice reform, antifraud and antitrust reform and insurance portability which would prohibit exclusions for preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, people are hurting right now, everyday, people are prevented from buying health insurance because of previous illnesses. Everyday, people are forced to remain in unrewarding employment because of a concern over the ability to qualify for new coverage in a new job.

Health reform should not and cannot be an "all or nothing" issue.

□ 1230

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, has a limitation on the number of speakers for 1 minutes been announced?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore, pursuant to the instructions from the Speaker, announced a moment ago that there would be 15 speakers per side.

Mr. WALKER. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. On our side we are a little confused by that. We have a much larger number of Members that want to speak on this side. Usually that has been accommodated. I know nothing in the time schedule today that is pressing us to limit the number of speeches. I am

wondering if an accommodation could be made on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the privileges of the Members here will be protected within the first 15, and the Speaker pro tempore will endeavor to make accommodations for other speakers as well.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman, of course, that 1 minutes are in order at the end of the day, but the Chair would try to get accommodations.

## WE CAN AND WE MUST REFORM THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received this letter from a doctor in Boulder, CO. He writes:

> I've just had my fourth patient in four weeks tell me that they were rejected for health insurance because they have a child who has a diagnosis of asthma * * * This is causing great hardships for both the care of the child, and also for the family as a whole. Is there some way that the Congress could make * * * this 'preexisting condition business'* * * come to end?

The answer, doctor, is yes—we can and we must do that, and more. It's inexcusable that in a country as great as ours, hardworking, responsible families lose health insurance coverage simply because their child has asthma. And it's unacceptable that the health insurance that you've paid into for years and years doesn't cover you when you get sick.

Today, President Clinton delivered the details of his health care reform proposal to Congress. It's a comprehensive plan that will provide health security for all Americans.

I applaud the President for having the courage and determination to tackle one of the most difficult and urgent problems we face as a nation. Now it's time for Congress—Democrats and Republicans—to join with him in making real health care reform happen. Only then will we meet our responsibilities as a nation—and do what this doctor from Boulder, his patients, and millions of families across the Nation demand—provide health security for all Americans.

## HEALTH CARE AND REFORM

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President is on the Hill today to unveil his health care reform bill once again. After months of running a gigantic propaganda machine to sell the American public Hillary's version, or vision, I should say, of health care, the Clinton health plan has finally been put into legislative language, although we understand that legislative language is still not ready.

After all the hoopla and revisions, one characteristic seems to summarize the plan. The Government, not us, not our doctors, not our insurers, but the Government will decide every citizen's health care package.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question. This week we are supposed to be considering congressional reform, because Congress simply does not work very well. Things like proxy voting, for instance, the American people are absolutely appalled at, and they say it needs to be changed. We are supposed to be considering that this week.

My question is, If the American people feel that the Government is broken, why in the world would the Clinton White House trust Government to determine the health care of every American citizen?

## THE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER WE CHANGE AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, BUT HOW WE CHANGE IT

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, before being elected to Congress I served as the president of my county hospital's board of directors. I pledged to my constituents then that I would continue to be an active advocate for health care reform on Capitol Hill.

Today I am proud to be an original cosponsor of President Clinton's Health Security Act. We can now formally begin what promises to be one of the most significant policy debates ever to be carried out here on the Hill.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by what the President said today. For the millions of Americans who are uninsured, receive inadequate care, or fear losing their coverage, it is clear that our health care system needs major surgery, not a band-aid. The question is no longer whether we change the system, but how we change it.

Health care coverage must be universal, accessible, affordable and provide high quality care and choice for all Americans. It should place an emphasis on primary and preventive care, and not discriminate against those with preexisting conditions. Finally, reform must eliminate the inequities which exist in health care for men and women, guaranteeing women complete reproductive health services.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this historic reform. Health care security must be a reality of the 103d Congress. The Nation deserves it.

## GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, as the President continues to talk about the health care plan today, I urge the American people to think of the implications of Government-run health care, and think of it in the context of our Government today. The President's Health Care Task Force, while they devised this Government-run scheme, decided they were too busy to fill out the employee forms required of the Government. Of course, that is against the law. Do we suppose that being too busy would be an acceptable defense for those who do not comply with health care programs?

In the House, where this Government-run proposal is being considered, we spend much of our time talking about the inefficiency in the delivery of the Federal Government, unsuccessfully, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, the President, with his health care scheme, puts an awful lot of faith in Government that, frankly, does not warrant it. I urge the White House and the Democrats to think twice about a Government-run program. Instead, we should make fundamental changes in a system that is left as a basic function of the private sector.

## NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, while the health insurance industry spends millions on a slick television campaign designed to provoke fear, and today while mockery becomes a form of debate on the House floor, millions of Americans cannot get and keep health care insurance, and millions more are one job or one illness away from financial catastrophe.

We must hear them and we must respond. We are morally obligated to solve this problem, to stop partisan fighting, and decide not who wins and who loses, but find out how to make sure that everyone wins.

Mr. Speaker, as C. Everett Koop has recently stated, the President has already done more than any living predecessor to engender change by just promising that this issue will be resolved. Mr. Speaker, the time for inattention, fear, and gridlock has passed. Now it is time for action. I urge my colleagues to join me as original cosponsors of this heath security plan.

## SIXTY-TWO REPUBLICAN HOUSE MEMBERS DEMAND AN EXPLANATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, today Mrs. Clinton and the President submitted their health care reform legislation. Until today, we have been dealing only with nothing more than a draft of the proposal, and yet the administration has, for over a month, been promoting this plan as if it was the final product. How? With this slick, 12-page, full-color brochure; 150,000 copies of this were printed at a cost of $82,000; 10,000 copies were sent to the Democrat National Committee, which is an unusual distribution of literature printed at Government expense.

This brochure is so shot through with misrepresentations and unsupported assurances that, in my opinion, if a private insurance company distributed this they would be subject to criminal prosecution.

It does not help the health care debate for Government agencies to be sending out blatantly misleading propaganda. Last week a letter, signed by 62 Members, was sent to the President asking for an explanation. We have not received any answers. We want some answers, and if we do not get them soon, the administration's credibility is subject to question.

## URGING SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION TO END FREE HIGHER EDUCATION FOR PRISONERS

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, in my almost 11 months in this body I have seen a lot of wasteful Government programs eliminated, but I cannot believe that the Federal Government is subsidizing the higher education of prisoners. A newspaper in my district, the Pottstown Mercury, has done a series of articles that reveals we are spending $200 million a year in Pell grants to educate prisoners. Maybe I have been a county sheriff for too long, and maybe I am not so sure there is such a thing as rehabilitation, but I cannot believe we should be spending taxpayers' money in this fashion.

□ 1240

I urge all of my colleagues to stop this madness and to sponsor Congressman GORDON's bill, H.R. 1168, and end this.

## TAKING ACTION ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

(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 Democrats are always signing the great Fleetwood Mac's "Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow," and in the case of congressional reform it is certainly true.

Tomorrow, the day after, maybe next month, do not worry, they say, it will be here soon.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope Americans are not buying that song and dance. I hope they continue to put the pressure on the Congress for meaningful and real reform today.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was created to bring together the House and the Senate in a bipartisan effort to make this institution work the way the country deserves.

We Republicans have proposed reforms that would certainly clean house, congressional reforms that actually reduce the size of committee staffs, that reduce the numbers of committees that keep us so frantically busy, that force the Federal Government to live by the laws they mandate on the rest of the country, that return fairness and the deliberative nature to the congressional process.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have made an honest and a forthright effort to bring changes to Congress, and it has been answered with delay and a commitment to the status quo. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Democrats should stop just singing about change and show a willingness to make some.

## NATIONAL BREAST CANCER MONTH

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is National Breast Cancer Month, and I think that means it is a very important month to be looking at our health care program.

As the President and the First Lady brought over that bill today, I wish everybody would shut up and read before they start shouting. It is amazing. There must be some real speed readers around here, because apparently they have read all of the pages, they know everything, and they are all ready to tear it apart before the ink is even dry.

I remember the budget debate too. Some of the same people stood around and said boy, the world is going to stop on its axle, and this will be terrible if this budget went into effect. Well, it went into effect, and the deficit projections are even lower than they anticipated, and things are looking a lot better than they were now. These people ought to be forced to come down and do apologies.

Please, this country needs to deal with the health care agenda. And we need to deal with it in a reasoned and a factual way. We need to find ways that we can have prevention so that we do not see diseases like the incredible rash of breast cancer and many of these other things that are out there because we have not focused on prevention.

Read before you talk.

## JEFF DAVIS HIGH SCHOOL ENDS NATION'S LONGEST LOSING STREAK

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, Jeff Davis High School in Houston, This past Saturday Davis won its first football game since 1985. That ends the longest losing streak in the history of the Nation. This achievement crowned a 25-year reunion that I was attending also Saturday night.

The fact that Jeff Davis rose to the occasion is not as great as the fact that they were able to overcome their past losses. It is an inner city school where we have seen over the years a lot of students transfer to other schools and we would have as few as 20 people show up for the football team in the fall.

They prevailed after a lot of community action and a lot of students decided that they were not going to take it anymore. They prevailed because their teammates put their best performance forward, not just in this game, but for a number of years.

The North Side community in Houston pulled together, and despite living under the scrutiny of this streak, they pulled together, and they worked as a team. The Jeff Davis Panthers set a shining example for our whole Nation. Through persistence, dedication, hard work, and pride they proved they can achieve if they maintain their discipline and never lose their faith.

Davis is far more than proud of this one win. They have proven to themselves and the Nation that they have the spirit to overcome all sorts of adversity.

This school is like our Nation, which fights, and we work, and then we pull together to win.

## EXPANDING WOMEN'S ACCESS TO CLINICAL EXAMS AND MAMMOGRAMS

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, every 3 minutes an American woman is diagnosed with breast cancer and every 12 minutes a woman dies from this disease. More than 1.5 million cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed before the end of this decade.

These high incidence and mortality rates demand that we encourage early detection and screening for breast cancer. I am concerned, therefore, about the limited coverage for mammograms included in President Clinton's health care plan. The administration's proposal to cover mammograms only every 2 years beginning at age 50 varies greatly from the breast cancer screening guidelines of the American Cancer Society. Those guidelines recommend clinical exams every year after age 40, with screening mammograms at 1 to 2 year intervals between ages 40 and 49 and annually after age 50.

Mr. Speaker, until concrete scientific data is available to support a decision limiting the availability of these life-saving tests, we must do everything possible to expand the access of women aged 40 to 50 to clinical exams and mammograms. Encouraging early detection is second only to our ultimate goal—finding a cure for this deadly disease.

## WHO WILL PAY?

(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, I commend the President and the First Lady for their efforts on health care. They deserve it. But now it is time, Congress to get down to business.

Who will pay the bill? Big business will not. They will pass the costs on to you and me, or they will move to Mexico. Small businesses may close.

There is one issue here: Who will pay? And I say it is you, and it is me, it is your neighbor, your family, your friends, your coworkers. The American worker will pay the bill, and everyone is not going to get everything that anyone wants, Congress, so let us be honest.

I have a word of caution. Be careful before it is over that everybody in America ends up with health insurance and no one has a job.

## NATIONAL UNFUNDED MANDATES DAY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today is National Unfunded Mandates Day. Local officials and taxpayers in my district and across the Nation have had enough. They simply cannot afford any more unfunded Federal Government mandates. It is wrong to force local governments to pay for new spending programs whose purpose it is to help Members of Congress get reelected. If Members of Congress had to raise Federal taxes or cut other Federal programs to pay for their spending, they know that they wouldn't be around here much longer. So they push this responsibility onto State and local officials.

As a former State legislator I know how much of a problem this creates at the State and local level. Often mayors or other officials are forced to cut vital programs or raise local taxes to pay for these mandates. Then they catch flak from their constituents when it's really Congress' fault.

Let us put an immediate stop to all new unfunded mandates—right now, today. Then, let us get rid of all the existing unfunded mandates. Then let us cut spending, cut taxes, and shift responsibility—and resources—back to State and local governments.

□ 1250

## INTRODUCTION OF DEFICIT REDUCTION FRANKING ACT

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that makes a meaningful statement to the American people, who want deficit reduction and campaign reform. The Deficit Reduction Franking Act takes a major step toward meeting these goals by eliminating all unsolicited mass mailings from our office operations.

Deficit reduction must begin within our own offices, and this act would save taxpayers millions of dollars.

Mass mailings are often used for the purpose of building name recognition. As incumbents, this activity clearly gives us an edge over our opponents. We cannot say that we are serious about campaign reform if we ignore this issue. I believe that eliminating unsolicited mass mailings is as important as reforming the campaign finance system.

Members may find reporting their record more difficult without the use of mass mailings, but we have a variety of other tools to report to our constituents, such as press releases, news conferences, responding to constituent mail, and simply getting out among the people.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Deficit Reduction Franking Act and work toward its passage. The details of my bill can be found in today's Extensions of Remarks.

## RED RIBBON CAMPAIGN OF NATIONAL FAMILY PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a different, but important kind of health care and health care reform.

I rise today in recognition of the efforts of the National Family Partnership and to demonstrate my support for their red ribbon campaign to promote the National Drug Awareness Initiative. This campaign asks everyone to show their support for this campaign by wearing a red ribbon during the last week in October—October 23 to 31.

Red Ribbon Week commemorates the brutal slaying of Federal Drug Enforcement Agent Enrique Camarena, which occurred in 1985. The goal of the red ribbon project is to increase awareness of drug and alcohol abuse issues and promote personal and community action. The National Family Partnership, in conjunction with the Business Partnership to Knock Out Drug and Alcohol Abuse are striving to promote education, training, and support to inform the general public of the dangers of substances abuse. This year's events of Red Ribbon Week in Buffalo, NY, will spotlight the cooperative nature of businesses and community activities to reduce the demand for alcohol and drugs.

Since embracing this project 6 years ago, WNY United has enjoyed great success promoting a wide array of Red Ribbon Week activities within families, schools, communities, and businesses.

The highlight of the activities held in Buffalo, NY, this week will include the unfurling of the world's largest red ribbon down the side of the 13-story Niagara Mohawk building in downtown Buffalo. This ribbon will be decorated with drug-free messages from school children, community leaders, and business associations.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot just wish for a drug-free America; we must strive to defeat the problem of substance abuse. I for one salute the efforts of the National Family Partnership and the WNY United Against Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Inc., and hope that we will all participate wholeheartily during the red ribbon campaign.

## LEGISLATION ON MUTUAL FUNDS

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that addresses a particular concern of mine, mutual fund sales. In the last few months, banks have increased their sale of mutual funds. For the first time in history, assets of mutual funds have exceeded assets of deposits.

This legislation would require financial institutions to disclose in writing information about mutual funds. More specifically, the disclosure should explain that mutual funds are not covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance System. Many depositors are unaware

of what is covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance System.

In the last few years, there were several bank failures, particularly in the New England area. I heard from numerous constituents who had more than $100,000 in their accounts. Several of these constituents were not aware of the $100,000 limit. This leads me to believe many depositors are not clear on which types of deposits are covered by Federal deposit insurance.

Recently, several banks have voluntarily let customers know mutual funds are not covered by deposit insurance. This is an important step. However, I believe there should be legislation that requires institutions to let customers know in writing mutual funds are not covered by the Federal Deposit Insurance System. This legislation would protect depositors and eliminate the confusion surrounding the sale of mutual funds by banks.

I urge you to protect depositors by joining me as cosponsors of the Depository Institution Mutual Fund Sales Act.

## THE PREMISE OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S HEALTH PLAN

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, the President is unveiling his health care plan today which basically says the Government can do it better.

That is the premise of Mr. Clinton's plan: The Government can operate one-seventh of our Nation's economy—the health care industry—and make it run more efficiently and more effectively than it is running right now.

But Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration cannot even tell us with any certainty who actually served on the Task Force on Health Care Reform.

They say "trust us". But how can we believe their number; how can we believe that they have the answer to provide effective and efficient health care for 250 million Americans when they cannot even keep track of 500 members of their own Health Care Task Force?

It does make you wonder, and it makes me worry.

## IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING CVN-76, THE NEXT NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently, Secretary of Defense Aspin and General Powell released their study of our future military needs in the "Bottom-Up Review." This review indicated that our national defense requires at least 12 aircraft carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these carriers should be the most modern and most capable the Congress can provide. To this end we must fully fund the next *Nimitz* class carrier, CVN-76.

Soon, the House and Senate conferees on the Defense appropriations bill will be discussing when to fund CVN-76. To me, the issue is very simple. We need CVN-76. Therefore, we should select the most cost effective method to fund the carrier.

By allowing the Navy to begin negotiations this year and permitting the shipbuilders to take advantage of construction cycles, we can save $200 million by funding CVN-76 in this year's appropriation bill.

To accomplish these savings, the Senate has fully appropriated the funds for the carrier. I urge my colleagues to support the Senate position and fund CVN-76. It is good for our country; it is good for our national defense, and it is good for the taxpayers.

## THE PRESIDENT AND SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(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, the President and Mrs. Clinton have worked very hard to develop and bring to us a health care reform proposal.

I have been guardedly optimistic that this body could work together in a bipartisan effort to have some health care reform. There are so many areas that we agree, both Republicans and Democrats, areas that can substantially reduce the cost of health care in this country; however, this morning I was very discouraged about something the President said. I heard the President say that he would not sign, that he would veto any health care reform package that did not go to socialized medicine, that did not have universal coverage for everybody. I think that closes the door on so many things that we can do that need to be done to increase competition, to reduce the paperwork, to make changes in the overzealous regulations that we have in this country, to make sure that doctors and health providers do not overcharge, to make sure our system is not abused.

We need to make those changes. We need to work to move ahead on those areas that we agree on. I hope the President will reconsider.

## LISTEN TO THE PRESIDENT ON HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, today the President and the First Lady did come to the Congress to unveil their plan on health care. I applaud them. I know it is going to be a long road before we come to some resolution, but let us be clear about one thing. We are going to have a debate, but at least let us be honest when we debate and let us not give out information, at least this early in the game.

The President did say that he had one key point and that is he would not sign that piece of legislation, not if it was not socialized medicine, but if there was not universal coverage.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is this. Be careful of those plans that say that they want universal coverage, but they do not have any kind of mandates. If in fact we are trying to insure that every American is covered for health care, there must be some guarantees. We cannot just leave this to an open market willy-nilly type of hopeful system that says, "We hope that everyone gets coverage."

We know that 37 million Americans out there do not have coverage, and we have to have some responsibility and some accountability to do it.

So Mr. Speaker, let us listen to what the President says, instead of trying to tell the people what he did not say.

## ON REDUCING COMMITTEE STAFFS

(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, my constituents often describe Government as a burden much like a disease. Congress shows numerous symptoms of Government disease. One is bloated committee staff. Treatment could start with a 25-percent reduction in staff. I was surprised to learn that in 1947 there were approximately 400 staff for standing committees. In 1992 that number had expanded to about 3,200. Each Member of Congress knows we have a phenomenal budget deficit. Each congressional district has a large number of people who want responsible spending decisions in Congress. They expect Congress to recognize this and reduce our payroll to adapt to these fiscal demands. The problem is that Government does not have external controls and it does not respond to internal controls. In a weak economy Government expands to find jobs. If times are good Government adds staff to meet increased work loads. In poor economic times a business would be forced to downsize and reduce its payroll. What is most disturbing is it seems that very few here in Congress ask themselves, "Who is paying for all these staff positions?" The answer is all the businesses and individuals who struggled during the tough economic conditions. Mr. Speaker, if you think they feel good about supporting a government-paid committee staffer, you are wrong.

Congress needs to do more to treat this disease by adopting a 25 percent staff reduction. Congress needs to set a good example of what needs to be done.

□ 1300

## FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION NEEDED TO ACCOMPLISH GOALS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is time for the Federal Government to alter the process by which it orders local units of government to spend large amounts of money without making any significant contribution, and no area is more glaring in this regard than the Clean Water Act.

Twenty years ago the President, the Congress, mandated that the local governments clean up the waters, and that is a very worthy goal. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, during the eighties the Federal Government took away the funding while leaving the order in place. As a result, particularly poorer, older urban communities, several of which I represent, face a burden that is simply unsustainable. It is not appropriate for the Federal Government to mandate that local communities engage in the national goal of cleaning up waters which are national and international in scope and make virtually no significant contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that one of the things we will do before this Congress ends next year is to change the law to restore the situation where the Federal requirement that there be clean waters be accompanied by Federal resources with which to accomplish it.

## NATIONAL UNFUNDED MANDATES DAY

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

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, today, on National Unfunded Mandates Day, I bring to your attention the plight of hundreds of communities across the Nation that continue to suffer financially because of irresponsible policymaking in Congress.

In my district, ratepayers in Fall River could see their water rates quadruple to pay for a new sewage treatment system to the tune of $130 million mandated but not paid for by the Federal Government—$130 million that should be staying in the pockets of those ratepayers so that they can buy a house and feed their family; $130 million that businesses facing skyrocketing rates should be using to hire more people or improve their plant.

But the Congress continues to impose oppressive mandates on cities, States, and towns and then turns its back when it is time to pay for it.

It is time to stop the dishonesty and end unfunded Federal mandates.

Pay for it, or do not pass it.

## THE HEALTH CARE ISSUE DESERVES FORCEFUL, YET RESPECTFUL, DEBATE

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, somehow in the health debate ahead we are going to have to be able to disagree without being disrespectful. The references earlier today to the President's health care presentation as "a circus" go well beyond disagreement. After all, the minority leaders participated with the Clintons. Were the minority leaders there as circus ringmasters?

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there is room for vigorous disagreement on health reform. Clearly the final product will be different than the introduced bill. The issue is not Government versus private health care; the issue is not regulation versus competition. Universal access does not mean socialized medicine. Some of the Republican proposals have provisions for universal access.

Colleagues, let us debate forcefully but in good faith.

## CLINTON'S HEALTH CARE REFORM

(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, most Americans believe health care reform means better quality at a lower cost. I fear that the Clinton plan will give them just the opposite. The heavy-handed employer mandates in the Clinton plan would cost jobs, slow the economy, and hurt American competitiveness in the global marketplace. The price controls in the Clinton plan would freeze in the inefficiencies of the current system and stifle the medical research which has helped produce the high quality of American medical care.

Mr. Speaker, according to virtually all the independent experts, President Clinton's numbers do not add up. This means the Government will be forced to decide between new taxes and more deficit spending.

We need true reform, not a cure that is worse than the disease.

## NAFTA—THERE IS A CHOICE

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

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the North American Free-Trade Agreement is heating up. The lobbyists are pounding the corridors, and the pundits are given to prophesy what the final tally will be. As we come down to the end, Mr. Speaker, the principal argument in favor of NAFTA is that there is no choice.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to say today that there is a choice, there is a choice other than a policy that allows, encourages, our businesses to chase low-wage jobs and chase the lax environmental standards across the border in Mexico.

On the Committee on Foreign Affairs subcommittee on which I serve, chaired by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], we are working with the administration to coordinate our export promotion activities and to lower our barriers against exports in high-technology industries, and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs subcommittee on which I serve, chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], is working on ways to encourage the development of capital for new technology businesses. All over the Government we are working to improve our manufacturing capabilities, to lower the capital gains taxes on new investment in new companies that are going to be the growth companies of the future.

We can promote trade. We can improve the quality of jobs in this country. It is our only choice to send jobs down to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I urge people to stand firm in this debate on the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

## NATIONAL UNFUNDED MANDATES DAY

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Jacksonville City County for 8 years, I saw first hand the impact of unfunded Federal mandates and regulations. That is why I add my voice to the protests today, National Unfunded Federal Mandates Day.

Smaller municipalities in my district cannot begin to deal with one size fits all regulations and penalties. In Neptune Beach, population 6,500, a violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act cost them $100,000. That left no money to actually fix the problem. All they can do is wait for the next fine.

Up near the Georgia border, pending chlorine regulations threaten to close a pulp mill which is the major employer in Fernandina Beach. Further south, Federal mandates will eat up a quarter of the Ormond Beach budget. Throughout my five counties, supervisors of elections prepare to double their staffs to comply with the motor voter legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to pass laws and mandates on the people

back home and refuse to back them up with the resources necessary to get the job done.

## UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

(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, Members, today is National Mandates Day, and I join many of my colleagues today in talking about addressing this problem in Congress this session. I am a member of the mandates caucus and on the executive board of the caucus. We invite many other Members to join us in this effort.

Each year, the Federal Government passes new regulations and laws which place a heavier and heavier financial burden on our States and localities.

Whenever Washington feels it is short on money to implement a program, they pass the cost on to local government. As one of the newest Members of Congress and a former State legislator, I know all too well the cost of these mandates.

In my home State of Wisconsin, one study estimates that State and local governments spend at least $100 million a year to meet Federal mandates.

The time has come to put an end to this practice.

States and local governments are not a cash cow for Congress. We cannot go to them every time we want a problem solved or a new program funded.

We are all too aware at the Federal level of our national deficit. We now need to show in our actions that we understand the financial strain we put on local taxpayers by passing the cost on to their shoulders.

Forcing local and State governments to pay for the cost of Federal programs, by either raising taxes or cutting local programs, does not leave our constituents any better off.

If Congress is going to pass a Federal mandate, then we should be willing to pay for it.

## INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO WITHDRAW FORCES FROM SOMALIA BY JANUARY 31, 1994

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the War Powers Resolution clearly states: U.S. troops are not to be deployed overseas in combat, or where combat is deemed imminent, for more than 60 days without congressional authorization.

United States forces in Somalia have been involved in combat operations for well over 60 days. Thirty troops have been killed and 170 wounded.

Congress has never authorized this operation, yet the Clinton administration contends that it supports the War Powers Resolution and is complying with it.

To end this confusion, I have introduced—under section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution—legislation that calls upon the President to withdraw our forces by January 31, 1994.

Under section 5(c), the Foreign Affairs Committee must report out my legislation within 15 days and this body must vote on it within 3 days thereafter.

In this way, the House will have the opportunity to fully debate the issue. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 170 when it reaches the House floor.

□ 1310

## A GUARANTEE OF HEALTH INSURANCE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I learned of a Milwaukee couple who are new parents. But their happy occasion has been clouded by two simple facts: their child has spina bifida and they have no insurance.

I can only imagine the burdens this couple faces: their child's constant pain, countless doctors visits, and the worries.

Where will they find a company now to cover the baby's preexisting condition? How do they pay for it? And how do they keep their small business running while taking care of their child?

Bureaucracies, rising costs have skewed our health care to serve some and ignore others.

We provide health care for prisoners and welfare recipients. But if you are working, paying your bills, and just getting by, it is likely you are going without health insurance.

We in Congress must commit our energies to make sure all Americans, including working couples, have health care. Let us give health care back to the American people.

## A BIPARTISAN COMMITMENT FOR SPENDING CUTS

(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, as Americans prepare themselves for traditional Halloween antics—they are watching the Congress with a wary eye. At the urging of the Clinton administration, the majority party has already socked it to us with the largest tax increase in history and so far failed to make good on promises of spending cuts. But this week, a bi-partisan group of 29 Members presents a long-overdue treat—a package of concrete spending cut proposals to save taxpayers tens of billions over the next 5 years. This package is the product of long hours and tough negotiations—and it includes some sacrifices for most of us especially including Members of Congress. But we will never bring our Federal budget into line without some sacrifice—and that means earmarking all savings for deficit reduction. It is time for bold spending reform. That may sound scary to big spending liberals, but we need spending cuts more than Halloween trickery.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the agreement reached earlier today, that concludes the 1-minutes speech section. The Chair will advise the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and other Members that at the end of legislative business 1-minute speeches will be in order.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

It was my understanding, with respect to the Members who were sitting here ready to do 1-minutes, that the Chair might be liberal in its interpretation. That is why I told the gentleman from California that he might be allowed to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will tell the gentleman from Indiana that the Chair was very indulgent today beyond what had been earlier indicated.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3116, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. MCDADE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCDADE moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 3116, be instructed to agree to the provisions in the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 relating to Somalia, beginning after the colon on page 8, line 19 and ending on page 12, line 2 of the bill printed with the

amendments of the Senate numbered, amended to make them findings and directives of the Congress rather than of the Senate.

Mr. McDADE (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] seek recognition?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman in opposition to the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE]?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] in opposition to the motion?

Mr. MURTHA. No, Mr. Speaker. I accept the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time will be divided. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion is self-explanatory. It simply suggests the enactment by the House conferees of the Byrd-Dole amendment that was adopted in the Senate. I have discussed it with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not believe there is any objection to it at all on his side.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to instruct is simple and straightforward—it instructs the House conferees on the Defense appropriations bill to agree to the so-called Byrd-Dole amendment passed by the Senate, which places limits on our military involvement in Somalia.

I do not offer this motion because I agree completely with everything in that amendment—because I do not.

I do not offer this motion as an endorsement, or a defense, of everything which has happened with regards to our Somalia policy—because all of us, and all Americans, have been distressed and deeply troubled with the course of events there, especially over the past 6 months.

And I do not offer this motion to indicate that this Member, or this House, wants to keep our forces in Somalia 1 day longer than is necessary or prudent. Like all of us, if I could wish for a perfect world, our forces would be home today.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not live in a perfect world. We live in a world that forces us to grapple with conflicting issues and that resists simple solutions. The challenge before us is to look forward and make the best of a difficult set of circumstances, in a clearly defined and responsible manner.

And there are two facts we cannot escape—that as we speak there are nearly 20,000 American troops deployed to that troubled region, joined by 24,000 soldiers from other nations; and second, that the United States will be leaving Somalia early next year. We are going to leave Somalia; of that there is no doubt.

So the questions before us are not whether we will leave, but how we leave, and how we conduct ourselves while we are still there.

And in my considered judgment, the Byrd-Dole amendment, constructed in a fully bipartisan fashion, provides a framework for our Somalia policy which is both well-defined and workable, and goes a long way toward redressing the deep flaws which had become apparent in our policy over the past few months.

There is a clearly stated and limited mission for our troops: To protect American and U.N. forces, and to keep the supply lines open and the relief efforts secure. That's the mission—period.

No nation building, no intervention on one side or the other, no warlord hunting. We will protect the multinational forces and relief efforts—a mission which is well defined, and which can be performed.

And it limits our involvement by setting a date for withdrawal, March 31 of next year as proposed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like setting dates, for obvious reasons, but like it or not that market was laid down and this amendment will ensure that it is adhered to. And there is nothing that says we must remain in Somalia until March 31. We can withdraw sooner and the President has indicated his intention to do so if events warrant.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this amendment does not go far enough for some, and goes too far for others. But I do think it is the best option before us in terms of striking a balance between our political objectives for Somalia and our military requirements on the ground. And it does reflect the new policy being carried out by the White House, our troops on the ground, and our diplomats—as such, it deserves an opportunity to work.

On that basis I believe this approach merits the support of the House, and accordingly, I would ask the House to vote "yes" for my motion.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, while I agree with both gentlemen from Pennsylvania and appreciate the way they have handled the business of the subcommittee, I respectfully believe that we should withdraw forces sooner than the time and date stated in the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3116, the fiscal year 1994 Defense appropriations bill.

The motion offered by my good friend from Pennsylvania would instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment 13, commonly referred to as the Byrd amendment regarding United States operations in Somalia.

The Byrd amendment tracks President Clinton's October 7 pronouncement and allows the use of funds for continued operations in Somalia through March 31, 1994.

I commend and applaud the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee for his efforts to maintain congressional oversight on the funds we spend on the Somalia operations. And I agree with most of the conditions the gentleman put on the use of any funds for Somalia, especially those dealing with the protection of our troops and keeping our troops under the command of United States forces.

What I do not agree with is the approval of this administration's policy to keep us in Somalia for 5 more months.

I believe we should only provide the funds necessary to protect the orderly withdrawal of our troops as promptly as possible.

This should not take 5 months.

Democrats and their friends in the press love to criticize conservatives for being political and "Johnny-come-lately" in disagreement with administration policy on Somalia.

But as usual the press doesn't do justice to the truth.

After a visit to Somalia back in January 1993, I said our humanitarian mission was successful and should be concluded.

In May, the House voted to authorize the use of our troops in Somalia; I voted against this bill and for the Roth amendment prohibiting United States troop involvement after June 30.

On September 1, I condemned this practice of this administration to double the cuts in the Defense Department proposed by the Bush administration diminishing the support for our troops, while still expecting them to engage in miscellaneous peacekeeping operations all over the world.

To date, some 74,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are deployed to over 18 separate countries for the purpose of keeping the peace.

If the United Nations and this administration have their way, they will be in 10 to 15 more countries in the next year, including Haiti and Bosnia.

This is a woebegotten and mistaken policy, Mr. Speaker, and it should be sent back to the drawing board, or else we will unnecessarily lose dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of young Americans in uniform.

We should stop this shameful policy of deploying the young people in our armed services at the whim, direction, and even the control of the United Nations.

We should begin by returning all our soldiers and marines from Somalia—not by March 31, but this year, and within the next few weeks. To do otherwise is to condemn

more young Americans to death, and more American families to sorrow and misery.

I urge the defeat of the motion to instruct, and the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from Somalia.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURTHA, DICKS, WILSON, HEFNER, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, DARDEN, NATCHER, MCDADE, YOUNG of Florida, LIVINGSTON, LEWIS of California, and SKEEN.

There was no objection.

## MOTION TO CLOSE PORTIONS OF CONFERENCE MEETINGS ON H.R. 3116, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURTHA moves, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a) of the House rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration: *Provided, however*, That any sitting Member of Congress shall have a right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 3, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—3

DeFazio
McKinney
Washington

NOT VOTING—21

Barcia
Bateman
Bentley
Berman
Chapman
Conyers
Geren
Harman
Kennedy
Rogers
Royce
Schumer
Sharp
Stokes
Swift
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Torres
Whitten
Wilson
Young (AK)

□ 1336

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the War Powers Resolution clearly states: U.S. troops are not to be deployed overseas in combat, or where combat is deemed imminent, for more than 60 days without congressional authorization.

United States forces in Somalia have been involved in combat operations for well over 60 days—30 troops have been killed and 170 wounded.

Congress has never authorized this operation, yet the Clinton administration contends that it supports the War Powers Resolution and is complying with it.

To end this confusion, I have introduced—under section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution—legislation that calls upon the President to withdraw our forces by January 31, 1994.

Under section 5(c), the Foreign Affairs Committee must report out my legislation within 15 days and this body must vote on it within 3 days thereafter.

In this way, the House will have the opportunity to fully debate the issue. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 170 when it reaches the House floor.

FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 283 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 283

*Resolved*, That all points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, are waived. The motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read.

□ 1340

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 283 waives all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2492, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal 1994. The rule further provides that the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the conference committee to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the House considered and rejected the conference report on the District of Columbia Appropriations Act last week. This rule will allow consideration of a conference report which includes a new section 142 prohibiting the use of Federal funds in the bill for abortions except to save the life of the mother and in cases of rape or incest. There was no language in either the House or Senate versions of H.R. 2492 concerning the use of funds for abortions.

This language is similar to the Hyde language as it applies to Federal funds. In addition, the Labor-HHS Appropriations conference report restricts the use of Federal Medicaid funds for abortions with these same three exceptions.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 283 will expedite consideration of this important conference agreement. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule and urge my colleagues to vote against it. When this conference report was defeated last week, the majority of the Members of this House made a strong statement against allowing the District of Columbia to subsidize abortion, except in case of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. Although this revised conference report prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortion services, it does not prevent the D.C. government from subsidizing abortion. In my opinion, this is contrary to the House position on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule. When this measure was before the Committee on Rules, an amendment to the rule was offered to allow the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to offer an amendment which would ensure that no funds could be used by the District of Columbia to help pay for abortion services. The gentleman from New Jersey was denied this opportunity, and the entire House has been denied the right to vote on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, again, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and to oppose the conference report all the way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. As my colleagues may recall, 1 week ago today, on October 20, this House rejected the first conference report on this bill by a vote of 206 to 224.

The one and only reason for that rejection was the failure of the bill to address the abortion issue.

On that same day a new conference was convened and concluded. Folded into the new conference report was a prohibition on the use of Federal funds for abortions, except in the cases of rape or incest, or to save the life of the mother.

As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] pointed out at our Rules Committee meeting on the conference report that same evening, this alleged compromise doesn't really stop one single abortion, since it puts no abortion restrictions on any of the District money appropriated in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, by putting this weak abortion language inside the conference report, the conferees have violated the scope rule. Ordinarily, such matters are reported as amendments in disagreement to allow a separate House debate and vote on new issues originating in conference.

Had the appropriators followed this standard procedure of reporting the abortion language as an amendment in disagreement, the so-called Smith language could have been offered as an amendment to that.

Instead, we have this rule, which waives points of order against the conference report's violation of the scope rule—the most serious rules violation there is.

What we asked for in the Rules Committee was that the Smith amendment be treated as the conference abortion provision should have been and that is that it be offered to one of the amendments in disagreement, and be protected against a germaneness point of order, just as the other abortion language is.

When we made known our plans at last Wednesday night's meeting to allow the gentleman from New Jersey an opportunity to offer his amendment, the Rules Committee hastily adjourned in disarray and did not reconvene until yesterday on this bill.

At that time, the Rules Committee rejected our motion to make the Smith amendment in order under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman DIXON suggested in the Rules Committee that Mr. SMITH could offer his language if he defeated the previous question here on the floor. But that is not a realistic option since the language would still be subject to a germaneness point of order without the waiver we attempted to get up in the Rules Committee.

Therefore, our only recourse is to defeat this rule, go back to the Rules Committee today, and bring back a rule that gives Mr. SMITH the equal treatment and protection that is given in this rule to the abortion language contained in the conference report. That is the least we can do to be fair to both sides on this issue. I urge Members to defeat this rule and give the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that opportunity.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues know I have always taken a pro life stand here on this floor, but at the same time I have to recognize the District of Columbia has the right to run its own internal affairs. I think too often we forget that the District of Columbia has home rule. I think that we have decided in this House that they have home rule for things that we like, but they do not have home rule for what we do not like.

I personally believe they have the right to run their own internal affairs. I think we should support the people of the District of Columbia in what decisions they make. If that decision is contrary to our personal beliefs, I think we have the right in our States to make the rules. We do not fund abortions in the State of Nevada, but I honor the right of the people of the District of Columbia to make their own choices, and urge that we support this rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in waiving all points of order against the conference report, this rule allows the House leadership to bring forward a compromise on the contentious issue of how funds are spent by the District of Columbia. I do not support this attempt to obfuscate the direct link between Federal funds and abortions—money is fungible and we all know it. I do believe that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] should have been given the chance to bring his amendment to the floor for full debate and vote. Mr. Speaker, I am mostly troubled about the larger issue of home rule in the District of Columbia—which is the underlying basis for arguments I favor of letting the District decide for itself how it will use its money, Federal or otherwise. As someone who lives in DC for a big part of every year, and as a former mayor of a small city, I have concluded with regret and some sadness that the home rule experiment in DC has failed. After 20 years of attempting to make this city work, even the friends of DC—and I count myself one—have lost confidence. I was full of hope in the midsixties that home rule was worth a try—and I live here now, by choice. Quite honestly, the District of Columbia is one of the most poorly run cities I have ever lived in. The Mayor of DC has conceded her inability to get a handle on the extraordinary violence here, resorting to seeking help from the National Guard in beefing up the everyday law enforcement of the city. The prison system is failing; the infrastructure is crumbling; the schools are struggling and if dealing with the Department of Motor Vehicles or any other city agency is usually a nightmare. To put it charitably—courteous/efficient service is apparently not a priority. The Constitution specifically establishes a Federal enclave—but it does not in any way assert that DC should be considered on par with every other State in the Union. Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing funding for the District. Leadership has signalled that in the next few weeks we will be discussing statehood. I think it is time we rethink the policy of home rule in the District of Columbia. As our Nation's Capitol, this city is a beautiful inspiration of monument and memorial. As a place to live it should provide a pleasant, safe and enriching experience for all. What has gone wrong? In a word—the D.C. government. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support efforts to pour more taxpayers' funds into a system that simply is not working.

□ 1350

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by a narrow margin last week this body defeated the conference report necessary for my city to carry on its daily business. Out of respect for the differences expressed among Members and for the positions of some of you, I agreed with Chairman DIXON to the new position the conference committee has taken.

This position, on its face, applies a standard on abortion to the District that is more restrictive than that applied to all 50 States and all four territories. The new standard before us today goes well beyond the Hyde amendment for Medicaid abortion funding that applies to my district as to those of my colleagues.

In addition to the Hyde amendment restrictions, we have accepted these same restrictions on other Federal funding, funding that has never been used for abortion in the past is unavailable under present budget conditions in the District to be used for abortion now.

In the face of this uniquely disparate treatment to my district and my constituents, a few opponents are now trying to pile on, by insisting upon an unprecedented rule that would invade local funding. This local funding, my friends, is 10 percent committed to local necessities other than abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2492 as it now reads is a virtual carbon copy of the bills passed by the House for the 10 years, from 1979 to 1989, and in 1991 and 1992. None of these bills—for 12 years—restricted the District's use of local funds to pay for abortions. The language in today's conference report discriminates uniquely against the District of Columbia. How much invidious treatment should one small jurisdiction be made to bear?

For 8 fiscal years, from 1980 to 1988, the House passed, and President Reagan signed, D.C. appropriations bills that were silent on the use of local revenues to fund abortions. In addition, in 4 of the past 5 years, the House sent D.C. appropriations bills to President Bush that did not restrict the District's use of local funds to pay for abortions. It was not until President Bush vetoed those bills that the House included language that restricted the District's use of locally raised funds to pay for abortions.

Thus, procedurally, what the subcommittee has done in this case is what it has consistently done in the past when conference reports were turned down. What our opponents are asking that this body do is unprecedented, and a particularly dangerous precedent for conference reports. Conference reports have almost not been subject to amendment. Surely, this body does not want to create this precedent just to penalize the District unnecessarily when the conference report has already excluded the use of Federal funds for abortion.

I am asking my colleagues not to use the rule as a club to whip the Nation's Capital. A vote against this rule does much more than harm the District. It is a precedent for the unmitigated confusion that would come with amendments outside conference reports.

A vote for this rule is in keeping with a long line of precedent that puts this body on record barring abortion using the only funds over which Congress has any rightful jurisdiction. There are more than $3 billion in funds in this appropriation that were raised exclusively in the District, paid for exclusively by District taxpayers and District businesses. These funds do not belong in your province.

My colleagues know well that my district and my constituents are experiencing tough days. They deserve better than a rule vote that is not satisfied to stop when discriminatory treatment is inserted, but insists on beating this horse to death.

Please help us. Vote in favor of the rule on the conference report on H.R. 2492.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. As Members may know, the conference report was defeated last week.

After the conference report, Members met with the Rules Committee and were denied the opportunity to further amend the report to disallow the use of local funds for abortion. This is taxpayers' money, and the larger majority of Americans oppose the use of taxpayers' money for abortions.

The problem is when you preclude Federal funds for use, those funds then free up local money for this purpose.

In addition, the conference allows the Congress to break its own commitment to the District of Columbia pension fund for the first time in 15 years. This is a deeply underfunded program, and the more we tinker with it, the worse the fiscal situation those pensioners will have. This commitment to those retirees must be kept.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] our distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. But I also rise to take 30 seconds of my colleagues' time, who may have wondered what I was referring to earlier in a 1-minute speech.

If Members will look at page 315 of the proposed bill which was dropped at

their offices today they will see subtitle (H) reserved, subtitle (I) reserved. That is, the two entire subtitles do not exist.

So when my colleagues on both sides of the aisle get the draft of the Health Security Act, turn to page 315 and look at subtitle (H), which simply says reserved, and subtitle (I), which simply says reserved. There is no legislative details on either of the two subsections of the bill.

I do urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I rarely rise to speak on a rule, but I do so today in strong opposition to the rule for the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

This rule is simply an attempt to protect the so-called revised language that would still, still permit the D.C. city government to resume funding of abortion on demand, entirely with federally appropriated taxpayer funds.

Mr. Speaker, the changing in the wording restricting the use of Federal funds for abortions is simply a sham. We all know that the entire D.C. budget is appropriated by Congress, including those funds raised through local revenue sources.

The Dixon language is a purely verbal distinction between Federal and local funds for the use of funding abortions.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, if this language were adopted, the District of Columbia would be the only jurisdiction where funds appropriated by Congress would be allowed to be used for routine, routine, Medicaid abortions. The language contained in the Hyde amendment only applies to those funds in the Department of Health and Human Services appropriations bill—not funds appropriated through the D.C. appropriations bill. The Dixon language would not deny funding for a single abortion.

This rule is restrictive, it's unfair, and frankly—it is downright wrong. The Rules Committee would not allow my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, to offer a compromise which would have continued the ban on the use of D.C. appropriated funds for abortion—in other words, codifying the Hyde amendment. So, I must ask my colleagues on the Rules Committee—why did you grant special protection to the Dixon language?

We should have been able to have chosen between the two. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to reject this weak attempt to appease those of us who are trying to protect the rights of the unborn.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I thank the gentleman from yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the rule for the D.C. conference report. This rule offers special protection to an amendment which it's supporters claim limits the use of taxpayer appropriated funds for abortions. All of the funds for the District of Columbia are appropriated by Congress. Federal as well as local. It is disingenuous to claim that by limiting the use of Federal funds for abortion, it will limit taxpayer funded abortion on demand in the District of Columbia.

A recent poll has shown that 69 percent of all Americans oppose the use of taxpayers' funds for abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest. It is reprehensible that we should be here today voting on a rule that does not allow those of us who cherish life to offer an amendment that clearly has the support of the taxpaying American public—an amendment that would ensure that no taxpayer funds are used for abortion except to save the life of the mother or in the tragic cases of rape or incest.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for us to discuss abortion during a debate on appropriations for the District of Columbia, but unfortunately some members feel that the women in the District of Columbia—if they're poor—shouldn't have the same rights as other American women, and that the people of the District should not have control over their own tax funds. So abortion is once again a central issue here today.

I believe very strongly that the decision about abortion during the early months of pregnancy is a decision properly left with the women, her family, and her physician. In each case, it is the woman, along with those she most trusts, who is in the best position to decide about an abortion. It is a personal moral decision, not a governmental one. And it is impossible for any of us here today to prejudge what that woman is going through, and what the right decision for her is when she is faced with that choice.

The Supreme Court has, on many occasions, made it clear that women have this fundamental right, and Government cannot take it away. This medical procedure is legal. We should not deny access to a legally protected medical procedure to certain citizens simply because they live in the District of Columbia.

This conference report, in its original form, would have allowed the people of the District of Columbia to decide whether, and under what terms, they would or would not use Federal funds for abortions for poor women. That is it. It would have neither preempted nor overridden any decision about this issue by the government of the District. That's the essence of home rule.

As the House showed by its vote last week, this was not an acceptable approach for those who want the Government to interject itself into these affairs. So the conferees have fashioned a compromise that would put the people of the District of Columbia on the same footing as the people of New Jersey and Indiana and Colorado. We have amended this conference report by inserting the very same restrictions on the use of all Federal funds provided in this bill that the House adopted in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill a few weeks ago for Medicaid funds.

There are some in this body who are not satisfied even with this compromise. They want to continue to force the same restrictions on local D.C. funds that have been in effect since the mid-1980's—restrictions that have made second-class citizens out of poor women—really, all people—in the District of Columbia.

They apparently do not see the inconsistency, or just want to gloss over the inconsistency, in trying to impose on 600,000 hardworking Americans a mandate that they would never dream of asking the House to impose on the rest of the American people.

Can we imagine the uproar from Park Ridge, IL or Huntington Beach, CA or Bartlesville, OK if we told their citizens, "We don't care how your elected officials in Springfield or Sacramento or Oklahoma City decide how they're going to spend your State taxes, we've got a few instructions of our own?"

Our capital city has a multitude of problems, and its leaders are not dealing with them in a manner that satisfies us. Washington is an easy target. We have all seen the post cards in our offices from the right-wing direct-mail organizations. They are bashing the District's efforts to become the 51st State and raising money by stirring up fear and promoting racial hatred.

But this argument isn't over whether we approve or disapprove of the D.C. government or its officials. It is over whether its 600,000 residents have the right to make their own decisions about spending their own money. D.C.'s local taxes cover 84 percent of their expenses, and the opponents of this compromise want to restrict that 84 percent—not the 16 percent the Federal Government provides in lieu of property taxes. Do we honestly think the people from our home districts would stand still for a similar interference?

Mr. Speaker, this new restriction is a compromise we should support. It is not ideal, but it does reverse a travesty

that has been perpetrated on the people of the District of Columbia for the past several years. The original conference report took a giant step in that direction. But the House has said that is not to be. We are instead taking a small step backward by restricting all Federal funds that flow to the District government. We should, if we have any basic respect for the principle of local autonomy, vote for this rule and then for the conference report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House rejected the D.C. appropriations conference report precisely because it reversed current policy that proscribes taxpayer funded abortions in the District of Columbia.

After the vote, Mr. DIXON and other conferees reopened the conference, and inserted language that says no Federal funds can be used to pay for abortions except in the case of rape, incest and life of the mother.

Notwithstanding its obvious surface appeal, this action, this language, is not at all what it seems to be. Please, I say to my colleagues, do not be fooled. Please do not be misled.

Simply put, if this rule passes and the D.C. conference report is enacted into law as presently written, taxpayers will be forced to pay for abortion on demand, at any time during the baby's gestational age.

What the purported Hyde language in this bill does not do is reach or affect in any way the other pot of funds over which Congress has jurisdiction.

If enacted, this appropriations bill will be used to pay D.C. abortionists to inject poison into the fragile bodies of little children. The chemical poison of choice, a highly concentrated salt solution, chemically burns, chokes, and ultimately kills the baby. Hiding behind home rule to defend that kind of tragedy and travesty is simply wrong.

In like manner, if you vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the bill, public funds will be diverted to abortionists who will then cut, hack, and dismember unborn babies.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the so-called Hyde language in the bill will not stop even one dime, not one abortion payment, not one dime would be prohibited as a result of this language. It is interesting to note how the pro-abortionists in the House keep harping on how the Hyde amendment is preserved in the D.C. bill. They know, including the provision is the only way to pass this bill. But I ask Members, do not be fooled.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that this baby-battering called abortion on demand has been given sanction by the high court, but do not force taxpayers to underwrite the cost of this child abuse. Do not force conscientious objectors, be they in the District of Columbia or anywhere else in the land, to be party to the destruction of children.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the pending rule so that an amendment that I have asked be made in order be permitted consideration. The amendment cosponsored by Mr. HYDE and Mr. DORNAN, like the policy that has been in effect since 1988, says simply no taxpayer funds, local or Federal, can be used for abortions except to save the life of the mother.

Additionally, tracking the recently enacted Hyde amendment, the amendment adds two additional exceptions: rape and incest. This admittedly is a compromise on the part of the pro-life side, but it is a position we advance to save the most number of kids from the human butchers.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask for a chance to offer this pro-life amendment. I ask that it be considered. We ask for fairness, not a closed rule. We ask for an opportunity to do just what Mr. DIXON has done. He has his amendment, his language protected by this rule. Why not allow our side at least an opportunity on the House floor, whether we win or not, be given an opportunity to be considered?

Mr. Speaker, let me say finally that we should make no mistake about it that if this amendment passes, lives will be saved. During consideration of the Hyde amendment earlier this year, I and others pointed out during that debate that as a direct result of the Hyde amendment, an estimated 1 million children have been spared. If you look at it another way, that is JFK Stadium filled to capacity with children not once but 20 times. Lives, too, will be saved if our amendment is approved to this bill.

About 5,000 children, it has been estimated, have been spared the agony and the cruelty of abortion since Mr. DORNAN successfully amended the law back in 1988. It would fill our own House Chamber—look around and see the seats around you—fill that Chamber to capacity 10 times. That is how many kids we are talking about would be saved if this amendment is continued.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we cannot save everybody; we all try, we are all concerned about children. But to hide behind home rule and say somehow this injustice of abortion on demand at taxpayer expense ought to be promoted and provided as a SOP to home rule is ridiculous. We have a moral obligation, I would submit, to help those we can especially children whether those people be in New Jersey, the District of Columbia, or anywhere else. If we can save a child in the District of Columbia today, that precious child's life is worth any and all aggravation. And if that means defeating a conference report move debate and discussion the life of a child is worth, in my view, that kind of effort.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chief deputy whip, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week I urged my colleagues to be really clear about the issue that is in front of us today. And today I renew that plea. Even though the waters have become more muddied, we are still dealing with a very straightforward issue, and that issue is the right of 600,000 citizens of the District of Columbia to exercise self-determination.

□ 1410

Last week I told my colleagues that this debate was not about Medicaid funding, which it is not. All Medicaid funding is covered by the Hyde amendment.

Last week we brought this conference report to the floor and it treated the District just like every other State. Other States have the right to self-determination. The conference report went down.

We went back to the Rules Committee and inserted the words saying, "No Federal funding for abortion"; but it seems this still does not satisfy some people.

So I urge my colleagues to look at this as an issue of fairness.

So many of the people who come to Congress have been in State legislatures. Can you imagine being told by Washington, DC, how you would spend your State money, money raised by your State income tax? The people of your State would be outraged, and so would you.

I was a Hartford city councilwoman for 5 years and I know how the people of my city of Hartford treasure their tax dollars, their local tax dollars, and I would have fought to the death to make sure nobody told them how to spend their hard-earned dollars.

So be fair today to the District of Columbia. If you cannot be fair, then have some pride. This is our National Capital.

A constituent of mine came here last week and said, "Oh, what a wonderful city," but this is a city with two sides. It is a city to which tourists come, and you see them in the hall. They love this city.

But this city has the same problems as every other city in the United States of America, real terrible tough problems.

So today we should allocate the money to the city so that they can go on with the work of trying to solve the same problems that many of us have.

I ask people to have pride in their National Capital, to treat them well. I ask people to be fair. I ask them not to use a debate that is going on in this country, and we all have very strong

feelings about that debate, but do not put this difficult question on the back of the District of Columbia. Vote for the rule. Be fair.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will echo the words of the last speaker, the distinguished gentlewoman.

I want to be fair, too. But I also want to adhere to the U.S. Constitution which gives us the responsibility to speak here today.

I have true affection for three cities in the United States, and all of them are horribly besieged by crime. For example, New York City, the Big Apple where I was born, has got serious troubles.

Los Angeles has a similar problem. In fact, I went home to speak at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, where John F. Kennedy beat LBJ. There was a pall of melancholy over the whole greater Los Angeles area because of crime. It is sad that a city named after the angels would be so plagued by crime.

I love this capital city. And I can tell the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] there is no more intellectually stimulating place on the planet Earth. But this city is in bad shape. If we love it then we have got to use the constitutional paper we have to improve it.

I rise to oppose this rule because some of us are trying to get something considered and we are being unfairly blocked.

For the past 5 years, the D.C. appropriations bill has included a provision that I initiated years ago preventing all congressionally appropriated funds from paying for abortions in the District of Columbia.

This conference report will completely overturn this pro-life policy.

The amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], which was added to the conference report, is not—repeat, not like the Hyde amendment to the Labor-HHS bill. It would not deny funding for a single abortion.

My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] added the word "Federal" to the Hyde language, which renders the limitation utterly meaningless. With this language, the District of Columbia will simply designate the money that pays for 4,000 abortions, which is more than the number of children actually born in the District of Columbia, as local funds which are, of course, fungible.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that would allow the House to vote on the old Dornan amendment, with no funding of abortions except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. That was a hard-fought battle on our side, I can guarantee you that.

There are many of us who believe the product of rape is a human being with an immortal soul.

What is interesting is that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] was placed within the conference report and given special protection by the Rules Committee. Twelve other amendments in disagreement will be considered after the conference report is adopted, none of which address the new language on abortion.

Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous speakers who have risen in support of this rule and conference committee report, I come to the well with a slightly different background on the issue of abortion.

I supported the Hyde amendment. I even supported the Hyde amendment when it was the Boxer amendment.

I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct. The expenditure of Federal funds should be restricted, there should be a restriction on abortions. It should be limited to cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother, and I voted that way.

But I find it somewhat insistent, the previous speaker and many others who have risen today are trying to impose a different standard on the District of Columbia and saying to them when it comes to their local funds, when it comes to revenues that they have raised, we want also to impose that obligation and the limitation of the Hyde amendment.

It is curious to me that for 8 years the previous speaker, the gentleman from California, has risen on this issue and on three or four consecutive years I made the point to him that his own home State of California uses its State funds far beyond the restrictions of the Hyde amendment.

The gentleman has said, "Well, I'm going to have to look into that."

Well, I have waited for 8 years. I cannot recall a single speech or an amendment by that gentleman or anyone else from the 13 States which allow their State funds to be used beyond the Hyde amendment that would restrict any Federal funds or restrict any expenditures in terms of their use of State funds.

So you have to ask yourself the question, why is it that some Members are on their high moral horse here when it comes to the District of Columbia, and yet ignore when their own home States are using their State funds beyond the restrictions of the Hyde amendment?

Why are they singling out the District of Columbia? Is it because it is an impoverished city in many areas? Is it because there are so many African-Americans in the District of Columbia, or so many Democrats, or the fact that it does not have full congressional representation? Why must the District of Columbia always be the whipping post year in and year out for these same Congressmen who will not apply the same standards to their own home States?

It is time for us to recognize that if you support the Hyde amendment, it applies to Federal funds, and this bill explicitly says that the Hyde amendment shall apply to Federal funds.

By this little quirk of bookkeeping where the local funds of the District of Columbia go through the Federal Treasury, the right-to-life movement and many of my colleagues are trying to make a great issue.

I will believe their sincerity when they apply the same standards to their home States, and until then, respect the right of the District of Columbia to home rule.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and he is a gentleman. I have tried to figure out a way in 8 years to find jurisdiction in my own State where there is some of this hyprocisy; but the gentleman knows as I know that we have constitutional authority here and I do not have constitutional authority to stop fungibility of funds or hypocrisy in California.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing, I do not quarrel with the gentleman. We are dealing with the fact that the local funds of the District of Columbia do pass through Congress and through the Federal process. I do not quarrel with it.

But where is the justice and equity when 13 States through their legislatures can establish standards which this country recognizes and then turns to the District of Columbia, subjugates them and says that they will be treated differently?

I see no fairness in this. I urge my colleagues, those who voted for the Hyde amendment, to stay consistent. Vote for the rule and vote for the conference committee report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman further, because he said we are picking on this city because of the African-American makeup of the population.

I have stood in this well many times to say that I marched for civil rights with Martin Luther King in this very city, and I am proud of that.

I went to Mississippi and Alabama as a Republican conservative to register voters.

I admit, I was kind of lonesome in that category, but I did enough that I

had a death contract out on me by sheriffs Ferris, Price, and Raney. I faced them down in their own offices.

There is no African-American twist to this. Indeed, how could there be? How those of us who want more black babies born in this city possibly have their motives questioned? When Jesus said, "Whatever you do for the least of these, you do for me," he was not just speaking to DORNAN of California. He was speaking also to DURBIN of Illinois.

I am simply trying to save lives. If they happen to be black babies in their mother's womb or Asian, or white. A life is a life. It is a crime that more babies die by abortion than are allowed to be born in this city. So please, spare us your home rule hypocrisy and don't dare question my motives.

□ 1420

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair indicates to the gallery that we are pleased to have guests here. However, demonstrations concerning what happens here on the floor are not permitted by the House rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] I would like to say that it is so important that we defeat this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is awfully easy for the District of Columbia to play a shell game and use Federal dollars for abortion.

You know, when you have a shell game, you spend money from underneath one shell, and you move it over, and you spend it from the other shell. I would like to believe that this could not be true, but I think it is. The gentlewoman from the District said that conference reports were always under a closed rule. I would like to inform her that is not the case. We do allow amendments. The Committee on Rules has the authority, Mr. Speaker. We tried to get the Smith amendment made in order unsuccessfully.

So, I urge the defeat of this rule at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] to close the debate on this date.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding this time to me.

I would never presume to instruct my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], Mr. Speaker. He is a fine man and a fine Congressman. But, "Really," I say to the gentleman, "don't question our motives. Don't say that we are picking on the District of Columbia because there are a lot of African-Americans there. That's really beneath you. I would like more children born rather than killed; that's my motive, and I don't care where they are." And the gentleman well knows, I have opposed abortion everywhere in the country, not merely in the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this rule is oppressive. It is a closed rule in the sense that the majority gets what it wants, points of order waived, a fraudulent Hyde amendment, and we did not get a full Hyde amendment. We did not get what we want.

The issue is big enough, important enough, significant enough to be fully debated, but we are oppressed with another closed rule, and so I say to my colleagues, "So then, when you people get down here and talk about bipartisanship and fairness, it really has a hollow sound, believe me."

Now, the District of Columbia, with all its problems, and I mean problems, is hung up on abortion, killing unborn children. We want to vote for money for the District of Columbia. It is the Capital City, it is the Federal City, but we are hung up here on the power, to exterminate innocent, inconvenient children. That is what is hanging this up. What an irony.

Now the amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] has put in this bill is a distinction without a difference. It does not stop one abortion, but it pretends to stop abortions by its very words.

There is an old Italian saying: "You may dress the shepherd in silk, but he will still smell of the goat." Now they put a Hyde amendment in here, but the goat smell is in here, too, Mr. DIXON.

Money is fungible like corn in a silo. If we give money to the District, that frees up what they are pleased to call "District money" for abortions, but the quarrel the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] has is not with us; it is with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind my colleagues, may I presume to remind my colleagues, the District of Columbia is not a State, not yet, and until it is, article I prevails, and article I gives this body the legislative authority, the exclusive legislative authority, over the District of Columbia. So, their quarrel is with the Constitution, not with us.

Now this bill's formula, as presented artfully and craftily by the gentleman from California, will coerce, through the tax process, the use of public funds to subsidize abortions. I ask, "Aren't there enough abortions in the District of Columbia? How do you make abortion safe, legal, and rare when you subsidize it? You get more of it—more—and already, among its distinctions, the District of Columbia has an abortion rate three times that of any State of the Union."

Vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I may be in a somewhat awkward position because I agree with the gentleman from Illinois on the principle of no elective abortions. I am sorry; that is just my position. I favor the exceptions of rape, and incest, and the saving of the life of the mother. I do not believe in killing anything. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am a vegetarian.

But I think there is a misconception about the payments to the District of Columbia, and I say to my colleagues, those of you who may come from jurisdictions where there is a Federal presence will remember Federal impact aid. The theory of Federal impact aid is that the Federal Government occupies territory that otherwise would be owned privately and would pay property taxes to the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, that is the proper analogy for the so-called aid to the District of Columbia. It is Uncle Sam paying his taxes because he is a tenant in the District of Columbia, and I might not have been able to make that argument before home rule, but since home rule it is crystal clear to me.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the position of the committee.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 187, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—239

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Bryant | Deutsch |
| Ackerman | Byrne | Dicks |
| Andrews (ME) | Cantwell | Dingell |
| Andrews (NJ) | Cardin | Dixon |
| Andrews (TX) | Carr | Dooley |
| Bacchus (FL) | Chapman | Durbin |
| Baesler | Clay | Edwards (CA) |
| Barca | Clayton | Edwards (TX) |
| Barlow | Clyburn | Engel |
| Barrett (WI) | Coleman | English (AZ) |
| Becerra | Collins (IL) | Eshoo |
| Beilenson | Collins (MI) | Evans |
| Bilbray | Condit | Farr |
| Bishop | Conyers | Fawell |
| Blackwell | Cooper | Fazio |
| Boehlert | Coppersmith | Fields (LA) |
| Bonior | Coyne | Filner |
| Borski | Cramer | Fingerhut |
| Boucher | Darden | Flake |
| Brewster | Deal | Foglietta |
| Brooks | DeFazio | Ford (MI) |
| Brown (CA) | DeLauro | Ford (TN) |
| Brown (FL) | Dellums | Frank (MA) |
| Brown (OH) | Derrick | Franks (CT) |

Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—187

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kyl
LaFalce
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Mann
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman
Berman
Royce
Sharp
Stokes
Tauzin
Whitten

□ 1448

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Tauzin against.

Mr. PORTER and Mr. DELAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1450

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the further conference report on the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, at page 25612.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

(By unanimous consent Mr. SMITH of Michigan was allowed to speak out of order).

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING FRESHMAN CLASS SPECIAL

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House to announce a meeting this afternoon from 3 to 4 o'clock for Republican freshmen and Democrats, and I join with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] in announcing that John Kamensky, Deputy Project Director of the National Performance Review, and Roger Johnson, with the GSA, and other Members will give the freshman class a briefing between 3 and 4 in room 2154 Rayburn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include tabular and extraneous material, on the future conference report on H.R. 2492.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the revised conference agreement which I bring to the House this afternoon is identical to the conference agreement which was voted on last Wednesday with one exception, the issue of funding for abortion.

The conferees met last week and agreed to include a new section, section 142, under amendment number 30, which places the same abortion restrictions on the use of Federal funds in this bill as the so-called Hyde amendment mandates for Federal Medicaid funds.

In other words, the new language we bring to the floor today in section 142 prohibits the use of Federal funds in this bill for abortions except when it is made known to the entity or official to which funds are appropriated that such procedure is necessary to save the life of the mother, or that the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

Madam Speaker, I personally believe this restriction is unfair, because it applies a higher standard to the District than is applied to the 50 States. The Federal funds in our bill are paid to the District in lieu of taxes on the 41 percent of District land owned by the Federal Government, and therefore, should be treated as any other local taxes and revenues are treated, and not be subject to Federal restrictions.

Nevertheless, I urge Members to support this revised agreement so we may proceed with necessary funding for District of Columbia programs.

At this point in the RECORD, I will insert a tabulation summarizing the conference action.

(The table referred to follows:)

## District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, FY 1994, (H.R. 2492)

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with Enacted | Estimate | House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL YEAR 1994 APPROPRIATIONS | | | | | | | | | |
| FEDERAL FUNDS | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal payment to the District of Columbia | 624,854,400 | 653,031,000 | 630,603,000 | 630,603,000 | 630,603,000 | +5,748,600 | -22,428,000 | | |
| Federal contribution to retirement funds | 52,070,000 | 52,070,000 | 52,070,000 | 52,070,000 | 52,070,000 | — | — | — | — |
| Federal contribution to crime and youth iniatives | — | — | 17,327,000 | 15,327,000 | 17,327,000 | +17,327,000 | +17,327,000 | — | +2,000,000 |
| Presidential inauguration | 5,514,000 | — | — | — | — | -5,514,000 | — | — | — |
| Trauma care fund | 5,561,600 | — | — | — | — | -5,561,600 | — | — | — |
| Total, Federal funds to District of Columbia | 688,000,000 | 705,101,000 | 700,000,000 | 698,000,000 | 700,000,000 | +12,000,000 | -5,101,000 | — | +2,000,000 |
| Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia | 688,000,000 | 705,101,000 | 700,000,000 | 698,000,000 | 700,000,000 | +12,000,000 | -5,101,000 | — | +2,000,000 |
| Appropriations, fiscal year 1994 | (688,000,000) | (705,101,000) | (700,000,000) | (698,000,000) | (700,000,000) | (+12,000,000) | (-5,101,000) | — | (+2,000,000) |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | |
| Governmental direction and support | (115,591,000) | (115,888,000) | (118,543,000) | (114,781,000) | (115,888,000) | (+297,000) | — | (-2,655,000) | (+1,107,000) |
| Economic development and regulation | (102,888,000) | (87,293,000) | (85,348,000) | (85,629,000) | (87,293,000) | (-15,595,000) | — | (+1,945,000) | (+1,664,000) |
| Public safety and justice | (945,551,000) | (892,158,000) | (907,968,000) | (877,703,000) | (892,158,000) | (-53,395,000) | — | (-15,810,000) | (+14,453,000) |
| (By transfer) | — | — | — | — | (1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) |
| Public education system | (713,592,000) | (711,742,000) | (711,813,000) | (710,742,000) | (711,742,000) | (-1,850,000) | — | (-71,000) | (+1,000,000) |
| Human support services | (886,777,000) | (882,359,000) | (914,830,000) | (869,587,000) | (882,359,000) | (-4,418,000) | — | (-32,471,000) | (+12,772,000) |
| Public works | (227,622,000) | (206,191,000) | (215,749,000) | (203,939,000) | (206,191,000) | (-21,431,000) | — | (-9,558,000) | (+2,252,000) |
| Washington Convention Center Fund | (13,250,000) | (12,850,000) | (12,850,000) | (12,850,000) | (12,850,000) | (-400,000) | — | — | — |
| Repayment of loans and interest | (291,299,000) | (306,264,000) | (312,948,000) | (316,948,000) | (306,264,000) | (+14,965,000) | — | (-6,684,000) | (-10,684,000) |
| Repayment of general fund recovery debt | (38,342,000) | (38,337,000) | (38,337,000) | (38,337,000) | (38,337,000) | (-5,000) | — | — | — |
| Optical and dental benefits | (3,423,000) | (3,323,000) | (3,423,000) | (3,423,000) | (3,323,000) | (-100,000) | — | (-100,000) | (-100,000) |
| Inaugural expenses | (5,514,000) | — | — | — | — | (-5,514,000) | — | — | — |
| Pay adjustment | — | (81,680,000) | (70,680,000) | (81,680,000) | (81,680,000) | (+81,680,000) | — | (+11,000,000) | — |
| Severance pay | — | (2,202,000) | — | (11,033,000) | (2,202,000) | (+2,202,000) | — | (+2,202,000) | (-8,831,000) |
| Facilities rent/leases | (16,682,000) | — | — | — | — | (-16,682,000) | — | — | — |
| Trauma care fund | (5,561,600) | — | — | — | — | (-5,561,600) | — | — | — |
| Furlough adjustment | (-36,000,000) | — | — | — | — | (+36,000,000) | — | — | — |
| Within-grade salary adjustments | (-13,000,000) | — | — | — | — | (+13,000,000) | — | — | — |
| D.C. General Hospital deficit payment | — | (10,000,000) | — | (20,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (+10,000,000) | — | (+10,000,000) | (-10,000,000) |
| Personal and non-personal services adjustment | (-30,798,600) | — | (-27,062,000) | (-7,000,000) | — | (+30,798,600) | — | (+27,062,000) | (+7,000,000) |
| Energy adjustment | — | (-482,000) | — | — | (-482,000) | (-482,000) | — | (-482,000) | (-482,000) |
| Communications adjustments | — | (-158,000) | — | — | (-158,000) | (-158,000) | — | (-158,000) | (-158,000) |
| Contractual services adjustment | — | (-1,500,000) | — | — | (-1,500,000) | (-1,500,000) | — | (-1,500,000) | (-1,500,000) |
| Cash reserve fund | — | (3,957,000) | — | — | (3,957,000) | (+3,957,000) | — | (+3,957,000) | (+3,957,000) |
| Total, operating expenses, general fund | (3,286,294,000) | (3,352,102,000) | (3,365,425,000) | (3,339,652,000) | (3,352,102,000) | (+65,808,000) | — | (-13,323,000) | (+12,450,000) |
| Capital Outlay | | | | | | | | | |
| General fund | (393,639,000) | (108,743,000) | (108,743,000) | (158,743,000) | (108,743,000) | (-284,896,000) | — | — | (-50,000,000) |
| Enterprise Funds | | | | | | | | | |
| Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund: | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | (251,630,000) | (240,929,000) | (240,929,000) | (240,929,000) | (240,929,000) | (-10,701,000) | — | — | — |
| Capital outlay | (45,908,000) | (29,087,000) | (29,087,000) | (29,087,000) | (29,087,000) | (-16,821,000) | — | — | — |
| Total, Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund | (297,538,000) | (270,016,000) | (270,016,000) | (270,016,000) | (270,016,000) | (-27,522,000) | — | — | — |

## District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, FY 1994, Including FY 1993 Supplemental (H.R. 2492) - Continued

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with Enacted | Estimate | House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund | (8,450,000) | (7,168,000) | (7,168,000) | (7,168,000) | (7,168,000) | (-1,282,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Cable Television Enterprise Fund | (2,500,000) | (2,353,000) | (2,353,000) | (2,353,000) | (2,353,000) | (-147,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Enterprise Funds | (308,488,000) | (279,537,000) | (279,537,000) | (279,537,000) | (279,537,000) | (-28,951,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, District of Columbia funds 1/ | (3,988,421,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (3,753,705,000) | (3,777,932,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (-248,039,000) | --- | (-13,323,000) | (-37,550,000) |
| Total, title I, fiscal year 1994 appropriations: | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Funds to the District of Columbia | 688,000,000 | 705,101,000 | 700,000,000 | 698,000,000 | 700,000,000 | +12,000,000 | -5,101,000 | --- | +2,000,000 |
| Federal funds to other institutions | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District of Columbia funds | (3,988,421,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (3,753,705,000) | (3,777,932,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (-248,039,000) | --- | (-13,323,000) | (-37,550,000) |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | --- | --- | (1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) |
| TITLE II | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL YEAR 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | |
| Governmental direction and support | --- | (14,231,000) | (15,133,000) | (15,501,000) | (14,231,000) | (+14,231,000) | --- | (-902,000) | (-1,270,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | (-6,342,000) | (-4,760,000) | (-7,162,000) | (-6,342,000) | (-6,342,000) | --- | (-1,582,000) | (+820,000) |
| Economic development and regulation | --- | (5,202,000) | (1,047,000) | (6,047,000) | (5,202,000) | (+5,202,000) | --- | (+4,155,000) | (-845,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | (-10,242,000) | (-10,587,000) | (-10,587,000) | (-10,242,000) | (-10,242,000) | --- | (+345,000) | (+345,000) |
| Public safety and justice | --- | (6,230,000) | (6,230,000) | (6,230,000) | (6,230,000) | (+6,230,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescission | --- | (-20,578,000) | (-18,921,000) | (-21,078,000) | (-20,578,000) | (-20,578,000) | --- | (-1,657,000) | (+500,000) |
| Public education system | --- | (1,976,000) | (246,000) | (4,246,000) | (1,976,000) | (+1,976,000) | --- | (+1,730,000) | (-2,270,000) |
| Rescission | --- | (-5,233,000) | (-7,503,000) | (-7,503,000) | (-5,233,000) | (-5,233,000) | --- | (+2,270,000) | (+2,270,000) |
| Human support services | --- | (81,772,000) | (70,772,000) | (81,772,000) | (81,772,000) | (+81,772,000) | --- | (+11,000,000) | --- |
| Rescissions | --- | (-2,221,000) | (-2,221,000) | (-2,221,000) | (-2,221,000) | (-2,221,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Public works | --- | (23,447,000) | --- | --- | (23,447,000) | (+23,447,000) | --- | (+23,447,000) | (+23,447,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | (-3,271,000) | (-3,271,000) | (-3,271,000) | (-3,271,000) | (-3,271,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Washington Convention Center Fund (rescission) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Repayment of loans and interest | --- | (11,059,000) | (19,051,000) | (11,059,000) | (11,059,000) | (+11,059,000) | --- | (-7,992,000) | --- |
| Repayment of general fund recovery debt | --- | (-5,000) | (-5,000) | (-5,000) | (-5,000) | (-5,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Resizing | --- | (225,000) | (225,000) | (225,000) | (225,000) | (+225,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Pay adjustment | --- | (7,880,000) | (7,880,000) | (7,880,000) | (7,880,000) | (+7,880,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Severance pay | --- | (10,410,000) | (10,410,000) | (10,410,000) | (10,410,000) | (+10,410,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Facilities rent/leases | --- | (-16,682,000) | (-16,682,000) | (-16,682,000) | (-16,682,000) | (-16,682,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Furlough adjustment | --- | (36,000,000) | (36,000,000) | (36,000,000) | (36,000,000) | (+36,000,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Within-grade adjustment | --- | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (+13,000,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Personal and nonpersonal adjustment | --- | (30,798,600) | (1,068,600) | (30,798,600) | (30,798,600) | (+30,798,600) | --- | (+29,730,000) | --- |
| Total, operating expenses, general fund (net) | --- | (177,656,600) | (117,112,600) | (154,659,600) | (177,656,600) | (+177,656,600) | --- | (+60,544,000) | (+22,997,000) |
| Capital Outlay | | | | | | | | | |
| General fund | --- | (200,000) | (200,000) | (200,000) | (200,000) | (+200,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescissions | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Capital Outlay (net) | --- | (200,000) | (200,000) | (200,000) | (200,000) | (+200,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Enterprise Funds | | | | | | | | | |
| Water and sewer enterprise fund: | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | --- | (12,717,000) | (12,717,000) | (12,717,000) | (12,717,000) | (+12,717,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Rescissions | --- | (-41,482,000) | (-41,482,000) | (-41,482,000) | (-41,482,000) | (-41,482,000) | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Water and Sewer | --- | (-28,765,000) | (-28,765,000) | (-28,765,000) | (-28,765,000) | (-28,765,000) | --- | --- | --- |

## District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, FY 1994, Including FY 1993 Supplemental (H.R. 2492) - Continued

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with Enacted | Estimate | House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund | -- | (-270,000) | (-270,000) | (-270,000) | (-270,000) | (-270,000) | -- | -- | -- |
| Cable Television Enterprise Fund | -- | (35,000) | (35,000) | (35,000) | (35,000) | (+35,000) | -- | -- | -- |
| Rescissions | -- | (-300,000) | (-300,000) | (-300,000) | (-300,000) | (-300,000) | -- | -- | -- |
| Total, Enterprise Funds, Net | -- | (-29,300,000) | (-29,300,000) | (-29,300,000) | (-29,300,000) | (-29,300,000) | -- | -- | -- |
| Total, title II, fiscal year 1993 supplemental | | | | | | | | | |
| District of Columbia funds (net) 2/ | -- | (148,556,600) | (88,012,600) | (125,559,600) | (148,556,600) | (+148,556,600) | -- | (+60,544,000) | (+22,997,000) |
| Appropriations | -- | (227,166,600) | (158,006,600) | (208,104,600) | (227,166,600) | (+227,166,600) | -- | (+69,160,000) | (+19,062,000) |
| Rescissions | -- | (-78,610,000) | (-69,994,000) | (-82,545,000) | (-78,610,000) | (-78,610,000) | -- | (-8,616,000) | (+3,935,000) |
| Grand total: | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal funds to the District of Columbia | 688,000,000 | 705,101,000 | 700,000,000 | 698,000,000 | 700,000,000 | +12,000,000 | -5,101,000 | -- | +2,000,000 |
| District of Columbia funds, 1994 | (3,988,421,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (3,753,705,000) | (3,777,932,000) | (3,740,382,000) | (-248,039,000) | -- | (-13,323,000) | (-37,550,000) |
| (By transfer) | -- | -- | -- | -- | (1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) | (+1,025,000) |
| District of Columbia funds (net), 1993 | -- | (148,556,600) | (88,012,600) | (125,559,600) | (148,556,600) | (+148,556,600) | -- | (+60,544,000) | (+22,997,000) |
| Appropriations | -- | (227,166,600) | (158,006,600) | (208,104,600) | (227,166,600) | (+227,166,600) | -- | (+69,160,000) | (+19,062,000) |
| Rescissions | -- | (-78,610,000) | (-69,994,000) | (-82,545,000) | (-78,610,000) | (-78,610,000) | -- | (-8,616,000) | (+3,935,000) |

1/ Includes decreases of -$36,969,000 for FY 1994 submitted in H.Doc. 103-136.

2/ Includes supplemental increases of $30,815,000 for FY 1993, of which, $23,447,000 is for the July-September 1992 payment to METRO for operating expenses, submitted in H.Doc. 103-136.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, last week the House conference report on the District of Columbia was defeated. Madam Speaker, we defeated this bill for a number of reasons, primarily, because it allowed the use of taxpayers' dollars to pay for abortion. Now the report before us, while precluding federally appropriated dollars, would allow local funds to be used. Since use of Federal dollars for other municipal obligation would free up more local funds, it is my concern that more abortions would be performed. I cannot support that.

I will also take a moment to say to my colleagues that the report still contains language delaying the obligation of $2 million to the retirement fund until the end of fiscal year 1994. This pension is already seriously underfunded and will require major surgery if it is to survive. I would like to have seen full payment of $52 million, as agreed to by Congress. I fear that we are setting a bad precedent when we start delaying payment. Our commitment to the District has the force of law and obliges us to meet our commitment. We should stick to it. Those retired employers were given our commitment and have planned accordingly, we cannot continue to shortchange them.

An unfortunate sidelight to this debate has been the statehood demonstrations. No one would deny the citizens of the District the right to protest. The right of free speech should not be challenged. However, when some of the demonstrators block entrances and exits to Federal buildings, they broke the law, and created a public safety hazard. When the district attorney decided not to prosecute the lawbreakers, it created a bad faith situation between Congress and the District of Columbia. Regardless of how they feel about the demonstration and the demonstrators' violation of the law, they are obligated to prosecute. Clearly, this does not help the already strained relationship between the District of Columbia and Congress.

A request of the Congress to provide National Guard troops to the District of Columbia in the face of official disregard of existing laws may be met with some degree of cynicism. For these reasons, I will again vote against the conference report in its current form, and urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, the first words I want recorded on the floor at this time are words of thanks to my colleagues. I appreciate the strong support we have just gotten on the rule. It means a great deal to me personally. I cannot tell Members how much it means to the people I represent.

However, I must appeal to my colleagues one more time. We must approve the conference report itself and get the D.C. appropriation behind us.

It should be remembered that the Senate overwhelmingly passed our first bill that was silent on abortion for both Federal and local funds. The Members of this House have now inserted unique language into our appropriation, language that applies nowhere that flies the American flag.

This bill has been needlessly difficult for the House, and it has been tortuous for the people I represent, especially at this moment in time.

What the Members have just done is to reject an extreme position on abortion, and the Members have done so because that has never been the position of this body.

□ 1500

The vote just taken on the rule is where this House has always been.

If it was good enough for Ronald Reagan, who signed bills just like this conference report, it should be good enough for anybody on that side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle. Ronald Reagan signed a bill just like the bill before us today every year for two terms. Do not depart from that tradition. Keep that balance here.

As to whether we in the District of Columbia will be spending local funds for abortion, I must ask, are you serious? Have you been reading the local newspapers lately? The District does not have money for cops in the streets. The only money for abortions for poor women is money you have already restricted for your districts and for mine in restriction on Medicaid funding.

Today I have heard a virtual roster of reasons why people may not vote for this appropriation: Crime in DC, problems with the city government, personal slights inflicted by someone in the District that people feel, votes against spending. How many of my colleagues come from jurisdictions to which these do not apply: Crime, problems with local government and the like? If you come from a jurisdiction where the government runs smoothly, where there is no crime, where you have not felt a personal slight from your local government, you are both fortunate and atypical.

If you deny funds because you just want an opportunity to vote down an appropriations, who are you hurting? You are not hurting the District government. You are not hurting the Mayor or the city council. You are hurting the people that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] says he cares most about. You are hurting poor children in the District of Columbia.

This city is in the middle of cruel layoffs, does not have enough money to pay for cops, has gone to ask the President for the National Guard—and you want to deny it funds.

Further, let us get the buzz words out of this debate. This debate got out of control for a while. It has come back into balance and moderation where the American people are. This is now a question of straight-out fairness.

Is it fair to overturn local self-government? Is it fair to compel uniquely discriminatory language in an appropriation bill? Is it fair to tell D.C. taxpayers how to spend money you had nothing to do with raising? These issues are what fairness is about. Fairness is about paying the debt you owe the District of Columbia because this appropriation is different from every appropriation that comes before this House. It is a debt you owe the District for services rendered and for compelling restrictions on the ability of the District to develop itself economically.

Finally, when you cite the Constitution, my dear colleagues, please cite it all. Do not just cite the part that says that you have plenary jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. You gave that up with the passage of the Home Rule Act, unless you did not mean it 20 years ago. If you want to cite the Constitution, cite the whole Constitution. Cite that part of the Constitution that guarantees self-government and democracy to the people of the District of Columbia, just the same way that the Constitution guarantees those rights to you and to those you represent.

Please vote for the conference report.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I think the arguments made by my colleague from the District of Columbia about the sad shape of the economy and the sad shape of the District of Columbia budget again underscores the fact that this area is not ready to be a State, this area is having a tough time working as a city, much less a State.

Well, Madam Speaker, here we are again with the D.C. appropriations conference report—for all practical purposes, the very same conference report we just defeated last week.

The amount of money in the bill—$17 million over the authorized Federal payment—is still the same. The poor fiscal practice of forward funding the pension contribution is still the same. And the ability of the D.C. government to fund abortions is exactly the same.

What is also exactly the same is that this bill rewards city officials who have

proven themselves irresponsible by committing illegal acts to pressure Congress, blocking streets leading to the Capitol and even blocking the doorways to a congressional office building.

Let me clarify a few things for my colleagues. I am not talking about citizens exercising their first amendment rights. I strongly support those rights, the right to speak, loudly and aggressively, the right to demonstrate, holding signs and joining with others to make a point. Blocking doors and streets is a totally different matter.

I am also suggesting that this bill should be defeated because of the legal actions of a few private citizens. As I said last week, if that's all it was, I wouldn't even mention it.

What I am talking about are the illegal actions of elected public officials to try to coerce Congress. Our colleague, Ms. NORTON, said that the residents of the District of Columbia didn't vote to blockade Congress, and that's true—but they did vote for several people who have engaged in such illegal activities, and that's the point. And then, of course, appointees of their government made sure that they suffer no punishment for their illegal actions of coercion against this Congress.

If you vote for this conference report, you will be telling the officials of this city, "Go ahead. Commit as many illegal acts against us as you want. Block our streets. Block our doors. There'll be no repercussions. We're such patsies, we'll not only give you your full Federal payment, we'll give you $17 million to boot."

Madam Speaker, we should be stronger than that. We rejected this bill last week. It still has the same problems it had then. Let's reject it again. Vote "no" on this conference report.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I have not spoken on this issue previously because I know that it is a loser politically in my congressional district, but we must speak out on this.

You know, next month we will all turn our backs on the District of Columbia where we do legislative business, and we will go home to a comfortable place, and sit around and celebrate Thanksgiving with our family, with our children, all of whom were wanted, all of whom are very well cared for, all of whom feel secure in the lives that we are able to provide for them. And we will turn our backs on the District of Columbia, having legislated that women in the northwest of D.C. who can afford to control their own lives will continue to be able to do that, and many of the women in southeast D.C. who do not have the financial resources to do so will not have that control over their own lives, because we have taken it away.

And we have also, many of the Members of this body, attempted to emasculate the D.C. City Council from even being able to determine how to spend its own tax revenue, because we know best what is best for them, how they should be making up their own minds. Our sense of morality is superior to them. Our sense of morality is superior to those young women whose lives we will never for one second experience. We do not know what kinds of conditions they are living under, but we know best how they should make that decision whether to carry a fetus to term or not.

□ 1510

Over 90 percent of the abortions performed in the District of Columbia are performed in the first trimester, before there is a viable fetus. That is responsibility; but it is also a responsibility to know whether that child can be cared for. Do you think that the amount of violence and the devaluation of life that we see happening in the District of Columbia has no relationship to the number of unwanted children? Have any of you ever walked the family corridor of the District of Columbia and seen young children cower, cower at the sight of their parents? But yet we have some type of moral superiority that we know what is best for people's lives.

We were not elected to play God. We were elected to support the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States makes clear we ought to separate religion from state. It makes clear that fundamental above all other principles is individual liberty.

Today we are going to violate that sense of individual freedom because of our moral superiority over the people who live in the District of Columbia every day.

Let me also tell you, ladies and gentlemen, what we are talking about is very directly related to the history of the District of Columbia, the fact that the grandparents and great-grandparents of many of the residents of the District of Columbia never had the opportunity to get a decent job or to live in decent housing. They were excluded from the suburbs that I represent. They did not have the options that were available to the white middle class. They were suffering under intolerable economic conditions.

But yet it is up to us to determine what is right and what is wrong in their lives? It is a shame that this bill is going to be passed and that this is the only way that we can appropriate funds to the District of Columbia. It is a shame, and we should be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say for the good of my soul that I think that, following the words of our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, when they said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men," meaning mankind, "are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," I take that to mean that it is an endowment from Almighty God that is inalienable, the right to life, and if trying to defend that right to life against people who think individual liberty is manifestly exterminating inconvenient, defenseless, vulnerable, can't-rise-up-in-the-streets, cannot-vote, little babies, then I am happy to do it, think whatever of me that ye will.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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

Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] that I happen to agree with his respect for the dignity of life, but it is my conclusion—and I have gone through much the same schooling that the gentleman has; I have had a Catholic education my whole life—I do not believe that before the fetus is viable that that is the same human life that exists in the last trimester of pregnancy. If the gentleman wants to put in an amendment that makes it more difficult in the last trimester of pregnancy, I would strongly support that. But there are many Americans who do not believe that what we are trying to do is to preserve human life.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, if I may say to the gentleman, it is human, not animal, vegetable, or mineral; it is a life that abortion killed, human life.

Mr. MORAN. It is not a human life. The sperm united with the egg is not human life. Where does the gentleman make that distinction? That is a judgment that each of us must make.

Mr. HYDE. No, sir, that is a medical judgment, and the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MORAN. It is the gentleman's philosophical and religious conclusion, which I respect, but it ought to also be up to the gentleman to respect other people's conclusions when they differ.

Mr. HYDE. We are here to defend innocent human life.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriations

bill H.R. 2492. This revised version includes a provision that, while no Federal funds may be used for abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest, local funds may be used to pay for abortions. Local funds and Federal funds are commingled in this bill.

It is merely an exercise in bookkeeping to say that no Federal funds are used for abortion services since all funds in this bill are appropriated by Congress. This bill still allows abortion on demand in our Nation's Capitol.

I recently did a survey of my constituents on a wide range of issues and abortion was one of them; 69 percent of Nevadans said they do not support the use of Federal funds for abortions. This directly correlates with a nationwide survey that shows that 69 percent of all Americans do not support the use of Federal funds for abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest. It is irresponsible of us to vote on a bill that uses taxpayers moneys in a way that taxpayers absolutely do not support. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. Let us send this bill back to conference until it contains language that has the support of the majority of the American people.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time and I reserve the right to close.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

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

Madam Speaker, look at what is going on in Washington, DC: The District of Columbia cannot protect the living, much less those who are yet to be born. When the District of Columbia has crime problems, murder problems, who does the Mayor call for? The Feds, the National Guard.

Now when we want to protect the innocent, the unborn, sudddenly the delegate from the District of Columbia tells us, "Well, the Feds aren't welcome now. Now you are meddlers. Now you are interfering."

The District of Columbia says, Ignore the U.S. Constitution and let them do anything that their council wants to do, the same council whose policies over the past several years have accounted for tens of thousands of people to move out of this place.

Article I, section 9 of the U.S. Constitution says, "We, the Congress," not the D.C. council, have exclusive jurisdiction over the legislation for the District of Columbia. And the home rule charter, by which we try to give them more local control, expressly has the reservation that we maintain the final say in these matters because we cannot give it away.

We kept the power, and it is our duty to decide that issue.

The District of Columbia can shift money around. If it is rape, incest, or the life of the mother, then they can use Federal money. But for other abortions, abortions on demand, they will say, "We will just use that money, but it is still taxpayers money." Federal funds cannot be used for abortion on demand, they can use social workers money or firefighters money, or street cleaners money, and the result is the same. We need to say taxpayers money is not going to be used for abortion on demand; only under limited circumstances such as we adopted for the Hyde amendment.

We need to reject the conference committee report accordingly.

I call upon the Members of this body to do so.

□ 1520

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I would like to ask my colleague, the ranking Republican, just one brief question.

As I understand it, the gentleman served on the council in his home city before he came to Congress?

Mr. WALSH. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct, in Syracuse, NY.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And how much did the gentleman get paid for being on the council?

Mr. WALSH. The pay scale then, and I think it still may be, is $15,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. $15,000?

Mr. WALSH. For the city council, part-time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And what is the population of that city?

Mr. WALSH. It is about 170,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

In Indianapolis, we have 750,000 people and the councilmen there make about $10,000 a year, plus they get meeting stipends, which bring the overall total to about $15,000 a year.

Does the gentleman know how much the councilmen make here in Washington, DC?

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just finish and then I will be happy to yield in just one moment.

They make $72,000 a year. That is five times what they get in Syracuse. That is five times what they get in Indianapolis, and Indianapolis is 50 percent more in population than Washington, DC, 50 percent more people in Indianapolis than here, and yet they are making five times as much, $75,000 a year to be on the council.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. In the two States and local jurisdictions that the gentleman cited, who decided what the council would be paid?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I imagine the council and the people of the city of Indianapolis.

Mr. DIXON. And that is exactly what has happened here. The people here have made that decision, and through the same kind of process.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might reclaim my time, Madam Chairman, I would just like to say that when they are using Federal tax dollars from all over the country, and you say to the people of Washington, DC, "What do you want to pay your councilmen?" Or "What do you want to pay my buddies on the council?"

They say, "Well, we don't have to worry about it. It's not our tax dollars. It's Federal tax dollars coming from all over the country."

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, I will not yield. I just yielded.

You get five times as much money as you are getting in cities that are much larger in this country; Detroit, Chicago, Indianapolis, Syracuse.

I mean, I think it is absolutely unconscionable that Federal tax dollars are going to this city in the amounts that we are giving them, and they are squandering, in my view, large amounts of money that they are not accountable for because the monies are not raised here.

Now, I am checking and I am sure because I checked this last year and the year before, I am sure that the public employees here in Washington, DC, even if you take into consideration that the cost of living is higher here, the public employees are getting a tremendous amount of money more than cities of like size throughout this country, and I believe it is because of the mentality that exists on the council here, and that is that it is not our tax dollars. We do not have to raise it here. It is coming from the Federal Treasury, and we are as Big Brother here in the Congress keep giving them more and more money.

As a matter of fact, this year we are giving the District of Columbia——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this additional time.

You are getting $12 million more than you got last year, and last year it was $688 million.

Now, I have not checked the budgets for other cities of this size, but I am

very confident that this is extremely in excess of what other cities of comparable size are getting.

I just would like to say to my colleagues who may be watching back in their offices that we have to do something about getting control of this city government here. They cannot control crime. They cannot control drugs. They cannot control the streets, and yet every year we give them more and more money.

And what do they do? They take a former convicted felon, the former Mayor of this city, and after he was convicted, he was reelected to the council and he is getting $72,000 a year, which is five times what comparable cities are getting.

I mean, for goodness sakes, where do we draw the line? We need to have more accountability in this city. We are not getting it.

I just would like to say to my colleagues, we ought to vote this thing down, send it back and put some pressure on this administration in this city to change its policies.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana.

Can the gentleman from Indiana tell me the total amount of money in this bill?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, according to the new budget authority obligated this year in fiscal year 1992, it was $688 million.

Mr. DIXON. No, the total amount in the bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, it says $700 million is obligated for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

Mr. DIXON. The point that I am trying to make is that the gentleman is talking about things that he has not even taken the time to really discuss and analyze.

I asked the gentleman how much money in total was in the bill. The gentleman is talking about whose money it is.

There is $3.7 billion in this bill; $3 billion are taxpayer dollars from District of Columbia taxpayers; $700 million in Federal funds is provided to the District, $630-some odd million is a Federal payment in lieu of the Federal government paying a property tax here.

You could argue that there is no Federal money in this bill; but my whole point to the gentleman is that he gets up on the floor, and when I ask the gentleman a simple question as to the total amount of money in the bill, the gentleman has to refer to the bill, and then he cannot come up with the answer, he comes up with the wrong answer, just as the gentleman comes up with the wrong answer when he goes through this dialog about something that the gentleman is not conversant with.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

The gentleman said he wants to be involved in a colloquy, and he stands up and makes a statement and sits down. Is that a colloquy?

Mr. DIXON. I allowed the gentleman to respond.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say, the fact of the matter is, there is $700 million of Federal money in this bill, and every statement I made was accurate.

If the gentleman wants to obfuscate the issue, that is fine.

Now, I realize that the total amount in the bill is $3.753 billion, but the fact of the matter is, there is $700 million in Federal tax dollars.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute, if the gentleman from Indiana would engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, the gentleman really wants to talk?

Mr. DIXON. Will the gentleman engage in a colloquy?

The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is $700 million of Federal money—what we want characterized as "federal money."

Can the gentleman break that down for me?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I do not think I have to break it down. It is $12 million more than last year, and this city is being run in an efficient manner.

Mr. DIXON. The question is, Does the gentleman know how this money is broken down?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I say to the gentleman, he knows I do not sit on his committee. The gentleman knows I have not been privied to all the discussions, but I do know the bottom line, and I can see what is going on here.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, the gentleman makes my point very well.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding this time to me. Let me say, Mr. WALSH has done an outstanding job as ranking member of the D.C. Subcommittee.

Madam Chairman, as we move toward a vote on this D.C. appropriations conference report, I urge Members to take a good hard second look as to what we will be authorizing.

You know, I talked to a large number of Members as they were coming through the door a moment ago during the vote on the rule, and Members kept telling me, "Oh, the Hyde amendment is in there. It's covered." In my mind, there continues to be a great deal of confusion purposefully put there by the proabortionists as to what this conference report will do on the issue of abortion.

Yet, it would also appear, at least judging by what Mr. DIXON and others have said, there is at least a consensus that Federal funds shouldn't be used for abortion. Even the proaborts say that now. I will remind them of this next year when we debate the Hyde amendment.

But let me just say very clearly and unambiguously that under this legislation, abortion on demand will be subsidized by the taxpayers in the District of Columbia.

The language in the report is deficient and bows to home rule. Yet if home rule is so sacrosanct, I must ask Madam Chairman, why we would have the large number of provisions, about 37 I think, under the "General Provisions" title, which restrict the use of funds dealing with travel expenses, the implementation of the Domestic Partners Act, gas mileage requirements, and on and on.

There are already restrictions in the bill that abridge home rule. Chairman DIXON himself offers us a piece of legislation today that circumscribes home rule in myriad ways. Yet, I don't hear a peep out of those who are arguing home rule about those particular matters today.

It seems to me that when we are looking at priorities, the care, the preservation, and the protection of innocent human life must be paramount. Protection of the right to life is the most elemental human right of all.

To argue home rule when talking about abortion on demand with no restrictions throughout the entirety of pregnancy, well it just pales in my view to insignificance in that comparison.

A child's life, Madam Chairman, is priceless. That life is in no way diminished because we are admonished to kowtow to home rule. I believe that we need to enhance those lives, but first and foremost we need to protect those lives from the implements of destruction that are no less lethal than Uzis, pistols, shot guns, and other types of weapons that are used to kill people.

□ 1530

To use poison shots to kill unborn babies with saline solutions is wrong, and we ought not to subsidize it. To pay off abortionists with tax dollars from the people of the District of Columbia, to give abortionists money to rip apart an unborn child limb to limb, tearing off the head, the body, the legs—and that is the gruesome reality of abortion—is unseemly. We sanitize abortion when we talk about it in this Chamber; the so-called pro-choice

movement sanitizes it in its marketing. Their euphemisms drip like cyanide. They love to talk around it, but not about it.

The simple fact of the matter is that abortion rips apart babies. It is not a respecter of race, gender, or even gestational age. Abortionists murder babies for a profit. If we vote for this conference report, Madam Chairman, we will authorize payoffs to abortionists to kill 3,000 or 4,000 innocent children per year. Some of those children, I say to my colleagues, if that subsidy were not there, would be saved from the cruelty of abortion. It seems to me that we have a moral obligation to stop those death payoffs. Those of us who see birth as an event that happens to each of us, those of us who respect babies, must stand firm against any and all efforts to facilitate or promote the demise of these vulnerable children.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise because there has been some discussion about how the District spends its funds. When we combine taxes paid to the Federal Treasury and local taxes, the District has the highest per capita tax rate in the United States. We pay for ourselves, Madam Speaker. What is paid us by the Congress is for what is owed us for restrictions and burdens Congress has placed on the District.

Members have surely chosen the wrong time to complain about how money is spent in the District of Columbia because the District of Columbia is not spending money these days. The District of Columbia is cutting money these days. This is not a time to complain about spending. Everything in the District is being cut.

My colleagues, the American people will think we have lost our minds if they wake up tomorrow morning and find headlines that say that Congress, in the midst of the District's crime crisis, denies the District of Columbia funds. During the Nixon administration, when there was a crime wave, that administration requested that the District be given more money to hire policemen and Congress complied. This administration has not, and this Congress has not.

Cite your excuse—whether it is abortion, whether it is crime, whether it is what the District spends its money for. We have heard them all. Most of this money is ours. Vote for this conference report and give the District of Columbia what belongs to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I say to my colleagues, you know, what's happening here reminds me of the story of the importuning widow in the Bible. You probably remember that story.

The widow really does not have much of a case, but she keeps coming to the judge and pressing her case, and finally he says, "You don't really have a case, Madam, but you're wearing me out, so I'm going to give you what you want."

This bill came to the Congress before, and we sent it back with a large majority. It now comes back, and it is fundamentally not a different bill than it was before.

Remember the story of the importuning widow. Do not be weary of welldoing. Send this bill back again, and tell them they have to send it here with the language we want or we are not going to fold like that judge in the Bible. We are going to keep sending it back until it comes back with the proper language.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, distinguished on both sides, we have all been subject to some of these deep, psychoanalytical questionings by reporters who ask us, as my colleagues know, what our favorite color is and what book is on our nightstands. I always say, "You mean after the Bible, and the Constitution, and the collected works of Jefferson and Lincoln, what's on my nightstand?"

And then the reporters ask, "What would you like on your gravestone?"

Madam Speaker, I say this quite seriously:

I don't mind putting on my gravestone the number of unborn children that have been spared because of the Dornan amendment, which prevented public funds from being used to kill innocent life in the womb. I had help in this fight. CHRIS SMITH, HENRY HYDE, George Bush, and Ronald Reagan. I took note that in the current Newsweek's "conventional wisdom" section it says this about President Bush, "We miss you, Big Guy."

Here is the arithmetic that I would not mind having on my gravestone:

In 1988, before the Dornan language prohibiting federal funding of abortion was adopted, there were 3,139 abortions. After the Dornan language took effect in Fiscal Year 1989: One. Fiscal Year '90: One. Fiscal Year 1991: One.

Madam Speaker, that is a fine legacy. And I just want to say to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], and everybody else, including the former councilwoman, that I see troops around the floor now who proudly say they know more than Mother Teresa, and Pope John Paul, and Billy Graham and all the other great leaders about abortion and life in the womb. But they are wrong. And doesn't anybody find it the least bit hypocritical that the most liberal among us, who fancy themselves exemplars of compassion, are downright uncompassionate when it comes to unborn children? They give the benefit of the doubt to a very unfortunate or disadvantaged human being, except the unborn.

It's my constitutional right to serve as the legislator for the District of Columbia. This House and the U.S. Senate function as the legislature for the District of Columbia. We are collectively the governors-general for this Federal District. It's our constitutional right to come to this well and defend innocent human life, with an immortal soul, put there by God, our Creator Himself. It is our right and it is right, that we should do that.

Now, Madam Speaker, we can be generous and defer to the city council, on many local issues. For instance, we do not interfere with their gun control laws. But I would like to know why I am tempted to break the law and carry a concealed weapon for personal safety every time I come into this District. I do not, even though I know I could get away with it because, as a Congressman, I will never be asked, let alone frisked. So I could get away with it for my personal safety. What in the three plus billion dollars in tax dollars, most of it paid by lobbyists, and corporations, and visitors to the city, and by wealthier citizens all in Northwest, goes to control crime in this beautiful city? Why does the District of Columbia have to turn to the National Guard and ask the President, who "fudged" it, to give them men in uniform?

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the right to close.

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

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker and Members, first let me acknowledge and thank both sides for a very stimulating discussion on the issue of abortion in this country. No doubt the issue of abortion is tremendously controversial and the kind of response we get from the American public depends on what issue is surrounding abortion. And I would also like to say that I appreciate the point of view of those Members who are generally characterized as pro-life.

□ 1540

They obviously characterize this whole issue as one about abortion in the District of Columbia. I like to think of the issue as the issue of fairness and how under our Constitution and as a body we treat the 50 States and those jurisdictions that do not have statehood. So for me, this is an issue of fairness.

During the debate on the rule, the issue of a shell game came up. I suggest that there is no shell game here on either side. Let me give you an example.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], my colleague and friend, continually says that the Hyde language is

not in this bill. To that limited extent, the gentleman is correct. He even goes on to say and use the word "fraud." The gentleman really does not mean fraud, he means that the Hyde language, the way he would like to see it, is not in this bill.

As I understand the Hyde language, the Hyde language deals directly and only with Medicaid funds. This bill is silent on that. That means that Medicaid restrictions, whatever they may be—in this case the Hyde language—apply to the citizens of California as they apply to the citizens of Washington, DC. So to that extent, the Hyde language is in this bill. It applies to all citizens of the United States.

Now, as it relates to taxpayer funds, I am sure that there are a lot of people really confused about the whole issue of money being fungible and what are taxpayers' funds, because we very loosely throw out this whole issue, that it is taxpayers' money.

It certainly is taxpayers' money. In this bill there is $3.7 billion. Of that amount, $631 million are a Federal payment made to the District in lieu of the Federal Government paying property taxes. There is $52 million in a pension program that has been authorized by this body, and $17 million in an additional payment to the District of Columbia for a crime and youth initiative.

By any stretch of the imagination, the only Federal money in this bill is $700 million. There is $3 billion of D.C. taxpayer money—income taxes, property taxes, fines, fees and various other charges.

Now, the next issue we move to is this term of art called "appropriated." So we move from Federal money to appropriated money.

It is true, as many Members have pointed out on both sides of the aisle, that the money that the District raises moves through our appropriation process, and in that sense it is appropriated by Congress. But by no means, because it is appropriated by Congress, does it become Federal money.

So what the District wants to do is use its own money, that $3 billion, or a part thereof, to provide abortions for those people who so desire them but cannot afford to pay for the procedure.

Now, this bill will in no way, in no way, impact the right of a person who can afford an abortion here in the District to get one. I do not think that anyone is happy with what the Supreme Court has said. But the Supreme Court in the Webster decision said that States, and I suggest to you to be fair we should treat all other jurisdictions of the United States as we do States, can reasonably promulgate rules. And the District here has said they want to provide abortions for those people who cannot afford them. It does not stop anybody who can afford an abortion from getting one.

So if we are going to treat these people fairly, if we are to treat the United States fairly, I think the average citizen, regardless of their philosophy on abortion, would say treat everyone in this country the same. Do not discriminate against one class of people, that is, people who live in the District and people that are poor, at the expense of pushing your own philosophy.

Finally, let me say that as it relates to District money, it makes no matter what the people in Nevada say about taxpayer money, because it is not their taxpayer money. Yes, there is a whole feeling and a whole body of thought about what we should do with Federal money as it relates to abortion, but not as it relates to local funds.

So, you really have to bend logically to say that Federal money is being used. It says in this bill that no Federal funds will be used. In other bills it applies to Medicaid funds, and the Hyde language is the language that prevails.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished minority member.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman a question: When these appropriated funds or this program in lieu of taxes is made to the District of Columbia, are there any strings attached, other than on abortion, as to the use of those funds?

Mr. DIXON. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Mr. WALSH. And what might those be?

Mr. DIXON. Well, there are a great deal of restrictions on the use of Federal money in the bill. For instance, we have lifted a restriction on the closing of Fire Engine Company No. 3.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there are some minor requests that those funds not be used, for example, or that they be used for a certain number of firemen and that sort of thing. But does this money not enter the general fund of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is the argument I alluded to. All money is fungible. When you accept that argument, you have to accept the argument that local funds far outweigh Federal funds $3 billion versus $700 million, and therefore you would have to use all of the District's funds—all of the $3 billion—to get to what are called the Federal funds. But this is the shell game. This is just a word game.

I would say to the gentleman that after we appropriate the $631 million that we owe them in lieu of a property tax by way of a formula, it is not our money at all. It is not Federal money at all. When you pay an obligation, the funds do not remain in your control.

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, other municipalities contained within a larger jurisdiction, for example, a city within a county, do not receive large payments in lieu of taxes to offset the loss of property tax.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is true. That is a whole different argument. Forty-one percent of the land mass here is occupied by the Federal Government. The Federal Government decided some time ago they would provide a Federal payment in lieu of paying property taxes because they are exempt from property taxes.

Madam Speaker, let me finally say that there are 13 States that allow the use of State monies for abortion. But that is not the issue either. The issue is whether all 50 States have the right to make that decision, and all 50 States have that right. And I suggest that the only fair thing to do is let this District have that same right.

I have a great deal of affection for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and I respect his ability and understand his position. The gentleman said that we should have respect for the unborn.

Madam Speaker, we should have respect for the unborn. But this is not the forum to decide where life begins. But I know that we should have respect for the living in the District of Columbia.

Madam Speaker, we voted for the rule. I ask for an "aye" vote on the bill.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The conference report now includes language stating that none of the Federal funds appropriated in the bill will pay for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

The bill has properly restored the right of the District of Columbia to decide how its own revenues should be used, as is the case for the States. This position has been consistently supported by the House since 1989. The concept of home rule is meaningless if Congress can dictate the allocation of local revenues.

Home rule was established in 1973 by Congress to allow the District to manage its own local affairs. The Supreme Court in recent years has defined matters to be reserved for State and local decisionmaking: "fire protection, police protection, sanitation, public health, and parks and recreation." To restrict the use of local District revenues for locally funded abortions violates the right of the District Government to make its own public health policy. In doing so, Congress is denying District residents the right of self-determination, a right belonging to every other resident of this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Danner
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NAYS—201

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kyl
LaFalce
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Rowland
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman
Berman
Murtha
Myers
Royce
Stokes
Tauzin

□ 1610

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Tauzin against.

Mr. ROWLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had an official leave of absence granted by the House. I was unable to participate in floor debate that day due to the flu. I missed rollcall votes 531 through 534. Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall 531, "yea."
Rollcall 532, "yea."
Rollcall 533, "no."
Rollcall 534, "no."

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2445) "An Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes." The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 17, 33, and 36, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the January 17, 1893, overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to offer an apology to native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii.

## FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1993

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to the rule, the amendments in disagreement and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 6, after "sion" insert ": *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall identify the sources of funding for Admission to Statehood from its own locally-generated revenues".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. 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. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein.

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

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. 6: Page 4, line 8, strike out $85,348,000 and insert: "$85,629,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "$87,293,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. DIXON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, in my notes, in amendment No. 6, economic development and regulation, the House passed about $85.3 million, the Senate was $85.6 million, and the conference committee came up with about $1.664 million more than either the House or the Senate. My question is I understand the Mayor and the city council transmitted their budget on September 13. Can the gentleman tell me what that extra $1.66 million is for?

Mr. DIXON. The additional $1.6 million is, No. 1, all District funds, and No. 2, it was a transfer from another appropriation account. The District's request for this change came up after the bill passed the House and the Senate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Is the gentleman saying this is not Federal money?

Mr. DIXON. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is not Federal money?

Mr. DIXON. No, it is all District money.

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

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 8, line 11 after "Department" insert " : *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to implement any plan that includes the closing of Engine Company 3, located at 439 New Jersey Avenue, Northwest".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert: " : *Provided further*, That in addition to the $892,156,000 appropriated under this heading, an additional $1,025,000 and 11 full-time equivalent positions shall be transferred from the Department of Administrative Services to the District of Columbia Court System for janitorial services, pest control, window washing, trash collection and removal, and landscaping," and on page 5, after line 7 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 insert "(Including Transfer of Funds)" as a centerhead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in item 10, amendment No. 10, there is $1.025 million, and it is to be used for transferring people from the Department of Administrative Services to the District of Columbia court system for janitorial services, pest control, window washing, trash collection and removal, and landscaping. Is that Federal money?

Mr. DIXON. The answer is no. The court system expressed the desire to take care of their own janitorial services. This is money allocated to them out of District funds to do so; it is a transfer from another District agency, the Department of Administrative Services.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

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

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. 19: Page 12, line 16, strike out "$312,948,000" and insert "$316,948,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$306,264,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 13, after line 9, insert:

D.C. GENERAL HOSPITAL DEFICIT PAYMENT

For the purpose of reimbursing the General Fund for costs incurred for the operation of the D.C. General Hospital pursuant to D.C. Law 1-134, the D.C. General Hospital Commission Act of 1977, $20,000,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

D.C. GENERAL HOSPITAL DEFICIT PAYMENT

For the purpose of reimbursing the General Fund for costs incurred for the operation of the D.C. General Hospital pursuant to D.C. Law 1-134, the D.C. General Hospital Commission Act of 1977, $10,000,000.

ENERGY ADJUSTMENTS

The Mayor shall reduce appropriations and expenditures for energy costs in the amount of $482,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act.

COMMUNICATIONS ADJUSTMENTS

The Mayor shall reduce appropriations and expenditures for communications costs in the amount of $158,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act.

CONTRACTUAL SERVICES ADJUSTMENTS

The Mayor shall reduce contractual services appropriations and expenditures within object class 40 in the amount of $1,500,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act: Provided, That no reductions shall be made to agencies not under the direct control of the Mayor or to the Department of Human Services.

CASH RESERVE FUND

For the purpose of a cash reserve fund to replenish the consolidated cash balances of the District of Columbia, $3,957,000.

On page 13, line 3 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2492, strike "$3,423,000" and insert "$3,323,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, in this amendment it says the conference allows $10 million to be spent for D.C. General Hospital deficit payment. It was not included in the House measure. For what purpose is that money spent, and is that Federal money?

Mr. DIXON. First of all, this is all District money. The Senate had $20 million. We reduced it to $10 million.

This is a return from D.C. General Hospital to the District's budget of $10 million because the hospital has overspent its budget over the past few years by $74 million. The rest of the items in this amendment are strictly an accounting procedure of all District funds.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It does not include Federal tax dollars?

Mr. DIXON. There are no Federal tax dollars.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 13, line 13, strike out "$27,062,000" and insert "$7,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the sum stricken by said amendment and delete the sum inserted by said amendment and strike out line 10 through and including line 14 on page 13 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492, and on page 29, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "1993" and insert in lieu thereof "1994".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 15, line 13, after "lapse" insert ": *Provided further*, That $50,000,000 shall be solely for the purpose of carrying out section 6 of Public Law 101-590 (104 Stat. 2929) and shall be transferred within 4-5 days of receipt of bond proceeds

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, that the District of Columbia government shall transmit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, no later than April 15, 1994, a proposed plan providing for the financing of the capital rehabilitation and revitalization of the medical infrastructure within the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That this plan shall include how the capital needs of all hospitals will be addressed: *Provided further*, That this plan shall specifically address the currently authorized George Washington University project as part of the overall plan

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

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. 26: Page 15, line 13, after "lapse" insert "*Provided further*, That, once the Fish and Wildlife Service study on the fishway at Little Falls Dam is complete the Washington Aqueduct may use up to $500,000 of funds provided to it under this heading to initiate construction of modifications to the Little Falls Dam facility for the purpose of environmental restoration and improvements by providing passage for anadromous fish on the Potomac River".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein.

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

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 34, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 139. The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall report back to the Congress within 90 days of the status of construction of a new Federal prison in the District of Columbia as previously authorized by Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON 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 section number named in said amendment, insert "137".

On page 33, line 11 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "SEC. 137" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 135".

On page 33, line 23 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "SEC. 138" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 136".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 34, line 14, strike out "$15,133,000" and insert "$15,501,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$14,231,000".

On page 35, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "$10,587,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,242,000".

On page 37, line 4 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 after "*Provided*," insert:

"That $7,000,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further*,".

On page 37, line 11 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "(Rescission)" and insert in lieu thereof "Including Rescission".

On page 37, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "Of" and insert in lieu thereof "For an additional amount of "Public works", $23,447,000: *Provided*, That of".

On page 37 line 16 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 after "rescinded" insert "for a net increase of $20,176,000".

On page 44, after line 14 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 insert "Sec. 203. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be available for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON OF Indiana. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, the House and the Senate appropriated $3.27 million, and the conference increased that by $20 million. What was the reason for that? It is for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, but what was the reason for the quantum leap from $2.3 million to $23 million?

□ 1620

Mr. DIXON. First of all it is all District funds.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, every one of these amendments in disagreement I have asked the gentleman about, he said they are all District funds. Are the Federal funds and District funds intermingled?

Mr. DIXON. In this case, no; this is a 1993 supplemental request.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. What I am saying is that on these technical amendments, when we give the $700 million to the District of Columbia, is that incorporated into their overall budget?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. How do you determine what is Federal money and what is city money?

Mr. DIXON. Well, I determine that by the fact that the bill is $3.7 billion and of that, $3 billion is District money. In this particular amendment, this is a 1993 supplemental and this is clearly all District funds, without any fungible item or issue involved.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And the previous amendments I asked about, the gentleman said those were all District moneys, there were no Federal tax dollars involved. Could it be that part of those moneys were Federal tax dollars?

Mr. DIXON. I did not hear the last part of the gentleman's question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Could it be that part of the money that went to those amendments were Federal tax dollars?

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, not according to my interpretation. If the gentleman would ask me, it was not.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman that I am a little disappointed because when I asked the question, I asked it in good faith, were any Federal tax dollars involved; and the gentleman said "no." Now the gentleman is saying according to his interpretation none of the $700 million, tax dollars we give, were included in those amendments. Had I known that that was partially Federal tax dollars, I would have called for some votes.

So I am a little disappointed in the gentleman's answer on the previous amendments.

Mr. DIXON. As it relates to this amendment, this is a $23 million payment from the District to the Metro system, paying their proportionate share of the Metro system.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. According to the gentleman's interpretation, then, none of this is Federal tax dollars?

Mr. DIXON. Well, his is clearly not Federal tax dollars.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, what about the three previous amendments that I asked about?

Mr. DIXON. I think I answered that. The gentleman would say it is tax dollars because he says money is fungible. I look at the entire bill of $3.7 billion of which only about $631 million are a payment by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, this $20 million is all Washington, DC, tax moneys. Is that right? This $20 million is all Washington, DC, tax money, no Federal tax dollars are involved?

Mr. DIXON. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. OK. Let me just say that I am truly diappointed on the previous three amendments because I asked the question, as I said, in good faith, and part of that was Federal tax dollars. I think I have been misled just a little bit, and I am disappointed in that.

But since all of this money is not Federal tax dollars by any stretch of the imagination, Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

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 34, line 19, strike out "$10,373,000" and insert "$8,339,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON 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 in said amendment, insert "$7,889,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The text of the amendment in as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 35, line 23, after "the" insert "Personal and".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DIXON

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DIXON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

## 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:

WASHINGTON, DC,
*October 27, 1993.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Repesentatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, October 26, 1993 at 8:00 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the "Government Reform and Savings Act of 1993", draft legislation.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
*Clerk, House of Representatives.*

## GOVERNMENT REFORM AND SAVINGS ACT OF 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103–155)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Government Reform and Savings Act of 1993". This legislation is based on the recommendations of the National Performance Review (NPR). Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

The goal of the NPR is to provide the American people with a more effective, efficient, and responsive government—a government that works better and costs less. The NPR began on March 3, 1993, when I asked Vice President Gore to conduct an intensive 6-month review of how the Federal Government works. The Vice President organized a team of experienced Federal employees from all corners of government to examine both agencies and cross-cutting systems, such as budgeting, financial management, procurement, and personnel. He spoke with employees at every major agency and sought the views of hundreds of organizations, business leaders, and State and local officials.

The NPR report presents numerous proposals, some of which require legislation, some of which can be achieved through administrative action. The

legislation I am presenting today is a major step in implementing those NPR recommendations that require action by the Congress. I plan to include additional NPR proposals in the Fiscal Year 1995 Budget.

This legislation includes proposals that seek to: consolidate and streamline agency operations; eliminate unnecessary programs; end unneeded subsidies; improve financial management and debt collection; reduce the burdens resulting from statutory reporting requirements; and improve the dissemination of government information. They were selected from the NPR report with the expectation that they can be considered expeditiously by the Congress. It is my hope that these recommendations will be passed by the Congress prior to adjournment this year.

The savings total for the legislation I am submitting today is $9 billion.

To accompany these NPR recommendations, a package of rescissions will be sent to the Congress shortly. The Administration is also working with the appropriate committees of jurisdiction on a major procurement reform measure.

By implementing these recommendations, I believe we can make fundamental changes for the better in the performance of the Federal Government. I pledge to work with the Congress to ensure the prompt enactment of this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 26, 1993.*

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the discussion earlier today, the Chair will take 1-minutes at this time.

## DO WE HAVE A FOREIGN POLICY?

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

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, this adjournment of the regular legislative business happened very quickly, and I appreciate the Chair honoring the decision this morning to allow 1-minutes and not have those 1-minutes interfere with the special orders of 5 minutes or 60 minutes, so that I may do a commercial for my 1-hour special order on Mogadishu, Haiti, Somalia, and where our foreign policy is going. I do not think we have one.

Madam Speaker, the letters are starting to show up from the parents of those young Rangers and the Fort Bragg special-ops guys, the 160th special operations aviation regiment heroes who died in Somalia. I have one I would like to put in the RECORD right now from retired Lt. Col. Larry Joyce, his wife Gail.

I also want to point out that in that special order this evening for an hour I am going to have color blowups this big on the floor here on an A-frame of about 25 of them explaining more clearly for you in color the quagmire we are in in Somalia than I have seen with black-and-white satellite imagery upstairs under secret conditions on the Committee on Intelligence.

I promise you that you will learn something if you stay with us during these special orders tonight. That is a promise.

The letter referred to follows:

CHICAGO, IL,
*October 22, 1993.*

Hon. ROSCOE G. BARTLETT,
*Committee on Armed Services,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARTLETT: My son, Sgt. James Casey Joyce, was one of the U.S. Army Rangers killed in the October 3 Somalia ambush in Mogadishu.

Even though I served two combat tours in Vietnam, I could rationalize Bill Clinton's protesting the war in Vietnam. Now, I'm struck by the irony of his objection to American policy in Vietnam, and his support of a similar policy for U.S. involvement in Somalia. It's similar, at least, in its vagueness, its politicization, and its misguided use of the military. My son opposed my support for Bill Clinton. His death in Somalia—brought about by weak and indecisive amateurs in the Clinton Administration—confirms my son's wisdom and my naiveté.

Senior military officers, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell, repeatedly requested armored and mechanized vehicles for Somalia. Secretary of Defense Les Aspin denied each request. Armored and mechanized units are essential reinforcements for the highly mobile but lightly armed Rangers my son was so proud to join.

Those reinforcements might not have helped my son, because he apparently was one of the first killed. But, they certainly would have helped many of the other 16 soldiers who were killed and the scores of others who were wounded. Army Rangers are the most highly trained and motivated soldiers this country ever produced. To put them, or any other soldiers, into combat with no way to reinforce them is criminal.

Americans, especially the casualties and their families, deserve answers. Congressional hearings should be held immediately to determine what went wrong in Somalia so those mistakes are not repeated. We must know who, specifically, made the disastrous decision to change the American military posture in Somalia from one of humanitarian relief to one of offensive combat and why this decision was made.

Did someone in the administration make that decision? Or were the President, the secretary of state and the secretary of defense simply asleep at the switch? Who decided Rangers should be used to arrest general Aideed? Why? If his arrest was so essential, why did we suddenly decide to reverse course after my son and 17 other American soldiers were killed on October 3? Who so grossly underestimated his generalship in urban guerrilla warfare? Why? Is Aideed perhaps the only stabilizing influence in Somalia? If so, why did it take so many American casualties to learn that fact? Didn't we learn anything from Vietnam, where our obsession with Ho Chi Minh drew us deeper and deeper into that quagmire?

These are just a few questions that are begging for answers. I urge you to call for an investigation and congressional hearings so we can set our foreign policy straight and make proper use of our military in enforcing that policy.

Questions also need to be asked of the military command in Somalia. Why were Army Rangers inserted into what we know was a deadly ambush without United Nations Forces—in place—to reinforce them? They were not American, but certainly, Malaysian and Pakistani tanks and armored personnel carriers were better than none at all. They did eventually arrive—ten hours late.

Today's army is far superior to the one in which I served in the 60s and 70s. The young men and women who serve in the defense of our country are a national treasure. In the future, let's ensure they get proper direction and support they need and deserve no less. Please let me know how I can help.

Respectfully yours,

LARRY E. JOYCE,
*Lt. Col. (Ret.), U.S. Army.*

## SPEND THE NIGHT WITH AMERICA'S HEROES

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, on Oct. 8, Joe Ungrady of the Brookline Fire Co. in Havertown, PA, crawled across the second floor of a burning, smoke-filled apartment, found an unconscious woman, and dragged her to safety.

Joe has been a volunteer firefighter since the age of 16, and is now in his 10th year of service. I rise to commend Joe Ungrady's heroic efforts, and cite him as just one example of America's heroes all across this country.

Tonight, as I have done every year that I have been in this institution, I invite my colleagues to rise with the D.C Fire Department, to learn firsthand the challenges that America's heroes face.

Firefighters respond not just to fires, but in our cities are the first on the scene of crimes, at drug shootings, and all of the problems of urban America. Much has been made over the past week about the need for assistance in addressing the alarming crime rate in the District. Well, get out from behind your desk and join us tonight, and have a chance to see firsthand what these men and women go through every day in cooperation with the law enforcement community.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort so that we can better understand and appreciate the need to support the emergency response community in America.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from the News of Delaware County about Joe Ungrady.

[From the News of Delaware County, Oct. 13, 1993]

FIREMAN RESCUES WOMAN FROM BLAZE

(By Mary Beth Lauer)

Joe Ungrady crawled across the floor of a burning, smoke-filled Havertown apartment

Friday night, found an unconscious woman and dragged her to safety.

"I didn't feel like a hero," the 26-year-old Brookline firefighter said. "I was just doing my job."

Ungrady was part of the search and rescue team that entered the second floor apartment at 424 Darby Road shortly after 10:37 p.m. when the alarm sounded.

Llanerch firefighters were already there trying to put out the blaze. They had arrived on the scene to find flames coming out the front room on the second floor of the duplex.

As Ungrady carried Terry Belciano, 38, to the steps of the apartment, he heard her cough.

"I was pleased to hear that," he said. "It meant she was still alive."

"Three of us got her down the stairs," Ungrady recalled.

Llanerch engineer Thomas Kelly and firefighter Kevin Doughtery helped Ungrady get Belciano, the only occupant of the apartment, down the stairs, said Llanerch Fire Chief Dave McKinney.

Once outside Belciano was treated by Haverford paramedics and then taken to nearby Veteran's Field. From there she was taken by helicopter to the Crozer-Chester Burn Center.

Suffering from severe smoke inhalation, she was listed in critical condition until Monday, when her condition was listed as critical but stable, officials said.

"When you go into a burning building, you're hoping everyone will be out and it will be just routine," Ungrady said Monday night.

It was the first time Ungrady was ever called upon to save a life.

"You're trained to know what to do," said Ungrady, who has been a volunteer firefighter since he was 16. "Now I know all that training paid off."

Ungrady said the first thing he felt when it was all over was pride and satisfaction. Now, he said he would like to meet Belciano.

The duplex, which houses an attorney's office on the first floor, suffered heavy damage, McKinney said.

Both the Bon Air and Manoa fire companies were called in to help put out the blaze.

McKinney, who was also on the scene, said the fire seemed to start in a front sitting room.

The cause of the fire has not been determined, he said.

---

□ 1630

## UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my congressional mandates caucus colleagues in support of National Unfunded Mandate Day, and to talk about the constitutional amendment I introduced yesterday on unfunded mandates. I reserved my own 5 minutes to allow other Members more time to participate in the caucus' special order.

Federal mandates are crushing State and local governments. In my home State of Ohio, Gov. George Voinovich released a report earlier this year showing that mandates cost the State over $300 million per year. Ohio spends more just to implement Medicaid mandates passed in 1988 than it spends on the entire Ohio Department of Health. No wonder the State has been forced to cut health department programs over the past several years.

I started serving in the Ohio Senate in 1967. By the time I left as senate president in 1988, what had started out as a trickle of mandates from the Federal Government had become a raging flood, setting the States adrift in red ink.

### GROWTH OF FEDERAL MANDATES

A recent insight magazine article calculated just 17 mandates from 1960 to 1985. Then from 1988 to 1992—just 4 years—the Federal Government added 88 mandates relating to toxics alone. Already this year, no less than 130 mandates have been proposed by a Congress full of avowed reformers and would-be reinventors of government.

Congress in effect tells State and local governments, "We know how to spend your money better than you do." Let me describe just how false that is. Federal regulations could require cities to keep atrazine levels in drinking water below 3 parts per billion. Yet a human would have to drink 38 bathtubs of water per day with 3 parts per billion of atrazine to equal the dose found to be cancerous in rats. Even though its water rarely exceeds that 3 part per billion level, it could cost the city of Columbus $80 million to build a water purification plant to comply with this rule. For the same amount of money, the city could hire an extra 2,300 teachers at the average State salary.

### MANDATE-O-METER

This is exactly the kind of story that gave me the idea for the Mandate-O-Meter. I am going to be bringing out this meter from time to time to show how mandates are destroying State sovereignty and taking away their ability to serve other important public needs.

This graph shows how much the motor-voter bill will cost Ohio, and shows other things the State could be spending its money on. While Members of Congress passed congratulatory handshakes back and forth, the State budget director must scramble to find another $20 million to pay for this bill after another year of bruising budget cuts. That's a lot of money for some new mandated government forms, and an expanded role for the bloated Federal bureaucracy. The $20 million could have been used for an extra 574 teachers. With that money you could increase by nearly 65 percent the number of tutors and small group instructors. You could double the number of preschool special education teachers. The State could have hired more than 400 extra highway patrolmen. It could increase tenfold its drug traffic interdiction team. The State could also have offered a full year of tuition to 2,000 students to attend Ohio State University.

Congress is intruding into legislative areas traditionally left to State governments, directly displacing State authority. When Congress imposes these unfunded mandates, States and local governments lose the flexibility to pay for vital services. They have to raise taxes or cut services to pay for programs into which they have no input.

Congress is in effect raising State taxes, and cutting services like police protection and education.

Yesterday I introduced a constitutional amendment to prohibit Congress from enacting any unfunded mandates and invite by colleagues to join me in cosponsoring it. This resolution will protect State and local entities from bankruptcy, and prevent us from driving more nails into the coffin of cooperative federalism.

I thank the congressional mandates caucus for its outstanding work, and yield back the balance of my time.

---

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 334, RECOGNITION OF LUMBEE TRIBE OF CHERAW INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–309) on the resolution (H. Res. 286) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 334) to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of Cheraw Indians of North Carolina, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 283, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–310) on the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 283) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

## PERMISSION TO LAY CERTAIN HOUSE RESOLUTIONS ON THE TABLE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 52, House Resolution 150, House Resolution 153, and House Resolution 218 be laid on the table.

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

There was no objection.

## COMMUNITY ARTS PROGRAM IN FOREST, MS, OFFERS WIDE RANGE OF ACTIVITIES

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, October is National Arts and Humanities Month. In conjunction with that observance, I want to call attention to a very active community arts program in Forest, MS.

Forest Community Arts, Inc., presented an exhibit of original paintings by 18 Mississippi artists on October 3 to kick off its monthlong focus on the arts. This past week it sponsored a Creative Christmas program at the National Guard armory that included entertainment, educational exhibits, arts and crafts exhibits, and Christmas gift items for sale. On October 31, the observance will end with a concert of sacred and classical music at the Forest Baptist Church, featuring the University of Mississippi Concert Choir under the direction of Jerry Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Forest Community Arts, Inc., for the work it is doing to promote a greater appreciation of the arts in Forest and Scott County.

## INTERNATIONAL COUNTERFEITING DETERRENCE ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, today, along with Congressman BACHUS of Alabama, I am introducing the International Counterfeiting Deterrence Act of 1993, to protect the integrity of the Nation's financial system from international counterfeiting and economic terrorism.

It has been reported that billions of dollars' worth of American currency around the world is fake and that as much as 200 million dollars' worth has already been identified. What was once an irritating problem has blossomed into an Achilles heel for our economy. Recent news reports show terrorists in the Bekaa Valley of Lebanon mass producing $100 bills. These terrorists have refined the process so that counterfeit $100 bills are near perfect. Intelligence sources have indicated that counterfeit bills are being used to finance international terrorism and to purchase illicit weapons from international arms markets. International counterfeiters are operating on an unprecedented scale and their activities have become a serious national security problem.

I am introducing this legislation in response to the increasing international threat to our economy and our national security from counterfeiters. The bill establishes an anticounterfeit strike force, chaired by the Secretary of Treasury and is charged with coordinating U.S. policy for the prevention and detection of international counterfeiting. Specifically, the strike force must determine the extent and probable effect of the counterfeiting of U.S. currency outside the United States and the extent to which it is engaged in as a form of economic terrorism. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to propose and enter into international agreements to promote international coordination in preventing, detecting, and prosecuting counterfeiters. The strike force is also required to study counterfeiting deterrence, detection, and enforcement techniques, and report to Congress within 18 months. In order to better coordinate U.S. overseas policy toward international counterfeiting, the strike force would be authorized to establish foreign offices.

□ 1640

The heart of the bill is in its various sanction provisions, one of which authorizes the President to issue Executive orders prohibiting depository institutions in the United States from transferring funds or accepting deposits from any person of a foreign country identified as engaging in significant amounts of counterfeiting. Other provisions authorize severe criminal penalties that apply to individuals within the United States and to individuals located elsewhere. Finally, the bill requires certain sanctions against countries engaged in State-supported counterfeiting.

In the process of development of this bill, Mr. Speaker, over the past 3 months input was solicited from all relevant Federal agencies. The bill is intended to send a clear message to international counterfeiters that the United States is taking counterfeit detection seriously. We plan to marshal all appropriate intelligence networks and law enforcement agencies to eradicate counterfeiting and preserve the integrity of our money supply.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this measure, and I insert in the RECORD a section-by-section description of the bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNTERFEITING ACT OF 1993

(A bill to protect the integrity of the Nation's financial system from international counterfeiting and economic terrorism, and for other purposes)

Section 1. Short title.

The International Counterfeiting Deterrence Act of 1993.

Section 2. International counterfeiting deterrence strike force.

Establishes an International Counterfeiting Deterrence Strike Force (Strike Force) to be chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury (Secretary) with representatives from: Treasury, BEP, FED, Secret Service, FBI, CIA, State Department, Attorney General's Office.

Requires the Strike Force to determine the extent and probable effect of the counterfeiting of U.S. currency outside the U.S., and the extent to which it is engaged in as a form of economic terrorism and report to Congress annually.

Authorizes the Secretary to propose international agreements to achieve international coordination and cooperation in combating counterfeiting.

Authorizes the Strike Force to seek assistance from the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense in carrying out its functions.

Section 3. Studies of counterfeit deterrence and enhanced detection and enforcement techniques.

Requires the Strike Force to do the following: (1) study available technological devices and methods used to enhance detection and enforcement techniques; (2) determine how much counterfeit currency has been detected and its cost to the U.S. government; (3) analyze and recommend methods and technologies used in the production of Federal Reserve notes; (4) study the demand for U.S. currency, to what extent its use is limited to $100 Federal Reserve notes and whether or not $100 Federal Reserve notes should be abolished.

Requires a report to Congress 18 months after the date of enactment. Allows certain information to be withheld if its disclosure would interfere with enforcement activities.

Section 4. Changes in design of currency.

Establishes a Currency Design Commission composed of the Secretary, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. If any member of the Commission proposes a need for a design change for counterfeit deterrence purposes, and two of the three members agree, the Secretary is authorized to implement the design change.

Section 5. Foreign offices authorized.

Authorizes the Strike Force to establish foreign offices to better coordinate U.S. overseas policy toward international counterfeiters.

Section 6. Anticounterfeiting training team.

Requires the Director of the Secret Service to establish a team of experts to provide training to foreign governments in detecting and prosecuting counterfeiting.

Section 7. Negotiations with countries in which a significant amount of counterfeiting of U.S. currency occurs.

Authorizes the Secretary to negotiate and to enter into international agreements with foreign countries identified as engaging in significant amounts of counterfeiting, to share information, technical expertise, and ensure cooperation between law enforcement officers in the prosecuting of counterfeiting activities.

Requires an interim report to Congress and a final report on the outcome of the negotiations and on foreign countries where there is reason to believe that significant counterfeiting is occurring and for which no agreement was reached.

Authorizes the President to issue Executive Orders prohibiting Federal Reserve banks, depository institutions and other person engaged within the U.S. in the transfer of funds from participating in any transfer of funds or accepting deposits from any person of a foreign country identified as engaging in significant amounts of counterfeiting. Also by Executive Order, foreign countries identified as engaging in significant amounts of counterfeiting, would also be prohibited from participating in any transfer of funds or from maintaining a deposit account in the U.S.

Authorizes criminal penalties, fines and/or imprisonment for not more than 15 years, for violations of any Executive order.

Section 8. Awards authorized for counterfeiting cases.

Authorizes the Strike Force to grant awards for actions that lead to convictions of persons for violations of U.S. anti-counterfeiting laws.

Section 9. Counterfeiting U.S. currency abroad.

Allows those outside the U.S., who engage in counterfeiting of U.S. currency, to be fined and/or imprisoned for not more than 15 years.

Section 10. Sanctions against State-supported counterfeiting.

Requires the Strike Force to recommend sanctions against any foreign country engaging in counterfeiting or who knowingly or recklessly permits counterfeiting to occur.

Requires the Export-Import Bank not to guarantee, insure, extend credit or service to any country engaging in counterfeiting or who knowingly or recklessly permits counterfeiting to occur.

Amends the Export Administration Act to include licensing for countries involved in State-supported counterfeiting.

Amends the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit foreign assistance to countries involved in State-supported counterfeiting.

## CONDEMNATION OF THE CARNAGE OF THE PAST FEW DAYS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again the men of violence have spoken through the mouths of guns, and once again their gruesome sabotage has blocked the road to peace in Northern Ireland.

Yesterday, paramilitaries of the Ulster Freedom Fighters killed two and injured five more Catholic workmen in Belfast. Monday night a 72-year-old Catholic pensioner was shot dead. On Saturday night another Catholic was killed.

The evidence is that these murder victims were chosen at random, sacrificed in retaliation for the bombing murders earlier Saturday, of 10 innocent shoppers—including 2 children—in a Protestant neighborhood of Belfast. The Irish Republican Army has claimed credit for that massacre, which killed 1 of its paramilitaries and injured 57 other unsuspecting bystanders. There was no warning, because the IRA sought to kill loyalist paramilitaries of the Ulster Defense Association it thought it would meet above the fish shop where their bomb exploded prematurely.

Such is the tit-for-tat cycle of death in Northern Ireland from which the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom have been struggling to pull the people of the North. The process for that effort was a series of talks that involved all the political parties in the North which have renounced the use of violence. Both Governments seek a third round of such talks, but little progress has been made in the last year.

Some hope had been raised in recent weeks by private talks between the leaders of the Social Democratic Labour Party, which renounces violence, and the Sinn Fein, the political arm of the IRA, which does not. The SDLP leader, John Hume, had issued a joint statement with Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Fein, which offered the prospect of a cessation of violence by the IRA and political talks involving Sinn Fein as well as the constitutional political parties—those which commit themselves to constitutional processes and renounce violence.

All who know John Hume, himself the target of numerous paramilitary attacks, applaud his dedication to a lasting peace for all of the people of the North through dialogue and economic empowerment, as exemplified by the multilateral efforts of the International Fund for Ireland. No details of the initiative he has authored have yet been made public, but one must question whether the IRA, which continued its campaign of bombings and killings in the aftermath of the joint statement, was ever serious about ending that violence. Certainly this most recent wanton attack cannot be squared with a commitment to peace or reconciliation. What is clear is that both the IRA and their counterpart Loyalist paramilitaries such as the UFF are dedicated solely to keeping their body counts up to date and in balance. This cruel preoccupation cannot but lead to future suffering, to grieving widows and parents, and, just as surely, to a diminution of the primacy of the human spirit over savagery.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot summon words to adequately condemn the brutal, callous character of the carnage of the past few days in Northern Ireland. The civilized world stands in awe and abhorrence at what we see there. What the Irish people, indeed all of us, must endeavor to take away from this view of the inferno, however, is not the terror that its perpetrators seek to instill, but the determination to see in our utter horror that its only solution lies in nonviolent dialog and shared devotion to a fair and peaceful solution that can bring together those whom the killing drives asunder.

A beginning to such an end would be a resumption of political talks among the constitutional parties and the two Governments. The Sinn Fein could be part of those talks, but its entry can only be bought by a genuine and convincing repudiation of paramilitary violence. There is no excuse, however, for any official or party who fails to see in these bloody reprisals the imperative for a renewed and genuine peace process. When Prime Ministers Albert Reynolds and John Major meet this Friday, Northern Ireland will dominate their discussions. The world awaits their joint demonstration of resolve to rejuvenate the quest for peace reconciliation, and justice in that troubled land.

## OPPOSITION TO NAFTA IN ITS PRESENT FORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARLOW] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, the people of my First District in Kentucky have the deepest respect for the people of Mexico. We revere their proud history and traditions. The people of Mexico have gone thru the same intense nation-forming process as has our United States. I have the deepest respect for the negotiators on all sides of the issues involved in the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. Yet, I rise today to register my opposition to this proposed agreement in its present form.

The proposed agreement concentrates its attention on the business sector, virtually solely, as the engine for economic growth in our nations. While the business sector is crucial as a determinant of economic growth, we in the United States have very laboriously learned that it is not the only determinant of economic growth. A modern factory with the highest standards of efficiency and productivity and product quality is not truly an indicator of economic prowess if the social infrastructure in the community and region of housing, water and sewers, quality roads, schools, police and courts of law, and fire protection is not being carefully nurtured.

How is this social infrastructure to be provided? Through public sector investment supported by wise tax policy. In truth, true economic development is rooted in business growth and, coequally, parallel public sector investment.

Mr. Speaker, it is deeply troubling to me when I view the growing industrial community just on the other side of our United States border with Mexico operating in tax-free zones, contributing little in proportion to needs of social infrastructure in the communities in which they operate. Many of these industries ship their product into our Nation where the product competes unfairly from a production pricing standpoint because this product is virtually tax free.

Companies in our Nation shoulder a significant tax burden for the sake of the communities in which they operate. If we were to pass NAFTA, as proposed, without Mexican industries paying appropriate taxes to meet infrastructure needs in Mexico, I believe that we would be promoting unfairness in the marketplace for companies operating in the United States and our working men and women and their families—who depend on their jobs in these companies—when we open our borders to imports from Mexico, that are virtually tax free. Further, I believe that we would be promoting the

continuation of social infrastructure conditions in Mexico that must be improved if the Mexican people are truly to benefit from economic development.

We in Kentucky respect the choices of the Mexican people in the economic system that they have developed through time. We ask that the Mexican people respect our economic system that we in the United States have worked so hard to nurture over time.

□ 1650

## UNITED STATES POLICY REGARDING HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, six American and three Canadian warships were deployed in waters off the Haitian coast in an effort to enforce the United Nations' agreement with Haiti's military rulers to return the country's elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, to power. The naval action is an attempt to make sure the United Nations' oil embargo, first begun in June, holds tight. In addition, President Clinton has refused to rule out the use of force in Haiti, prompting a confrontation with Senate Minority Leader BOB DOLE over a President's authority to send American forces to foreign countries without Congressional approval. The debate in the Senate illustrates the continuing concern in Congress over the worsening political and economic crisis in Haiti.

As early as January of this year, I wrote to President Clinton urging him to lift trade sanctions against Haiti. Currently, the United States is enforcing an embargo begun by the Organization of American States which prohibits nearly all trade with Haiti, the only exceptions being humanitarian goods such as food and medicine. The trouble with this policy, I argued to the President, is that it has had little effect in restoring democratic rule to that desperately poor country. I also wrote:

> However, there is widespread agreement that the embargo has had one devastating effect. It has forced the Haitian people into even deeper economic deprivation.

That is even truer today: Haiti is ruled by ruthless military officers whose main concern is to retain power, and who have nothing to gain by allowing the return of Mr. Aristide, or by keeping promises made to the United Nations.

When I visited Haiti a few years ago, I observed first hand the grinding poverty and economic chaos.

A country's economy, even in an economic basket case like Haiti, is actually a patchwork of transactions; destroying one part leads to the devastation of other parts. That is why the international sanctions cannot help but destroy what little semblance of commerce once existed in Haiti. Also, exempting food and medicine has not saved the Haitian people from near-starvation and an almost complete shutdown of Haiti's rudimentary health care system. On October 21, the Washington Post, in a front-page story, reported that even Aristide's staunchest supporters now resent the economic sanctions which are making life progressively more difficult.

I am afraid that if the United States and the United Nations continue their present policy of sanctions, the likely result will be thousands of deaths from starvation and disease in Haiti, coupled with additional thousands of refugees teeming to United States shores in creaky boats, hoping to escape their nation's growing misery. Certainly, the United States has an interest in political events in Haiti; but a series of crippling economic sanctions are not going to turn hardened military leaders away from their tyranny. Poverty and dictatorship usually go hand in hand. Our policy of further impoverishing Haiti not only has hurt the Haitian people, but may have increased the resolve of a military regime which resents the world's great powers seeking to impose a system as delicate as representative democracy on a country which can barely feed itself.

Today, in my statewide newspaper in Arkansas, in Little Rock, the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, columnist John Robert Starr wrote, and I think his analogy is perfect for the situation that we face in Haiti, he wrote this:

> What Clinton and the United Nations are proposing to do to Haiti is the moral equivalent of building a wall around the scene of the Los Angeles riots and starving everyone who lives there until all gang members are converted into angels.

That is basically and simplistically the policy that has been adopted concerning this very impoverished nation called Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, I thank the gentleman for making this important point. It is my understanding the gentleman has actually visited Haiti, which I think places him in a select group of individuals, at least here in this body, as someone who is familiar firsthand with the conditions that are in Haiti.

I understand that Haiti is a very impoverished country. I think I read it has a per capita income of something like $370 a year per person. I believe that is what I read.

You know, I have been very concerned about our mission in Haiti, this U.N. mission which the President had approved and was trying to move troops into in support of that. Thank goodness, under pressure from the Congress, he reversed his decision.

I think, however, the blockade, for reasons the gentleman mentioned, is ill-advised. It could only have consequences contrary to what would be desirable. Indeed, perhaps really creating a severe pressure for a refugee crisis.

I go to the President's comments before the United Nations. We are familiar with the Weinberger doctrine developed by the former Secretary of Defense under President Reagan and followed by both Presidents Reagan and Bush. But President Clinton, before the U.N. in a speech recently, asked three questions when we get into involving U.S. troops in some sort of peacekeeping mission. Those questions were this: First, is there a real threat to international peace and security; second, does the peacekeeping mission have clear objectives; and third, can an end point be identified?

Let us go through those for a minute. What is the interest of involvement by the United States in Haiti? As far as I can see, as one Representative, we have no national interest at stake in sending our troops there. So I think the first test, is there a real threat to international peace and security, there are problems in Haiti, and there have been problems for years, arguably centuries. But it is not something which is a threat to the international peace and security. I think that is quite clear.

Second, does the peacekeeping mission have clear objectives? I think this was the problem. The objectives were not clearly defined. Indeed, I understand from the reports I am familiar with that it is likely that the parliament of Haiti is going to reject the U.N. peacekeeping mission. So there is no support for it. And we know with the violence that has occurred, obviously that has been clearly demonstrated.

Third, can an end point be identified? It is on that third point that we should all take note, because this has been tried before, hasn't it? It seems to me there was an expedition of Marines that was sent there, I believe in 1915, by President Wilson, is that correct?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. If the gentleman will yield, he is absolutely correct in his historical analysis of Haiti. In 1915 American Marines went in, stayed almost 20 years, and were very unsuccessful in the process of nation-building.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That was their effort, was it not? In fact, were not the Marines sent to protect U.S. investments after the President of Haiti was assassinated in 1915? And they ended up staying 19 years. And as soon as they left, Haiti split off the road of democracy back into whatever they have.

By the way, I think it is interesting to note, just to understand the nation of Haiti, which I think is about 6.4 million residents, a majority of the population of Haiti actually practices voodoo. So we are dealing with a country

that is very different from our own and which has enormous problems. We have tried to help solve those in the past to no avail. Nineteen years worth of nation-building went down the drain and ended in the 1930's. And here we go again. Now we are being called upon to install Mr. Aristide.

I could go on about Mr. Aristide, but I see our friend from Texas [Mr. DELAY] rising. Maybe he will tell us.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to make the point, and make it very clear, that not only does it seem that this administration does not understand what military power is, how it should be used, and in what way it should be used. I mean, to send a contingent of our military to Haiti unarmed is absolutely outrageous. But obviously they cannot even, or have not even, had any sort of historical perception or historical basis. I mean, it would seem to me that you would look back at the history of our involvement with Haiti and understand that you just cannot do what they are intending to do; that it did not work then, and it will not work now. Nothing has really changed since we spent all that time in Haiti unsuccessfully.

What makes this President or this Secretary of Defense or this Secretary of State think that they can change things and change history and change a whole culture in a country that has always had these kinds of problems? Are you going to talk about Aristide?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, I am. The gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] a moment ago mentioned as he went through the President's criteria for determining where we should be involved and where we should not be involved, mentioned the issue of national interest.

□ 1700

Do we have a national interest in Haiti? Certainly, most would agree that in contrast to Somalia a case for national interest could be made in Haiti. But if it is, it is based upon the risk of thousands and thousands of boat people making their way to American shores.

In a recent Washington Post article, the October 15 Washington Post, they admitted that the reimposition of the sanctions would demolish the few viable businesses in weeks and that the result of that is that the United States would bear the major responsibility for the harm caused by the embargo. Accounting for over 70 percent of Haiti's exports and more than 50 percent of its imports, the United States is by far Haiti's most important trading partner.

What results from that? Since the embargo went into effect, at least 140,000 private sector jobs have been lost from a total of 252,000. Since there are approximately six dependents per jobholder, the losses directly affect nearly 1 million people. These conditions that are generated produce a flood of desperate Haitians, more than 40,000, attempting, ready to attempt to escape the economic hardship and political repression existing in Haiti. And so the very policies that we have adopted, instead of curing and minimizing the risk of illegal immigrants coming to our shores, exacerbate the problem, increase the very conditions that cause people to want to escape the Island of Haiti.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas for pursuing the whole issue of Aristide and whether he is the right one for us to support, if we are to accomplish our goals of seeing democracy established in Haiti.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, before I get into that, I want to ask the gentleman a question about what he just said, because it seems to me that our national interest, number one, is to make sure we do not have a flood of immigrants, and some of them being illegal or even political refugees, because they may be fleeing the tyranny of the army or the people that are in power now in Haiti. So there are two reasons: first for economic interests, because they cannot eat, do not have a job, have to take care of their family; and second, fleeing political persecution, probably risking their lives.

It seems to me that this embargo, as the gentleman has pointed out, costs us all these jobs, but it also puts those that are in power, the people that are killing people in Haiti, puts them into a better position, more powerful, because if they control the economy and they control the money and they control the goods that are in the country, the embargo makes is even more onerous about putting into power the very people you are trying to take out of power.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The reports that I have heard indicate that the last ones in Haiti to run out of oil and gasoline will be the military regime, that it will take very little for them to continue their regime of repression, their power and dictatorial policies, and they will be able to continue that even as the nation of Haiti continues to go deeper and deeper into hunger and deprivation.

Mr. DELAY. The army is probably sitting there looking at our ships offshore and just laughing themselves sick about the United States trying to come get them, trying to impose Aristide on them and yet, at the same time, the United States is increasing their power.

Who is Aristide anyway? If I may just take a minute, I would like to go over what the Heritage Foundation found. We are going to spend all this money, we are going to spend or at least put our people at risk to put a leader back into power, and maybe the American people do not know who this Aristide is.

As has already been said, Haiti's military views the deposed Aristide as an unstable leader who filled his cabinet with cronies. And some accused Aristide's government of Marxist leanings and said that the Haitian army could not tolerate the existence of such a government.

The first question you ought to ask is, are the views of the military in Haiti justified.

CBS News reported on October 13 that President Aristide, during his short reign, encouraged the necklacing of his political opponents, the practice of igniting gasoline-soaked tires around the neck and burning the victim alive.

Here is the quote that CBS—not exactly one of our friends, and not exactly having been accused of being a right-wing or a conservative operation—CBS ascribes to Aristide, in reference to necklacing, this quote:

> What a beautiful tool. What a beautiful instrument. What a beautiful device. It is beautiful. Yes, it is beautiful. It is cute. It is pretty. It has a good smell. Wherever you go, you want to inhale it.

This is the man that they want to put back in power in Haiti, that believes this way about necklacing. And President Clinton has embraced Aristide, as has Jesse Jackson, Randall Robinson of TransAfrica, and members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Heritage Foundation, in 1991, had this to say to Aristide:

> He is a lifelong leftist, a fervent nationalist and a strong advocate of liberation theology, which promotes the ideals of Communism thinly veiled with religion. In fact, Aristide, who is a Roman Catholic priest, was ousted from the Salesian order of the Roman Catholic Church in 1988 because it considered him a revolutionary.

Now, this is a man that, one, believes in necklacing people and could really turn into a tyrant, if we put him back into place, and a man that embraces Socialism and Communism and has even been removed from an order in the Catholic Church.

It does not make too much sense to me. There is also the Heritage Foundation, in February of 1991, stated that:

> Aristide invited Fidel Castro's regime to send a delegation to attend his inauguration. Haiti and Communist Cuba had never had diplomatic relationships, but Aristide seemed to be opening the door to diplomatic ties. Aristide's party sent young volunteers to Cuba for training as "political party operatives." Aristide's party also created neighborhood militias.

Does that sound familiar?

> Titled Vigilance Committees, modeled on Cuba's neighborhood militias, which appeared to target Aristide's political rivals, including the press and foreign diplomatic and business interests. The Vigilance Committees organized street protests, sponsored attacks against their opponents and served as intelligence operatives for Aristide.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I do not think we have any business with United States

troops going to Haiti, but I will tell you, as one Representative, if I were going to send United States troops to Haiti, it would be to eradicate Aristide, not to install him back as the President.

I cannot believe that this country, under the leadership of President Clinton, would be seeking to install a man who in essence is a Communist, who has preached openly the murdering of people by fire, death by necklacing, a burning tire, you eventually die. Think of that for a minute.

Where is the compassion? Where is the justice? Where is the humanity that has always been the hallmark of the U.S. policy?

And here we are, furthering the purposes of somebody like this, somebody who reliable reports indicate is not even mentally stable; obviously, not with that kind of an attitude.

I have a quote here that I would like to quote from the Boston Globe, October 15, quoting a top Haitian officer who said this:

> We have lived seven months with Aristide. We had many soldiers killed. We had many members of society killed. And the international community says this is democracy and you have to drink this same poison because he is an elected president, and an elected president can do anything he wants. This is incredible. I can't believe it.

It may help people, Mr. Speaker, to understand why the military does not want to see Mr. Aristide come back, because he has, in essence, threatened them with mass executions, if he comes back. And obviously, some of those things were going on even when he was President.

It is just remarkable to me. I do not see a national interest there.

□ 1710

They say it is immigration, or illegal immigration, but it seems to me if we continue this blockade we are going to ensure that the problem happens. Of course, maybe that is what President Clinton wants, because he opposed President Bush's policy on repatriating the Haitians. He criticized him for lacking humanity, if you can imagine that, for lacking humanity. Then, of course, he got into the Presidency and decided that maybe we should keep the policy up.

From what the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] said, we may be faced, if we continue our blockade, with having 40,000 refugees coming by boat to this country, when instead we could eliminate the blockade, stay out of Haiti, and hope that they can somehow resolve their differences, and not be party to reinstalling Mr. Aristide. We should be glad he is out of there.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. If I might reclaim my time for a moment, I think in pursuing whether Aristide is the right one for us to be banking our foreign policy on in regard to Haiti, the Washington Post article this year, January 24, 1993, and again, the Washington Post, I think, is not one necessarily to take a conservative position, but they point to his record in Haiti when he was actually President in Haiti.

> "The Catholic Church was a central target of Aristide's more violent supporters," they wrote. "Monsignor William Murphy wrote a graphic account of events in January 1991 when, according to Murphy, a group of thugs, supporters of newly elected President Aristide, went on a rampage. They destroyed the old cathedral, gutted the archbishop's house, went on to the nunciture, the home of the Pope's representative. There they completely destroyed the building, attacked the nuncio, and his priest secretary, broke both legs of the priest, and roughed up and stripped the nuncio, who was saved only by the intervention of a neighbor."

This is the person we want to bank our foreign policy on. This is the one we want to put on an embargo to restore him to power. This is the one we are even talking about risking American lives for.

Then I would like to cite a statement from Lawrence Harrison in the Atlantic Monthly, who made a return to Haiti in April of this year. This is what he said.

> On my brief return to Haiti in April to finish my work on the democratization program, I noticed an ominous change in the Atmosphere. Aristide had been slow to organize his government. His relations with the bicameral parliament, chosen in the same elections that brought him to power, were deteriorating, in no small part because his goons had threatened and even roughed up some legislators. Some in the military believed he was out to destroy their institutions, as did some of the judiciary.

That is the Atlantic Monthly. That is Lawrence Harrison, saying that indeed Aristide is not a model of democracy, or the one that ought to carry the banner of representative democracy in Haiti.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman is saying is the President is saying it is in our national interest to reinstate someone, and we have already pointed out, who believes in necklacing, but more important, reinstate someone that leans toward communism, that is a despot, that believes in punishing, not just punishing his opponents, but actually killing them and terrorizing them, even if it is the church, the Catholic Church.

That does not seem to me to be in our national interest. Our national interest should be to support democracy, not replace one dictator for another.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That is exactly true.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I do not know if any of the gentlemen are of the Catholic denomination of the Christian faith. Let me touch on this Catholic thing with a Reuters story out of Rome yesterday about what the Vatican's position is, because I am embarrassed as a Catholic that this person is described as a priest all the time.

Judas Iscariot was a priest of Jesus, and when he hung himself in the valley of fire he was still a priest, going to his judgment day, so once a priest, always a priest in the church. However, this guy was kicked out of the Silesian order and suspended from all of his priestly functions in public.

It is fair to say he is defrocked in the sense that he has no permission to say mass or hear confession or baptize or marry or do any priestly functions.

Here is the Reuters story out of Rome, headline: "Vatican Wary," and that is a typical Vatican diplomatic word, "wary," w-a-r-y, "Wary of his return to Haiti."

It says "Vatican diplomats long opposed to the policies of exiled Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide expressed deep concern this week about the possible return to power of the left-wing Roman Catholic priest." They keep saying that, because once a priest, always a priest.

Then it says "The Silesians, one of the largest religious orders of the Catholic Church, said the charismatic priest had used religion to incite hatred and violence." One little word about that word "charismatic." The first time I ever went to a dictionary to look up that word in the eighth grade it was used, applied to Adolf Hitler. They said he was charismatic, or had charisma. I did not know the word. I went and looked it up.

I never considered that word in the same light that it is used in American politics, that this Congressman is charismatic or that Senator or this Presidential candidate, because I learned the word applied to Adolf Hitler, so charismatic does not mean this guy is some kind of hero.

It says "Church laws bar priests from holding elective office." Anyway, that is why the two priests were, and I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin, TOBY ROTH, beat one, and the other one was ordered to leave here, leave his priesthood.

I heard him in the Speaker's lobby right outside his door to CHRIS DODD, right outside in the Senate, saying "I was between a rock and a hard place. If I had chosen the House, I would have lost my seat anyway, because my district in half Jewish, half Catholic, so there is more than one way to skin a cat," his exact words. He ends up head of the Americans for Democratic Action, which is kind of like flaunting it to the Pope anyway, and he is now teaching left-wing law down at Clinton's alma mater, the former pro-abortion priest of the House, Robert Drinan, with ROBERT DORNAN canceling every one of his votes, so there are some strange things going on in the priesthood.

One Vatican high-ranking official says "We are not too thrilled here. One thing is that he is a priest. The other thing is that he advocates violence," as we all heard in depth in a classified session down in the deep basement today.

This guy, and they gave us the word, did you keep that note, TIM, on what he calls necklacing, Pere Lourran, the name of a man who opened a tire company who was his biggest supporter. So when Aristide says "You must use Pere Lourran," he is saying use "Father Necklacing," use those tires.

I got the names on something else we were told in this briefing that is not classified. The great national hero who freed the slaves and fought Napoleon Bonaparte, the Napoleon, emperor, the first, was named Toussaint L'Ouverture, Toussaint is the George Washington of Haiti. He said "I will give amnesty to my rival, Rigaud". But Toussaint subsequently killed all of Rigaud's supporters after he said he would give them amnesty.

In this country, you remember in our briefing, they said they did not know where it was from, but it was in exile recently Aristide said "I promise everyone amnesty," in the tradition of Toussaint, promising Rigaud's followers amnesty. So he is actually saying, and this escapes no one's attention in Haiti, from the second grade education on up, he is saying, like our George Washington, "I am promising you amnesty but what you are going to get is Pere Lourran," the necklacing of tires.

Did you already read his exact words about the smell of burning human flesh and all? I mean, what is going on that our colleagues in the other body are actually putting their arms around this guy, physically embracing him sideways, shaking his hand in public, and here is what offends me most, resisting classified briefings?

I have some more stuff here, but let us kick the ball around.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUTCHINSON] for bringing this matter before the House. I come from the State of Florida. I wanted to discuss with the gentleman the impact of immigration and Haitian policy on our State, and also some of my personal involvement in this matter that has been such a critical issue.

I know the gentlemen that have spoken from California, that State has been heavily impacted. However, let me talk, if I may, for a few minutes about what has happened in Florida.

□ 1720

In 1980 I had the opportunity to come here as a member not of the House, but as a staff member in the U.S. Senate and representing a U.S. Senator from the State of Florida. Remember, if you will in your minds what took place in 1980, the Mariel boatlift and the tens of thousands of people who Carter had permitted to enter the State of Florida and the United States who soon became the charge of the State of Florida.

I was first met in my work in the Congress with that deluge of humanity that had been cast upon us by failed policy from another former Governor who had been President of the United States. So I saw firsthand the impact, the financial impact, that our hospitals were overburdened, we had people sleeping in the streets. It took us many years to recover, and we still have not recovered financially from the impact of that.

So when I was elected in November to the U.S. Congress, just a few days after the election, President-elect Clinton had again pronounced his intentions of reversing the Bush policy on Haitian immigration. And I woke one morning, Saturday morning to hear the President-elect again say that he was reversing this policy. From the experience Florida had and I personally witnessed, I anticipated a similar travesty taking place in my State, and my immediate reaction was to wire the President-elect of the United States, which I did, and I asked him then and informed him that your action is going to cause a disaster for the State of Florida, it is going to cause a disaster for Haiti in that people's lives would be lost trying to reach our shores for freedom and economic advantage. And he did not respond.

But I did have an opportunity to talk again personally with the President-elect when he met with some of the new Members in the Library of Congress, and I again reiterated my concern, and the flood began. And I do not know if the people of the Congress are aware of it, but 40,000 Haitians came to Guantanamo, and again, Florida ended up with 10,000 of the 12,000. We did not send all of those folks back. Florida again, and New York, and some of the other States, Massachusetts, ended up with these folks. But Florida ended up with more than 10,000 Haitians. We did not send them all back.

Fortunately, the President finally, after lives were lost at sea and probably hundreds of Haitians washed up on our shores in Florida. Again our hospitals, our facilities were not able to absorb these folks the way we were the Marielitos because we had a larger Cuban population who chipped in and helped that failed policy through.

So here we were again. We did fortunately get the attention of the President-elect of the United States.

In 1 week, on a Thursday morning before he was sworn into office, he did change his policy, but again, only after this disaster took place. And as I recall, he took the air urging the Haitians to stay at home who were tearing down their homes and building boats to reach our shores.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICA. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I want to compliment the gentleman for being such a leader on this issue. I know you have deep concern about this as it impacts your own State.

I think there was a spate of stories on this back in January that there would be relocation centers, 10 of them around the Nation. So it is not just, as you well pointed out, not just the State of Florida that would be impacted by a flood of Haitian refugees coming in. But I have a figure of anywhere from 90 percent-plus of the refugees are economic refugees, not political, not trying to escape oppression necessarily, but economic, trying to escape the grinding poverty.

Mr. MICA. Yes. And this administration has made it an international policy to reach our shores now and claim political asylum. That is the key word. It is political asylum. And we cannot possibly take in all of these. If you look at China you have probably a billion people who would like to come in from China. You have hundreds of underdeveloped nations, people who are economic refugees, but also political refugees. So Florida experienced that in the 1980's.

Let me tell you right now the State of Florida is owed over $150 million in documented costs from the Mariel and tens of millions from the impact. Imagine absorbing 10,000 into any of your communities. So this is what we have had to endure with this failed policy.

Let me tell you what took place next. We stopped. We reversed the President. We finally turned him around. Then we had the question as we sent back people to Haiti, and the boats stopped sailing for our shores, then what happened is we ended up with 140-some HIV-infected individuals, Haitians. And this Congress, the United States Congress passed on the floor of this House of Representatives legislation that prohibited the entry into the United States, and it passed overwhelmingly, 300-something, which is unusual in this body, we passed legislation that prohibited having HIV-infected individuals come into the United States, not on a discriminatory basis. We just cannot absorb them. We have trouble right now.

The President stood just down the hall today describing how we are trying to provide health care for our citizens, and it was within days that the President, when a court sought to overturn previous language that prohibited these folks with HIV, he failed to direct the Department of Justice to appeal that decision, and quietly, through the night, they flew into Miami, and to New York, and again

Florida ended up with the vast majority of these people, HIV-infected.

I introduced legislation and had sponsors for legislation, and it is still sitting in this House of Representatives, to reimburse the State of Florida for even a portion of the costs that we are going to endure with HIV-infected individuals. Forty Members of the House of Representatives joined me in a letter which I sent to President Clinton asking him to appeal this decision. It was not just Florida. We do not have that many Members. It was Members from all over the United States. So they signed that letter. We sent it to the White House. And then he flew the people in in flights, and we are now absorbing that cost. We have them in the United States.

Mr. DORNAN. If the gentleman will yield for a question, I missed how much the State is already owed on the Mariel boatlift.

Mr. MICA. It is owed over $150 million.

Now I want to get into something else that I have found since I have been elected to Congress, that you have to have documented expenses. Those are the expenses, and they changed the rules on our hospitals and our facilities and our public entities. Those are the documented costs that still have not been paid by this Congress, or by the United States, owed to our State, the cost for 150 HIV-infected, of which we will get probably three-quarters and end up, and the other States, at probably $10 million or more.

The other problems with these individuals is many of them we were told did not even feel that they had AIDS. They did not believe that they had AIDS. They believed that we were telling them something because we did not want them in the United States. And we know that once they were released into the United States they had a multiplier effect in spreading that disease, and the cost of this is tremendous.

So let me continue, if I may. Let me tell you where we are with Haiti. What has happened in Haiti is a disaster again for my State, because Haiti has had a terrible history. It has been sort of the stepchild, the neglected stepchild of the Western Hemisphere, and it is an international disgrace. It is a disgrace for this country, because I have been there, I have worked with their people trying to lift them out of poverty. And we have not provided that means.

□ 1730

And what is really sad is the failed policy that this administration brought forth with Somalia in making a paper tiger out of the United States of America. That policy, when we sailed our ship into the harbor of Port-au-Prince and set ourselves up in a fashion—my goodness, in 10 months have we destroyed the intelligence capability of the United States? Have we destroyed our ability to take advice from our military? Have we destroyed our ability to develop a foreign policy that makes sense?

We sailed that boat, that single boat with engineers and carpenters into the port of Port-au-Prince harbor, setting ourselves up for the thugs who had sent the demonstrators to the port. I was told today by people who were there it was a disaster.

So we set ourselves up for a disaster. We did not listen to even Teddy Roosevelt, who said, "Walk softly, carry a big stick."

If we were going in there, that was our time to go in there with force and to demonstrate our commitment to democracy on that island.

We have lost that chance. We will never gain that opportunity again.

We lost the confidence of this Congress, we have lost the confidence of the American people, and we have lost the confidence of the world because we are now a laughingstock when it comes to our creating or supporting Democratic institutions, whether in the Western Hemisphere or anywhere else.

Let me say one more thing, if I may: That same policy is the policy that has caused the murders of those who would seek freedom and democracy in Port-au-Prince. My heart aches for those people. But they were set up, and now they are being murdered.

What is going to be so sad is if November 1 comes and goes and nothing has occurred. Now our only hope—and I thank the gentleman for pointing this out—what we have done with sanctions, this administration's policy of sanctions are the worst thing that we can do to the people. We have put those people out of jobs, we have made them more dependent on seeking our shores, or reasons to come to our shores.

Sanctions are dumb, they are stupid, they are idiotic to impose on a country—and the gentleman is exactly right—the military leaders, the elite have gas, they have supplies. The people, however, are out of jobs, they are out of work, they are desperate.

So we have become a paper tiger, we have hurt the people we should be helping, and we will not restore democracy to that land.

So it is a sad day.

Now our only hope is the United Nations. And if we do not get behind the United Nations in some final effort, and the whole thing has become bizarre because, again, who is going to look up to the United States? What do we do?

So I commend the gentleman so much for bringing this to our attention. I apologize for taking so much time. But I had to go over with you my personal involvement in this issue and what it means to the people of the State of Florida and to me personally.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. JOHN, I thank you for being a part of this special order. I think the gentleman has quoted a great quote from Teddy Roosevelt, "Speak softly, carry a big stick." Somebody suggested our foreign policy is that we have a broken stick and that we have lost our voice.

It certainly, I think, indicates the misdirection that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado. I am glad that he is a part of this special order.

Mr. McINNIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that over the weekend I was back in Colorado—it is snowing in Colorado, by the way—I was watching television and noticed that the President had come on and they asked the President in some of these newscasts, "What about the CIA reports about Aristide?" This guy is not exactly a guardian angel. The fellow that our Government is trying to put back into power is not exactly what our country may think that he is. I was surprised by that, but what surprised me more was the President's response of the Central Intelligence Agency and the President's administration response discounting significantly any kind of information that the CIA offered in regard to Aristide.

So I wanted to take a look at Aristide. I will keep my comments limited to a couple of minutes.

Let me say that in November I did a little research. In November the Cato Institute critique on the Haiti policy, let me read it. It says: "The United States and the Organization of American States so far have achieved precisely the opposite of what they intended. Their policy has provoked human rights violations," repeat, "human rights violations, further impoverished the destitute nation, helped degrade the environment, worsened public health conditions, encouraged drug smuggling, and failed to achieve a primary goal, restoring democracy." I do not know what we are about to send back down there in this Aristide. I guess not being up on the Haiti as a freshman Congressman, I am stunned that our Government is about to put young American men and women's lives at risk to restore this character Aristide.

Let me go on with a couple of other comments. This is from the Washington Post. Let me give you the date, December 18, 1992. "During his 7-month rule when Haiti needed someone to bridge social divisions, Aristide exacerbated class strife. He showed brazen intolerance for those who didn't support him, and he condoned violence and mob terror. In fact, the new leader all but urged his followers to 'necklace' opponents." That is, execute opponents.

Let me go on further, and this is curious. We always look to someone like Aristide, and everytime I see the guy, he is in a brand-new suit, well groomed, very well groomed. Most of

the time they show him walking out somewhere and he gets into a limousine. I am curious as to where he gets the money.

My understanding is, and the gentleman from California is here, my understanding is that he is getting about $900,000 a month, $900,000 a month being released to him from frozen assets of Haiti, out of Haiti.

But what is going on here?

Mr. DORNAN. Swiss banks.

Mr. McINNIS. Yes.

And them, my God, to throw it all on top of all this confusion, and there are the kind of mysteries that, as a former police officer, just puts more questions in my mind: Where is Ron Brown? Did he not represent—maybe one of the gentlemen here can help me on this—was not Ron Brown, before he became Secretary of Commerce, a lobbyist for Haiti down there, for one of these regimes?

Mr. DORNAN. Duvalier.

Mr. McINNIS. I mean this is incredible. The more the story goes on—I know others would like to speak.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. McINNIS. Let me finish my comment, and then I will be happy to yield for a question.

What is required? Is the policy aimed at advancing the interests of the Haitian people rather than the promise to Aristide? If nothing else happens—well, let me quote this: "If nothing happens and life remains as bleak as it is today for the Haitian people," they grimly predict that up to 200,000 Haitian boat people may hit U.S. shores. And who blames them? If that guy came into my backyard and I could go into your backyard and get the benefits offered by this country, I would go into your backyard.

U.S. intelligence estimates that 100,000 people are ready to depart Haiti for the United States. That does not take a rocket scientist. We know they are down there and we know they want to land on our shores. We are going to take the driving force to push these people into our country, a fellow who has $900,000 a month, then we know the CIA says this guy "ain't so good." He is not all he is built up to be. In fact, he vioaltes—if we can take the U.S. criminal laws and apply it toward this gentleman, he would be in prison for the rest of his life if, if not executed, in this country. Instead we support him, we call him the guiding light of democracy, and we are ready to restore him back in Haiti. It is amazing.

Mr. DORNAN. We are in the full House and I discussed this with the gentleman from Arkansas, but we would like to ask unanimous consent to put in this entire December 18 column of Mr. Lally Weymouth, along with this full January 4 column earlier this year.

(The documents referred to follow:)

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1992]

HAITI VERSUS ARISTIDE

(By Lally Waymouth)

PORT-AU-PRINCE.—President-elect Clinton has criticized President Bush's policy on Haitian refugees. But if Clinton is genuinely concerned about improving the welfare of the Haitian people, the incoming president would do well to focus on facilitating a political settlement in Haiti and on lifting the harsh economic embargo imposed by Washington—the embargo that almost brought this already poor nation to its knees.

Only two years ago, Haiti held its first free elections, choosing a president and a parliament. Liberated from the long Duvalier dictatorship, the country appeared to have a promising future. But the new president, a young, charismatic, extremely radical anti-American priest named Jean-Paul Aristide—perceived as the most ardent foe of the old order—did not exactly lead the island into a period of liberal enlightenment.

During his seven-month rule, when Haiti needed someone to bridge social divisions, Aristide, exacerbated class strife. He showed brazen intolerance for those who didn't support him, and he condoned violence and mob terror. In fact, the new leader all but urged his followers to "necklace" opponents. Mobo heeded his word in several instances; I saw harrowing photographs here depicting the charred remains of men who had been burned alive.

In August 1991, the parliament met to consider a vote of no confidence in Aristide's prime minister, Rene Preval. A mob surrounded the parliament building, threatening the very lives of the members—who then backed off.

Seven months after Aristide's inauguration, with opposition leaders fearing for their lives, the Haitian army staged a coup.

In response to the military coup, the United States, in collaboration with the Organization of American States, imposed an economic embargo that remains in effect.

Nevertheless, the elected parliament, with the approval of the army, went ahead and chose Mark Bazin to serve as prime minister. A former World Bank economist with close ties to the United States, he had run for president against Aristide and lost. Bazin's job now is to find a political solution and, in the meantime, to direct Haiti's economic and foreign policy.

Bazin is an impressive man of moderate sensibility who understands the importance of achieving an electoral mandate; he believes he can earn one if he is given the time and opportunity to reduce poverty.

But the chief barrier to his success, Bazin asserts, is the economic embargo. He notes, moreover, that few U.S. businesses have been willing to stay in Haiti: "We have lost 75 percent of them."

Even senior Bush administration officials admit that the embargo has been a failure. It has not succeeded in its dubious purpose: to ease the return of Aristide. It has instead all but destroyed the economy of the poorest nation in the Caribbean, driving up prices, eliminating jobs and making life for the poor unbearable.

American leadership is the key to any potential settlement: At the moment, all sides appear frozen in place. Aristide sits in Washington, receiving, according to U.S. sources, about $900,000 a month from frozen Haitian assets to maintain his ambassadors and himself in style. Since Aristide hopes that Clinton will restore him to power, he is disinclined to make any compromises.

The army, on the other hand, is equally unlikely to bend unless there is genuine U.S. pressure to compel it to reduce its role in Haitian life. There's little question that the military continues to commit major human rights violations.

For the Clinton administration, the "Washington Protocol" of February 1992 provides a possible starting point for a settlement. Under its terms, Aristide might remain president, but his return home would be delayed. In exchange, he would be expected both to abide by laws passed by the Haitian parliament and to grant a general political amnesty—including, of course, those involved in the coup.

What is required is a policy aimed at advancing the interests of the Haitian people rather than one that promotes Aristide. If nothing happens and life remains as bleak as it is today for the Haitian people, Bazin grimly predicts that up to 200,000 Haitian boat people may hit U.S. shores. There are U.S. intelligence estimates that 100,000 people are ready to depart Haiti for the United States. Bazin estimates that 99 percent of them are, contrary to the prevailing wisdom in liberal circles, economic and not political refugees.

If Bazin's moderation doesn't appear to pay off, it's altogether possible that the army will depose the Bazin government and revert to a more traditional and brutal Haitian military dictatorship.

"The opportunity is now," says Bazin. "If we let it pass, no one will be in control of the boat people and the extremists. The Americans could then," he warns, "have to carry out another Somali operation"—right here in our own hemisphere.

---

[From the Republican Study Committee, Oct. 22, 1993]

HAITI'S ARISTIDE: DEMOCRAT OR DICTATOR?

"The announced purpose of the U.N. Haitian initiative is, *in the name of democracy*, to reinstall Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power. It has been publicly reported, however, that U.S. intelligence believes Aristide to be a clinical psychotic, an individual who is sufficiently mentally unstable as to require medication and institutional treatment for depression and megalomania."—October 14 Decision Brief, The Center for Security Policy.

"Because of our concern that U.S. military involvement in Haiti could result in a situation similar to Somalia, we request that you provide us with answers to the following important questions in order to clarify the reasons for your decision to commit U.S. troops to Haiti."—October 8 Letter to the President sponsored by Congressmen John Doolittle and Robert Dornan.

"Peace-keeping commitments may so degrade the armed forces' war-fighting capability that it will be impossible to carry out the national military strategy * * * If the commitments/forces mismatch continues to develop as current trends suggest, the military will be unable to carry out the strategy."—Floor Speech by Congressman Ike Skelton (D-MO).

INTRODUCTION

Reverend Jean-Bertrand Aristide was evicted from office in a military coup on September 30, 1992, seven months after his inauguration. Aristide was elected with 67% of the vote.

A peace accord was signed July 3 at Governor's Island, New York, between the military, headed by Lt. General Raoul Cedras and exiled President Aristide. Cedras was to resign by October 15, and Aristide to return to office by October 30. Other conditions of

the accord included passage of a bill by the Haitian Parliament that would grant amnesty to those responsible for the coup, and another bill to separate the army from the police. General Cedras has said he would not leave office until the other conditions of the accord are met.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 867 (approved September 23) created the U.N. Mission in Haiti (UNMIH). UNMIH was to be composed of 1600 U.N. observers, police and civilians. Violence and death threats against the Canadian chief of the UNMIH police forced his recall on September 30. U.S. troops would be particularly exposed in Haiti, since the original plan was to provide 600 UNARMED U.S. troops to help rebuild Haiti.

Country background: Haiti's adult literacy rate is 23%. Its population is 6.4 million. Haiti is the size of the state of Maryland, and is based 100 miles east of Cuba and 750 miles southeast of Miami. The official language is French (although the majority of Haitians speak Creole); Haiti's GNP per capita is $370, and its population is 95% African descent.

WHO IS PRESIDENT ARISTIDE?

Haiti's military views the deposed Aristide as an unstable leader who filled his Cabinet with cronies. Some accuse Aristide's government of Marxist leanings and said the Haitian Army could not tolerate the existence of such a government.

Are the military's views on Aristide justified?

CBS News reported on October 13 that President Aristide during his short reign encouraged the "necklacing" of his political opponents, the practice of igniting gasoline-soaked tires around the neck and burning a victim alive. (This is a practice frequently used against political enemies by the African National Congress in South Africa.) Here's the quotation CBS ascribes to Aristide in reference to necklacing:

"What a beautiful tool, what a beautiful instrument, what a beautiful device, it's beautiful, yes, it's beautiful, it's cute, it's pretty, it has a good smell. Wherever you go you want to inhale it."

ARISTIDE IS THE CENTERPIECE OF CLINTON'S HAITI POLICY

President Clinton has embraced Reverend Aristide, as has the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Randall Robinson of TransAfrica and members of the Congressional Black Caucus. The Heritage Foundation in 1991 had this to say of Reverend Aristide:

"He is a lifelong leftist, a fervent nationalist, and a strong advocate of liberation theology, which promotes the ideals of communism thinly veiled with religion. In fact, Aristide, who is a Roman Catholic priest, was ousted from the Salesian Order of the Roman Catholic Church in 1988 because it considered him a revolutionary."

Aristide's political platform endorsed redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor, and his rhetoric blamed the U.S. Government for the abuses of the Papa Doc and Baby Doc Duvalier dictatorships, the latter previously represented in the U.S. by Clinton's Commerce Secretary Ron Brown.

ARISTIDE'S TIES TO FIDEL CASTRO

The Heritage Foundation's February 1991 analysis states that Aristide invited Fidel Castro's regime to send a delegation to attend his inauguration. Haiti and Communist Cuba had never had diplomatic relations, but Aristide seemed to be opening the door to diplomatic ties. Aristide's party sent young "volunteers" to Cuba for training as "political party operatives." Aristide's party also created neighborhood militias titled "vigilance committees," modeled on Cuba's, which appeared to target Aristide's political rivals, including the press, and foreign diplomatic and business interests. The vigilance committees organized street protests, sponsored attacks against opponents, and served as intelligence operatives for Aristide.

HAITIAN MILITARY FEARS REPRISALS BY ARISTIDE

The Army fears reprisals by the deposed President, a proponent of necklacing, should he be returned to office. The October 15 Boston Globe quoted a top Haitian officer saying:

"We have lived seven months with Aristide . . . we had many soldiers killed. We had many members of society killed, and the international community says this is democracy and you have to drink this same poison because he is an elected president, and an elected president can do anything he wants. This is incredible. I can't believe it."

The military appears justified in its views on Aristide by the 1991 State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices: "President Aristide, however appeared less concerned about prosecuting members of the military accused of human rights abuses if they were supporters or appointees of his government. The Aristide Government repeatedly attempted to interfere with the judicial process or usurp it through 'mob justice.'"

CLINTON'S RATIONALE FOR INTERVENTION IN HAITI: REFUGEES

Secretary of State Christopher and Madeleine Albright have sought to rationalize U.S. interference in Haiti by arguing that its policy will prevent the flow of Haitian refugees to the U.S. President Clinton's support for U.N. sanctions is likely to produce the one result the Administration claims it is fighting—More Refugees!

The October 15 Washington Post admits that: "reimposition of the sanctions . . . would demolish the few viable businesses in weeks." A Cato Institute Policy Analysis (November 5, 1992) claims the embargo cost 140,000 private sector jobs from a total of 252,000 total and generated 40,000 refugees. "Since there are approximately six dependents per job holder, the losses directly affect nearly 1 million people." To circumvent sanctions, the nation's military elite has resorted to selling smuggled goods, expanding trade with the Dominican Republic, and allegedly engaging in drug-trafficking.

Most Haitians fleeing their country are economic refugees. How can President Clinton justify the imposition of sanctions against the most impoverished black-ruled nation in the Western Hemisphere? Sanctions will only inflict mass suffering and deprivation on Haiti's people. Some speculate that the President, having reneged on his campaign pledge to hear the asylum claims of Haitian refugees, is now trying to compensate for his policy reversal.

It is a sad commentary on a great power that it claims it can do nothing about the influx of refugees from a nation of 6.4 million. There is a rather simple solution—Haitians know that if they can make it to U.S. ships only a few miles offshore, they will be taken to the Florida coast. This promotes refugee flight. Political stability, law and order, and economic growth, which can only be achieved by the Haitians themselves, are the key to stopping the refugee flow.

BLIND SUBSERVIENCE TO A RADICAL U.N. AGENDA

President Clinton's misplaced fealty to the United Nations produced a disastrous policy in Somalia. He is on the verge of repeating the same mistake in Haiti, and again, recklessly endangering the lives of U.S. soldiers. The American people are unwilling to see more American troops placed at risk, or to be sacrificed on the altar of "mindless multilateralism," the foreign policy being pursued by the Clinton White House.

The U.S. is not the enforcement arm of the U.N. President Clinton failed, in approving U.S. participation in U.N. peacekeeping in Haiti, to address basic questions raised in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly:

"Is there a threat to international peace and security? Does the peace-keeping mission have clear objectives? Can an end point be identified?"

The answer, in Haiti, to all of President Clinton's conditions is a resounding NO.

American soldiers are volunteers, but they volunteered to defend the United States and its interests, not to become proxies for the United Nations or world policemen. Clinton's policies reflect a contempt for the military and if continued, may result in more dead American boys for no just cause.

CONGRESS REJECTED WHITE HOUSE REQUEST FOR PEACEKEEPING MONEY

The President must get Congress' message; the peacekeeping money his Administration requested was rejected by the House, both on the DOD Authorization bill and DOD Appropriations bill. The President cannot ignore the Congress or the will of the people in decisions to deploy forces overseas under U.N. command.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS TO BE LEFT DEFENSELESS IN HAITI

The Haitian Parliament is expected to vote to condemn the U.N. intervention. Why would the President deploy troops with only "self-defense weapons" given the obvious hostile political climate in Haiti? As recently as September 26, the State Department's assessment was that the U.N. military trainers and police advisors were not expected to face any hostile reaction in Haiti.

The Clinton Administration must know that the hotel housing U.N. staff was attacked, and that the Haitian civilian "attaches," said to be armed by the Haitian military, carry Uzis. Yet regardless, American soldiers were to be sent into harm's way, with the hope that the Haitian military, roundly condemned by Clinton spokesmen, would protect them. U.S. troops would be obvious targets for terrorist attack, especially with inflammatory Administration rhetoric fanning military and nationalist animosity towards U.S. Government representatives.

TROUBLED HISTORY OF U.S. INTERVENTION IN HAITI

President Woodrow Wilson deployed 350 marines to Haiti in 1915 following the assassination of Haiti's President and prompted by concerns about U.S. investment in Haiti. The U.S. occupation force stayed until 1934. During that period of time, the Marine Corps restored order, introduced constitutional reforms and the country's first telephone service, and built roads and schools.

The United States should profit from history. The U.S. Marine deployment in 1915 did not stop Haiti from sliding off the road to democracy. In fact, the Marines increasingly inspired Haitian resentment towards the Yankee oppressors. Large anti-American demonstrations helped force the U.S. withdrawal. Post-U.S. occupied Haiti returned to corruption, political chaos, dictatorship, and human rights abuses.

As the November 5, 1992 Cato Institute policy critique persuasively argues, "The United States and the OAS (Organization of American States) have so far achieved precisely the opposite of what they intended. Their policy has provoked human rights violations, further impoverished a destitute nation, helped degrade the environment, worsened public health conditions, encouraged drug smuggling, and failed to achieve its primary goal—restoring democracy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The U.S. Government should explore the possibility of having the Vatican mediate the political impasse in Haiti, a suggestion offered by the Haitian military. The Vatican, far more than the U.N. or the Clinton State Department, which have taken sides in Haiti's political feud and implemented counterproductive policies, could serve as an objective mediator.

The U.S. should avoid any military intervention in Haiti except in the defense of American lives on the island.

The Congress should fault the Clinton Administration policy for its political bias towards the deposed and discredited President Aristide, and should endorse a policy which supports democratic principles, not undemocratic individuals.

The Congress should encourage the immediate revocation of the trade embargo, which is exacerbating Haiti's deep poverty, escalating political tensions in Haiti and reducing the possibility of a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the conflict.

The U.S. should distance itself from any U.S. "nation-building" plan in Haiti, which undoubtedly would be a bureaucratic boondoggle, and instead, embrace a genuine prodemocracy strategy towards Haiti, which emphasizes free market economics, decentralized government, civilian control of the military, and improving human rights.

MARGARET HEMENWAY,
*Senior Policy Analyst.*

---

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1993]

HAITI'S SUSPECT SAVIOR: WHY PRESIDENT ARISTIDE'S RETURN FROM EXILE MAY NOT BE GOOD NEWS

(By Lally Weymouth)

Before his Inauguration, well aware that thousands of Haitians were planning to set sail for America in direct response to his perceived campaign promises, Bill Clinton reversed course and adopted the Bush administration policy he had bashed resoundingly—ostensibly on humanitarian grounds—during the campaign. The president-elect announced that Haitians trying to reach U.S. shores would be forcibly returned to Haiti.

Human rights groups have attacked Clinton for the reversal. Their chief hope now with regard to Haiti is that the incoming administration will restore deposed President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power. A leftist priest, Aristide was chosen president of Haiti in a free election in December 1990. Seven months later, he was ousted from office in a military coup.

After the coup, the Bush administration, in coordination with the Organization of American States, slapped a harsh embargo on Haiti. A senior Bush foreign policy official explains that the action was meant to remind the militaries of other Carribean and Latin American countries that coups don't pay.

Not surprisingly, however, the Haitian people became the primary victims of the embargo. While Aristide lived nicely in Washington—enjoying access to thousands of dollars in frozen Haitian assets made available to him by the U.S. government—Haiti, already the poorest country in this hemisphere, saw the loss of thousands of jobs as companies in electronic assembly, clothing manufacture and other light industry sold out to Haitian businessmen or moved operations elsewhere.

Before the Clinton administration sets out to restore Aristide to power, newly appointed officials would be wise to study carefully the true character of Aristide's short, but brutal, tenure in office. Not only did he abuse democratic practices but Aristide condoned and even encouraged violence.

The State Department 1991 human rights report said that under Aristide there were fewer instances of abuse by the military but "the government proved to be unwilling or unable to restrain popular justice through mob violence. . . ."

In his speeches Aristide called upon his followers to attack freely anyone who dared disagree with him. This included even organizations such as the labor union CATH, which had supported Aristide's election but later criticized some of his actions.

Aristide actually urged his followers to engage in the hideous practice of "necklacing"—slapping a petrol-soaked tire around the neck of a political opponent and igniting it, thus burning the victim alive. On Sept. 27, 1991, shortly before he was overthrown by the military, the former Haitian president told a mass rally that if they should see "a faker who pretends to be one of our supporters . . . just grab him. Make sure he gets what he deserves . . . with the tool you have now in your hands [the burning tire]. . . . You have the right tool in your hands . . . the right instrument. . . What a beautiful tool we have. What a nice instrument. It is nice, it is chic, it is classy, elegant and snappy. It smells good and wherever you go, you want to smell it."

A few days, later an Aristide-inspired mob attacked Sylvio Claude, the founder of the Democratic Christian Haitian Party (PDCH)—a man who had been jailed and tortured by Duvalier but was a political opponent of Aristide. Although Claude sought shelter in a police station, he was turned over to the mob and burned to death.

The Catholic Church was a central target of Aristide's more violent supporters. Monsignor William Murphy wrote a graphic account of events in January 1991 when, according to Murphy, ". . . a group of thugs, supporters of newly elected President Aristide, went on a rampage. They destroyed the old cathedral, gutted the archbishop's house . . . and then went on to the nunciature, the home of the pope's representative. There, they completely destroyed the building, attacked the nuncio and his priest-secretary, broke both legs of the priest and roughed up and stripped the nuncio . . . who was saved only by the intervention of a neighbor."

According to senior U.S. government officials. Aristide also participated in a cover-up of the killing of five teenagers on July 26, 1991. Members of an anti-gang unit claimed the killings occurred when they became involved in a struggle with the youths as they tried to escape. Photographs, however, showed that the young men were severely beaten and shot at point blank range by several weapons. The Haitian armed forces—in particular Interim Commander-in-Chief Raoul Cedras—demanded that the incident be investigated. But Aristide, who had been building his own security forces outside the military chain of command, tried to block the investigation and sided publicly with one of the officers involved in the slaying.

U.S. government officials cite extensive evidence showing that Aristide personally gave the order to kill Roger Lafontant, the Duvalierist, who was incarcerated in the National Penitentiary after his conviction for leading a coup attempt in January 1991.

When Lafontant was tried in July 1991, a mob of Aristide supporters assembled outside the courtroom carrying tires and gasoline cans and threatening to kill the judge in the case if Lafontant were not given a life sentence. As a result, Lafontant received a life sentence although the Haitian constitution sets the maximum penalty for his alleged crime at 15 years. Aristide praised his followers for their efforts, asking whether, without the threat of necklacing, "don't you think that the sentence handed down would have been 15 years?" Lafontant was killed by his jailers on the night that Aristide was overthrown.

After the coup, Cedras became chief of staff. He is, nevertheless, credited by U.S. officials with saving Aristide's life the night of the coup. In a December interview, Cedras said he also has information that Aristide intended to have other political prisoners killed, not just Lafontant: "He [Aristide] gave the orders to kill around 20 people, but they had the courage to execute only Lafontant.".

During Aristide's short rule, says Canadian journalism professor Gerard Etienne, a Haitian-born staunch opponent of Duvalier who conducted a detailed study of Aristide's rule, soldiers were regularly assassinated and several military posts were burned. Aristide, according to Etienne, not only failed to denounce these brutal slayings, but "backed them up by his silence and his demagogic tirades . . . ."

In August 1991, Haitian legislators met to deal with the government's abuses. They planned to question Prime Minister Rene Preval—who, according to the State Department human rights report, had personally interrogated political prisoners and denied them recourse to legal counsel—and then to consider censuring him. Before parliament met, shots were fired outside the headquarters of the National Front for Change and Democracy (FNCD)—a political party that had originally supported Aristide but had begun to criticize some of his actions. The home of an FNCD legislator was also stoned.

When the parliament met, its members found themselves surrounded by about 2,000 demonstrators, many carrying burning tires. Under the threat of the mob, the legislators decided to recess.

Cedras says he did his best to keep order in Haiti during the 1990 elections that brought Aristide to power. Moreover, he recalls trying subsequently to cooperate with Aristide. "But we could never really find out why he behaved the way he did," said Cedras. "He spent seven months violating the constitution of this country which he was there to guarantee."

After Aristide was overthrown by the military on Sept. 30, 1991, the army soon appointed a civilian government, headed by Prime Minister Marc Bazin. Since then, efforts have been made—with U.S. assistance—to arrive at a negotiated settlement between Aristide, the army and Bazin.

The closest the two sides came to an agreement was the Washington Accord reached 11 months ago. But the accord reached a stumbling block after Aristide changed his mind on a central element—amnesty for the armed

forces leadership. Negotiations dragged on, and Aristide proved to be in no hurry to make a deal.

During the transition, the threat that thousands of Haitian boat people might descend on Florida quickened the negotiating pace. The two sides appear to have approached a solution—amnesty would be granted to tne army in return for a recognition of Aristide's right to return to power. In theory, both sides have agreed to accept a large team of international monitors that would hopefully reduce the widespread human rights violations currently being committed by the army and prevent future abuses by Aristide's supporters should he return.

The challenge for Haiti and its U.S. friends is to turn to building institutions that can sustain a measure of democracy. Helping Aristide regain power may make sense as a way of stemming the flow of Haitian immigrants to Florida. But it is foolish to assume that he represents a return to human rights and democratic rule for that impoverished island.

(Lally Weymouth writes frequently on foreign issues for The Washington.)

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 24, 1993]

VATICAN WARY OF ARISTIDE'S RETURN TO HAITI

ROME.—Vatican diplomats, who have long opposed the policies of exiled Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, expressed concern this week about the possible return to power of the left-wing Roman Catholic priest.

Mr. Aristide became Haiti's first democratically elected president in 1990, two years after he was expelled from the Salesian order and suspended from carrying out his priestly functions in public.

The Salesians, one of the largest religious orders in the Catholic Church, said the charismatic priest had used religion to incite hatred and violence.

But Mr. Aristide is still a priest in the eyes of the church, since he never officially received a dispensation from his vows. Church law bars priests from holding elected office, except in unusual circumstances.

"We're not too thrilled," said one high-ranking Vatican official, speaking on condition of anonymity. "One thing is that he's a priest. The other thing is that he advocates violence."

Mr. Aristide, who was overthrown in a bloody coup in September 1991, was scheduled to return to Haiti at the end of the month as part of a U.N.-brokered accord.

But Haitian military leader Lt. Gen. Raoul Cedras has refused to comply with the U.N. plan and has suggested that the Vatican mediate. A Vatican spokesman said no official request for mediation had arrived in Rome.

The Vatican blames Mr. Aristide for an assault on a Vatican mission in Port-au-Prince in January 1991 by a crowd unhappy with the church's official position toward the exiled president. The Vatican ambassador, an Italian archbishop, was stripped to his underpants, and his assistant was both stripped and severely beaten in the attack.

In other words, in our busy day around here, this has been kicking around for almost a year, and we have just not been able to, with our other duties, to focus on this. And by the way, I want to get it right because we are going to hear more of it, I am afraid, if we lose the lives of our young men and women in harm's way to force him back; his term for this cruelest of all deaths, putting a tire around someone and the tire is filled with gasoline or turpentine so as it is set on fire you run and the gasoline splashes out of the tire and continues to burn you alive, he calls that "pere," as in "father," "Lebrun." That is the name of the guy who is one of the main financial supporters.

I wanted to give one final paragraph from that Vatican column of Reuters out of Rome, and then I want to ask JOHN a couple of questions because he is the expert of our 50 States closest to Cuba and Haiti. It says, "The Vatican blames Mr. Aristide for an assault on a Vatican mission in Port-au-Prince in January 1991 by a crowd unhappy with the church's official position toward the exiled president." And this built up to his overthrow in September. "The Vatican ambassador, an Italian archbishop, was stripped to his," and this is the word they used, "underpants and his assistant was both stripped and severely beaten in the attack. And the gentleman said his legs were broken." What I wanted to, with the gentleman's permission, is ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], who said, "All HIV-infected people have been brought here on flights from Guantanamo." Are we still putting just general refugees that we pick up at sea—now, Coast Guard ships snuck into Port-au-Prince quietly and deposited, I think, 24 people last night or this morning. They were picked up, saved from the high seas. Are we still putting Haitians found on the high seas, surviving shark attack and dehydration; are we bringing them into Florida or taking them back to Guantanamo?

□ 1740

I believe we are taking them into Florida, but now you have created this situation where you may truly have questions raised as far as political amnesty, and they will immediately claim political refugee status, which is a very murky area.

Basically this administration because of its lack of enforcement has created an atmosphere that allows anyone to make that claim.

They have also created a new category of entrants, which are HIV infected. In spite of the law, we have allowed them in. We have allowed that judge's decision to stand.

But let me say this, that Haiti will not go away. Haiti is an integral part of the western hemisphere. It has been a neglected nation. There is no reason that Haiti should exist the way it does today, except for some of the failed policies of the past where we have given tremendous amounts of aid that has ended up in Swiss bank accounts, where we have paid for studies, but we do not pay for the thing that has made this country successful, which is helping people to help themselves.

Our policies have been handouts. We have an AID program and we have missions all over this world that are giving out money, and once that money is gone it is either again in a Swiss bank account or in some project. It is not established in a fashion to create an entrepreneurial system to promote business.

The thing that will make Haiti a success, that will keep Haitians from our shores, and the independent proud people that they are, is their economic success.

So if we can do business in trade and show them how to do that, and they are great people, these are people who want to work. They want the same things Americans want. They want a home. They want transportation. They want a job, just like Americans do. That is the problem with this Congress. It is easier to give aid to some foreign country. It is easier to give aid to these cities.

I heard yesterday one of the speeches that absolutely just brought me almost to tears, when one of our Representatives from Detroit told me that 20,000 Americans showed up for job applications because of a post office job opportunity in Detroit, which has the highest amount of unemployment in the United States, I think somewhere around 50 percent.

But those policies in Detroit or those policies in Port-au-Prince have failed. That is what needs to be addressed. That is what can raise all the boats, all the people to success.

Mr. Speaker, that is the positive note on which I leave.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just a moment, and then the gentleman can please close this.

The letter that the gentleman helped circulate, with the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and myself, the million-and-a-half audience watching will say, "Well, you are criticizing the President. What are you offering?"

Mr. Speaker, I will put in the RECORD the letter from myself, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the October 8 letter to the President giving him suggestions, putting Senator DOLE's article in yesterday's Washington Times that Aristide is not worth one American life, that he is not the Thomas Jefferson of Haiti. I just want to get those in.

Mr. Speaker, I include that material at this point.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, DC, October 8, 1993.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is considerable concern within the U.S. Congress about your administration's plans to expand the role of U.S. military forces in United Nations peacekeeping missions. Much of the concern results from your administration's failure to

clearly define the criteria used to determine when U.S. troops will be committed abroad.

On October 11, 1993, 200 U.S. servicemen and women will arrive in Haiti, with 400 more to follow later in October, to participate in a U.N. mission that is designed to prepare Haiti for the scheduled October 30 return of exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Because of our concern that U.S. military involvement in Haiti could result in a situation similar to Somalia, we request that you provide us with answers to the following important questions in order to clarify the reasons for your decision to commit U.S. troops to Haiti:

1. What are the vital national security interests that require the placement of United States forces in Haiti under the auspices of the United Nations?

2. What is the mission of the United States forces involved in the United Nations mission in Haiti and the estimated duration of that mission?

3. What is the exact size and composition of the United States forces involved in the United Nations mission in Haiti?

4. What is the estimated cost of this United Nations mission to the United States?

5. What is the precise command and control relationship between the United States forces and the United Nations?

6. What is the precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the commander of the U.S. military command here in the United States?

7. To what extent will United States forces deployed to Haiti rely on non-U.S. forces for security and self-defense, and what is the ability of those non-U.S. forces to provide adequate security to the U.S. forces involved?

8. What are the "rules of engagement" for United States forces in Haiti?

9. What are the conditions under which the United States forces can be withdrawn from Haiti?

We know that you appreciate and understand our concerns about deploying U.S. forces abroad as part of a United Nations operation. We hope that you will provide us with a prompt reply to these important questions.

Thank you for your cooperation and for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

John T. Doolittle, Robert K. Dornan, Richard Pombo, Tim Hutchinson, Nick Smith, Rod Grams, Paul Gillmor, Bill Archer, Dana Rohrabacher, Jack Kingston, Richard Baker, Jim Ramstad, Roscoe Bartlett, Chris Cox, Dan Burton, Jim Bunning, Jan Meyers, Carlos Moorhead, Bob Livingston, Toby Roth, Gerald Solomon, Tom Ewing.

Sam Johnson, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Duncan Hunter, Dick Armey, Ed Royce, Bill Goodling, Cass Ballenger, James Sensenbrenner, Elton Gallegly, Wally Herger, Jon Kyl, John Duncan, Jim Saxton, Bob Inglis, Howard "Buck" McKeon, Henry Hyde, Tom Delay, Spencer Bachus, Bill Baker, C.W. Bill Young.

---

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 25, 1993]

DOLE OPPOSES SENDING TROOPS—SAYS ARISTIDE ISN'T WORTH U.S. LIVES

(By Major Garrett)

Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole and former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney joined forces yesterday to oppose using any U.S. combat forces to restore exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power in Haiti.

In response, Vice President Al Gore said the Clinton administration continues to support Mr. Aristide's peaceful attempt to get his office back from the military junta that ousted him in September 1991.

Mr. Dole said a recent CIA briefing given to 13 senators last week unearthed some "very disturbing" information about Mr. Aristide's mental stability, his treatment of political opponents and his commitment to democracy."

"It involves a lot of different areas that would indicate he doesn't believe in democracy with a small d and that he may not be very successful once he returns," Mr. Dole said on ABC-TV's "This Week." "I certainly wouldn't risk one American life to put him back in power."

Mr. Cheney said the Clinton administration should think twice about making Mr. Aristide's return to Haiti a top diplomatic or military priority.

"This is not the Thomas Jefferson of Haiti. I don't think it's worth American lives to try to restore him to his office in Haiti, especially when he might well not survive very long if he were to go back to Haiti," he said.

"While certainly he was democratically elected, there are very serious questions about his mental stability, about his conduct in office the few months he was in office," Mr. Cheney said on the ABC news program.

Mr. Gore discounted the negative reports about Mr. Aristide.

"There are allegations by his opponents that he denies, that are uncorroborated," said Mr. Gore, who appeared on the same program. "I can tell you this, that we have dealt with him for nine months now. He has been reliable, he has been very thoughtful, he has been persistent in his efforts in behalf of the Haitian people."

Ever since he was ousted in a military coup, Mr. Aristide has appealed for support from the United States, the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

The Bush administration expressed initial sympathy for Mr. Aristide after the coup but ruled out the use of U.S. troops to restore him to power. It also turned back roughly three-quarters of the 40,000 refugees who sought to come to the U.S. in makeshift wooden boats.

The Bush administration began to distance itself from Mr. Aristide in early October 1991, when politicians and businessmen interviewed by the Organization of American States revealed a harsh side to the Aristide regime.

The critics complained that Mr. Aristide encouraged vigilantism among the poor and intimidated his political opponents.

Allegations also surfaced that Mr. Aristide condoned torture and executions to settle political scores and that he had bypassed the legislature and imposed his definition of social justice above those outlined in the constitution.

As a candidate, Mr. Clinton criticized the policy of shipping refugees back to Haiti as "immoral" and vowed to do more on Mr. Aristide's behalf. After months of employing a policy quite similar to Mr. Bush's, Mr. Clinton has moved more aggressively to restore Mr. Aristide to power.

The vice president said the administration remains committed to Mr. Aristide because of his standing as Haiti's democratically elected leader.

"He represents democracy in Haiti," Mr. Gore said. "We believe that he should be restored. He was elected president by the people there. When he was president, conditions began to improve. The people began to have an opportunity to restore some stability there."

Mr. Gore said that a blockade by U.S. and Canadian ships is working and that prospects are improving for a negotiated settlement between Mr. Aristide and the military leaders.

Mr. Dole said the United States had a "national interest" in preventing more Haitian refugees from trying to enter the country. But that goal should be pursued entirely through diplomatic efforts, the senator said.

"This country needs help, but I doubt if they're going to get much help from the likes of Aristide," he said.

Mr. Cheney said it may not be within the United States' power to restore Mr. Aristide—peacefully or otherwise—and that Mr. Clinton might have to wait for international efforts to run their course.

"I think that sometimes, in fact, the right answer is that there is no quick and easy fix; there is no solution that can be imposed by the United States on Haiti," Mr. Cheney said. "They've been independent for 200 years, they've never mastered the complexities of building a democratic society. And I would not sacrifice any American lives to that end."

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Just wrapped this up, I do not have time to expand on this, we are not against the nation of Haiti. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] so eloquently said, they are a proud people. They are a nationalistic people, and our hearts go out to them.

It is not enough to criticize American foreign policy. I want to suggest four components of what we need to do very quickly.

First, we need to refrain from sending United States military personnel to Haiti. It would be a recipe for disaster to send lightly armed American troops into Haiti.

We need to lift the economic embargo on Haiti. All that is doing is hurting those who are already most hurting. It is only causing greater starvation, greater hunger, greater chaotic economic conditions.

Third, we need to delink the United States Haiti policy from Aristide. We need to drop our support for Aristide as being the sole one who can restore democracy to Haiti.

I think there has been adequate testimony and evidence presented during the this special order to show indeed that Aristide is the wrong one for us to be backing.

Fourth, we need to promote United States interests and encourage a political compromise in Haiti through the OAS, through the United Nations, and through the good offices of the Roman Catholic Church.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am out of time. I would like to.

I think we need another special order on the subject of Haiti.

But let me just say, I have gone to Haiti. I have spent time, my church

sponsors a mission there, a school there. We send food there. We send clothes there. I have spent 8 days down there myself helping and working with those people. We need to do all we can to continue to do that.

Our hearts go out to the people of Haiti. Our concern is the misguided foreign policy that is only making the conditions and the situations of poverty even worse in that impoverished nation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be in favor of free elections to elect new leaders in Haiti?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would support free elections wholeheartedly, and in fact I think——

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentleman accept the result of that free election? Aristide was elected by two-thirds of the voters, 70 percent of the voters. We have not elected a President of the United States with 70 percent of the vote in a long time, so that is their choice. If they voted again, would the gentleman accept their choice for freedom and democracy?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support free elections. The problem is the elections in which Aristide gained that office was years ago now and the time that he served—

Mr. OWENS. Two years ago.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The time that he served, the 2 years that he established, as we pointed out, was in violation——

Mr. OWENS. U.N. supervised.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. It was one of initiating and supporting violence against his political opponents. That is not the right way to go about getting democracy.

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

## NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the House this evening, but before I talk about the North American Free-Trade Agreement, I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] would like to respond and talk about the issue that was just being discussed on Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

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

I do appreciate the discussion of my previous colleagues. They have a point of view, but I think it is very important not to allow that distorted point of view to go unchallenged.

The most important thing for the American people to know is that President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was elected by the people of Haiti in a United Nations supervised election, the only fair election ever held in the history of Haiti.

Now, if we cannot accept the people's choice, then what is democracy all about?

It is their choice. If you had elections now, after more than 2 years that Aristide had been out of office because he was thrown out of office by a military coup—the people who had the guns and the army forced him to leave—he has been gone now for 2 years; if you still held an election, the population of Haiti would overwhelmingly reelect Jean-Bertrand Aristide as their President.

After all the suffering they have gone through and all the suffering that was described by the previous speakers, which is very real, the question they raise is not one that should be dealt with lightly.

How much do you make the people suffer as a result of trying to force their illegal gangster rulers to bow down to democracy and accept the result of democracy? That is a very fair question.

I am not sure from day to day where we come out on this embargo and sanctions as the only means of being able to get a return to democracy in Haiti.

I would like not to go on too long. I know the gentleman has other things to say, but I just would like to correct a few other misstatements.

Aristide has been described as a Communist and therefore we should not support his return because he is a Communist. That is a flat untruth. He is not a Communist, has never been a Communist.

Now, if they say he had some ideas that sounded socialistic or sounded communistic, that may be true, because you can use your own judgment about what sounds communistic and what sounds socialistic.

□ 1750

But let us understand where we are in October 1993. We are openly supporting ex-Communists. As my colleagues know, the chief ex-Communist now being supported by the United States is Boris Yeltsin. Boris Yeltsin was once a card-carrying Communist. He will not deny he was once a Communist. We do not hold that against Boris Yeltsin or the nation of Russia as we seek to give them large amounts of foreign aid because that is a bygone era as far as we are concerned.

We want to build a new world order. Lech Walesa came to this House and was roundly applauded by both sides of the aisle. Lech Walesa was once a card-carrying Communist. He does not deny that he was once a Communist.

Aristide, he once had some socialistic ideas and set forth those ideas in one place or another. It may be true, but he has never been a Communist and is not now a Communist. He is the democratically elected leader of the nation.

Finally, I want to say that in terms of the caliber of leadership around the world, stop and think a moment about Jean-Bertrand Aristide, and think of what we have. We have a man who is an ex-priest. He is no longer a priest in the Catholic Church because they excommunicated him. Why did they excommunicate him? Because the Catholic Church in Haiti is under the control of the Government. By a special arrangement with the Pope the Catholic Church in Haiti gets their appointments approved by the Government. So, the Government and the Catholic Church in Haiti have been hand in hand for a long, long time. It is nothing new if one really reads.

I want to say to the viewers who might be listening that there are three articles being prepared, already in print, by the New York Review of Books where they take books written by Jean-Bertrand Aristide, and books about Aristide, and books about Haiti, and they do a thorough analysis, and it is kind of strange to offer this to my colleagues because they were sent to me by the editor of the New York Review of Books, and this is a November 4, 1993, issue. It is not on the stands yet, but it is coming. This is a November 18, 1993, issue, and they are printed ahead of time, and they are not on the stands yet, but I urge my colleagues to look for the New York Review of Books on November 4, when it comes out, and November 18, and then there is a third article which thoroughly reviews the history of Aristide through the writings of Jean-Bertrand Aristide and also through the writings about him.

The man speaks eight languages. The man has studied all over the world, in Israel, in Canada, in Santo Domingo. The man has a very exceptional education, and among the leaders of the world we find very few who are as well educated as Aristide. Very few have as deep religious and spiritual underpinnings as Aristide.

Mr. BONIOR. And the man was elected, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] correctly said, by the people.

Mr. OWENS. To complete the circle, the man was elected in a free and fair election supervised by the United Nations by a vote of 70 percent of the voters in Haiti. He deserves to be returned as their democratically elected leader, and we, as the leader of the free world, deserve to help him to return.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his response, and I would like now to return to the issue of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

To be honest, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I have a tough act to follow tonight. I have a tough act to follow because 2 days ago the people of Canada spoke more forcefully and more

powerfully about NAFTA than I could ever hope to do this evening. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the people of Canada sent a very clear and very convincing message that this NAFTA treaty will not work. It is fatally flawed, and it is time that we go back to the drawing board with the new Prime Minister of Canada, our newly elected President and a new President in Mexico who will be elected next summer.

In their national election 2 days ago, Mr. President, the people of Canada were given a choice, a choice between one party that supported NAFTA and another party whose platform called for NAFTA to be renegotiated, and, when all the votes were counted and all the counts were in, the party that supported NAFTA was wiped off the political map in a way that we have not seen in the Western world.

The conservatives who supported NAFTA started the day with 154 seats in Parliament. When the final votes were tallied, they were left with just two seats in the Parliament. Meanwhile the Liberal Party, which has pledged to renegotiate NAFTA, has been swept into office in a landslide. They picked up an unexpected 98 seats, which leaves them 177 of the 295 seats in the Parliament.

This election, Mr. President, confirms what all the polls in Canada have been telling us about NAFTA. Leading up to the election, Canadian polls showed that 58 percent of Canadians opposed NAFTA while only 29 percent supported it, and among Canadians with strong opinions on the subject 63 percent said they oppose NAFTA.

In the Province of Ontario which borders my congressional district in which I have a lot of personal, and political and business dealings with the fine Canadian people there, Ontario, which has 37 percent of the people in Canada, 69 percent of the people there oppose NAFTA while only 23 percent favored it, a margin of 3 to 1, and, as a result of this election, the Conservative Party that negotiated this NAFTA has nearly ceased to exist.

Mr. Speaker, by next year at this time the three Presidents who negotiated the original NAFTA, Presidents Salinas, former President George Bush and, of course, Brian Mulroney, will all be private citizens. Mulroney is already, and so is George Bush, and of course President Salinas will be next summer.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the people of Canada. I say it is time to go back to the drawing board, it is time to go back to the drawing board with a new generation of leadership from all three countries, and come up with a treaty that benefits the people, the working people, of Canada, the working people of Mexico and the people of the United States.

As it stands now, Mr. Speaker, this treaty is a bad deal for working people in all three countries. It will do nothing, nothing, to raise wages. It will do nothing to raise our standard of living. It will do nothing to move us into a future that we will be proud of, that we want our children to be raised in. All this NAFTA will do for the United States and for Canada is to make jobs our No. 1 export, and it will lock into place a system in Mexico that exploits its own people.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the Joint Economic Committee under the leadership of Congressman DAVID OBEY, one of the most respected and knowledgeable people about economics in this institution, released an analysis of the 16 major NAFTA economic impact studies, and they found some very disturbing results. The Joint Economic Committee found that in the United States, and I quote, NAFTA could result in a gross job dislocation of 500,000 or more workers in a downward pressure on U.S. wages. Let me say that again. Mr. Speaker, the JEC found that NAFTA could result in a gross job dislocation of a half a million or more in downward pressure on U.S. wages.

I wish I could say I was shocked and surprised by these findings. I wish I could say that these findings, as my colleagues know, just came out of the blue. But the truth is we were told it was going to be this way. We were told that jobs would be exported. We were told that wages would be forced down.

Do my colleagues know who told us, who we were told by? We were told by the business leaders themselves. They told us. Do not take my word for it. Listen to their own words.

I have some charts that I am going to put up there that illustrate a study that was done in the Wall Street Journal last year. It was done in September of last year by Roper for the Wall Street Journal. They interviewed 455 business executives, and this is what they said in their study of these executives.

I think the headline says it all: "Heading South. U.S. Companies Plan Major Moves into Mexico." The study found that in a sign of American eagerness to expand in Mexico that 40 percent of the respondents say it is very likely or somewhat likely that they will shift some production to Mexico in the next few years, and that share was even increased, goes to 55 percent for executives who represent companies with sales of a billion dollars a year or more, the very biggest of companies.

Let me say that again. If NAFTA passes, 55 percent of America's largest businesses said they will move manufacturing to Mexico in the next few years.

What is more damning is what they say about wages, which is shown in the next chart. Even if they do not move directly to Mexico, the poll found that about one-quarter of the executives surveyed said they are very likely or somewhat likely to use the trade accord as a bargaining chip to try to hold down wages in the United States.

Again, one out of every four business executives said they would use NAFTA to force down our standard of living here in America, and that is just what they admit. When we look at their track record over the past 10 years, the reality has got to be worse, and we know why they want to go down to Mexico. It is very clear why they want to go to Mexico. The Mexican Government has proven why they want to go to Mexico, and this ad has appeared in major trade publications all over America, seven major trade publications.

□ 1800

I just want to read it for you tonight. It is a beleaguered looking American businessman, with the caption, "I can't find good, loyal workers for $1 an hour within 1,000 miles from here."

"Yes, you can, in Yucatan."

This is an ad by the Mexican Government. It goes on to say, "Labor costs average under $1 an hour, including benefits. You could save over $15,000 a year per worker if you had a production facility here. So if you and your plant manager want to see how well you can live, come on down." It gives you a phone number to call.

Of course, we called the number, and they have been flooded with calls from American business, just ready, perched, roosting and ready to go to Mexico once this agreement is put into effect.

So on one hand you have Mexico beckoning our companies to move down there. On the other hand, you have American companies who say they are eager to use NAFTA to move. It makes you really wonder. It makes you wonder why many of the pro-NAFTA studies that have been done never conclude that American jobs will be lost. They never factor into the equation these things.

Well, the Joint Economic Committee had some interesting findings on that front, too, Mr. Speaker. Of the 16 studies that the Joint Economic Committee looked into, they found that 10 of the studies begin by assuming that no investment will be diverted from the United States to Mexico.

Now, having just demonstrated the invitation, having demonstrated what the business community has said, having demonstrated in fact what has happened in the maquiladoras since the mid-1960's, the studies start off by suggesting that no investment will be diverted to the United States, and therefore by design they are unable to conclude that the United States would suffer job losses because of shifts in investment, even though the Wall Street Journal showed that NAFTA would shift investment to Mexico.

Seven of the studies begin by assuming that the United States will experience no net change in employment levels in the future, and therefore by design they cannot conclude that the United States would lose jobs under NAFTA. The four studies that predict net job gains for the United States begin by assuming no diversion of investment, and, therefore, by design, could conclude nothing but the fact that jobs will be gained.

Mr. Speaker, talk about using a stacked deck. Most of these studies could not conclude that the United States would lose jobs even if they wanted to.

As misleading as these studies are, this does not really come out as any great surprise, because this is the same kind of formula they use to come up with all their other numbers, all their job projections, all their export numbers, all their wage figures. And in every case, the formula they use is what I like to call NAFTA math.

Here is how NAFTA math works. Under NAFTA math, if an export creates a job, it counts; if an import displaces a job, it does not count. If a product is sold to Mexico, it counts; but if a company moves its plant to Mexico, it does not count.

NAFTA math is kind of like taking gross profits instead of net profits. It is only half of the equation. Using NAFTA math you would conclude that Maryland has a great football team because its offense averages 24 points a game and over 450 yards per game. NAFTA math lets you ignore the fact that Maryland's defense has given up 46 points and 572 yards per game. That is why their record is one and six. That is how NAFTA math works.

Let me give you another example, one that I think hits a little closer to home. When Ford shifted its production of the Ford Escort plant in Wayne, MI, to Hermosillo, Mexico in 1992, they laid off 4,000 workers. Most people would regard that as a loss of 4,000 jobs.

But not under NAFTA math. Under NAFTA math, the way the administration figures it they would ignore the 4,000 American jobs that were lost and they would ask how many jobs were involved in companies supplying that plant? They find out that about 12,000 jobs were involved in companies that supplied that plant. These are not new jobs, but the same jobs that have been all along supplying that plant. But because they are now shipping their parts to Hermosillo, Mexico, instead of Wayne, NI, they are counted as 12,000 new export jobs. So under NAFTA math a loss of 4,000 jobs magically becomes a gain of 12,000 jobs.

That is the deception that is going on here with this treaty and the selling of it, and that is not even counting the jobs lost when many of those supplier plants follow the main plant to Mexico, as they are bound to do under NAFTA. It is not counting the imports that result when these products are assembled in Mexico and shipped right back to the United States, displacing even more American workers.

But that is what has been happening in the past 10 years. Maybe in his next TV commercial, Lee Iacocca can explain why the auto industry has sent 100,000 jobs to Mexico over the past 12 years.

Ladies and gentleman, that is how NAFTA math works. That is the formula that NAFTA supporters use to generate export and job numbers.

Last week the Office of Special Counselor to the President for NAFTA issued a statement claiming that 19 of 20 studies indicate that NAFTA would produce positive results for the United States. My only reaction was that I was surprised that it was not 20 out of 20, because under NAFTA math, you could prove just about anything.

These numbers are not real and the American people know they are not real. What is real is what has been happening to the American people. We have seen job losses, we have seen wages distressed, we have seen communities uprooted, we have seen lives displaced. They know that NAFTA will not make the situation better. They know instinctively it will make the situation worse.

I would be willing to bet that the biggest regret of NAFTA supporters is that they cannot use NAFTA to pay for this treaty. That is what they would like to do, use NAFTA to pay for this treaty. But they have to use real numbers this time, and they are having a very hard time coming up with them. Here we are. Think about it. This debate has been raging for about, feverishly I would say 6 months, but at least a good year now, and we are 3 weeks away from a vote on the biggest, most comprehensive trade agreement, in the history of the world, and the supporters of NAFTA do not have a single clue about how they are going to pay for it.

We have said time and time again, over the past 6 months, that the deep, dark secret of NAFTA is that it is going to cost between $40 and $50 billion to implement, and none of the NAFTA supporters have been willing to talk about how we are going to pay for it.

Let me ask the same question that Business Week asks in its current issue: Has anybody seen the NAFTA blueprint? Does anybody have any idea how they are going to pay for this? If they do, they are sure not telling us. The past 3 weeks all we have seen is a lot of trial balloons. First we read that the administration was looking at taking money from Social Security, Medicare, and disability payments, to pay for NAFTA. At least they were considering it.

Then we heard they were looking to take money from the Mickey Leland Hunger Program. Then we heard they were going to cut Civil Service retirement benefits to pay for NAFTA. Then somebody suggested they would cut the capital gains tax in order to pay for NAFTA.

As Business Week says, "Can't anybody here play this game?"

Now, what is next? Taking money from Head Start to pay for NAFTA? Using funds from the Child Immunization Program to pay for NAFTA? Here is an idea. How about if we take the money from the School Lunch Program? We will call it Hot Meals for Lost Jobs. How does that sound?

The truth is, ladies and gentlemen, it looks like we are going to be asked to raise taxes in order to pay for NAFTA. It looks like we are going to be asked to raise our taxes in order to pay for NAFTA. Our jobs are going to Mexico and we are going to be asked to raise our taxes to do that.

Over the past few weeks the administration has proposed to raise airline taxes as well as truck and rail fees. First the idea was proposed, then it was modified, then it was scrapped, and then it was modified again. Now it looks like it is back on the table.

Keep in mind they are having all this trouble coming up with just $2.5 billion to offset the lost tariff revenues, $2.5 billion a year. We are not even talking about the overall cost of $40 to $50 billion to implement this. We are just talking about the $2.5 billion in lost revenue.

But it looks like we are going to be asked to raise taxes in order to send our jobs to Mexico. If this is not the straw that broke the camel's back, I do not know what is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where it ends. Are our laid-off auto workers in Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania going to have to have taxes raised to clean up environmental waste coming from Mexican factories that took their jobs? Are laid-off furniture workers in California going to have to have their tax bills go up to rebuild the roads that carry the trucks that took their jobs to their factories in Tijuana? Mr. Speaker, that charade really has gone on long enough.

□ 1810

We cannot afford the cost for this NAFTA. We cannot afford the human cost. We cannot afford the social cost, and we cannot afford the economic cost.

The people of Canada were right on the money. It is time to go back to the drawing board. It is time to come up with a NAFTA that will put people back to work, that will raise our standard of living, that will raise wages.

It is time to go back to the drawing board and come up with an agreement that will create the kind of future we want for the people of Canada and the people of Mexico and the people of the

United States. This NAFTA is not going to cut it. It will not do it. It will just make jobs our No. 1 export and force our standard of living down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN], who has been a strong opponent of this agreement.

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

I would like to take a few moments to talk about how I believe this North American Free-Trade Agreement will affect the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the district which I represent in Pennsylvania, the Sixth District.

As my friend from Michigan has stated, that both the Bush administration and the Clinton administration have admitted that there is going to be a short-term job loss if NAFTA is ratified and goes into law. I happen to believe it will be a long-term job loss. I also happen to believe that the jobs they are talking about losing will greatly affect Pennsylvania.

I would like to give a few examples of that. People like to say that the garment industry is dead. It is not dead, but it is dying. A lot of the industry that survives is in the district I represent, and the administration can talk about displaced workers and how we are going to take the time, energy, and effort to retrain our workers so they can be competitive and find a job in another field all they want, but the truth of the matter is, if we talk about the garment industry, we are talking about a work force that is mostly made up of women, closer to retirement than they are entering into the job market. They have a long tradition of living in Pennsylvania, Michigan, or Ohio. They have their families there.

In many cases, their grandchildren are there. They do not want to go anywhere. They want to stay where they are. If this agreement goes into effect, I say it is going to be the nail in the coffin of the garment industry. We are going to have no manufacturing jobs left at all in that one particular field.

I also had the opportunity, in studying this agreement that has been proposed, to talk to many manufacturers, so-called business people, who we are being led to believe are totally in favor of this agreement. I had a meeting in Berks County, PA, the largest county in my district, with 17 manufacturers.

I walked into the meeting expecting them to be totally in favor of this agreement, expecting them to pressure me to vote for this agreement. To my surprise, 13 out of the 17 people at the meeting were vehemently opposed to the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and they were opposed to it for the same reasons that I have been hearing the majority whip talk about for so many months on this floor, that they are fearful that all our jobs will be lost and our competitors will move south and take advantage of cheap labor and environmental laws that may be on the books, but certainly are not enforced, and that they will not be able to compete with products coming back across the border. They asked me not to support that agreement.

The majority whip talked about a plant in Michigan, the Ford plant, that went south of the border. I will give you one example in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In the western part of the State, Governor Thornburgh, in his administration, spent millions of dollars trying to entice Volkswagen to move a plant from Germany to Pennsylvania because we have a good work ethic. And we will be able to manufacture and produce Volkswagens. We did that, and they did not stay long. And they did not give anything to the community, because they created a false economy. They created jobs for a very short period of time, and then what did they do? They closed the doors, because they did not want to pay the wages. And they went to Mexico.

They survived in Mexico for a few years, and then what did they do? They shut the doors down there and said they would not bring anybody back unless they agree to concessions on wages. And they did that because the Mexican workers are hungry for work and they will work for anything.

They took jobs from Pennsylvania, took them to Mexico. And when they thought the Mexican workers were getting too much money, they stopped paying down there.

We have to defeat this agreement, Mr. Speaker. I also serve on the Agriculture Committee. If you listen to the proponents of NAFTA, they will tell you that everything about this is great for agriculture. You will hear them say that this will be wonderful for the American farmer. I disagree with that. I will admit that there are some aspects of the agriculture community that are supporting the agreement, pork producers are one, for example. But I spend a lot of time talking to fruit and vegetable growers and dairy farmers, because I represent a lot of those farmers. They are concerned about this agreement. They are concerned because of the cheap wages and because of food safety regulations in Mexico. We are going to have fruit and vegetables produced down in Mexico and, because of our highway system being so superior and our infrastructure being what it is, they are going to have their produce in our markets in 48 hours. Therefore, undercutting the price of the crops that we are growing in Pennsylvania and throughout the Midwest.

Mr. BONIOR. People should know that the Mexican standards on herbicides are much, much different than ours. The stuff in this country that is banned because it causes nausea and even death, in some instances, is used on those products that the gentleman just mentioned and, undoubtedly, will be able to be shipped into this country without being inspected and on into our markets.

Mr. HOLDEN. I do not think there is any side agreement that has been negotiated or on the board that is going to be able to enforce the use of pesticides in Mexico, as it goes to the produce as it gets into this country. You remember the Chilean grape fiasco or scandal we had. We had Americans dying because of unsafe food. I remember going into the supermarket in Pennsylvania and seeing "Grown in the U.S.A." Are we going to have that same problem? Are we going to be able to enforce the law so we have safe foods, or are we going to have a reaction where we are going to have consumption go down in this country, therefore harming farmers even further?

Mr. BONIOR. The administration has not come up with the money to even pay for the lost tariff revenues, let alone for the additional border cleanup or inspection people that are needed to deal with this agriculture question which you raise. There is $40 to $50 billion in costs here on border cleanup, retraining of workers. And speaking of retraining of workers, I do not mean to depart from the gentleman's text, but I just—what are we going to retrain these people for? Does anybody ever ask that question?

First of all, Secretary Reich is offering in the way of retraining about a third of what the Bush administration offered with regard to retraining because of NAFTA. Secondly, what are we going to retrain these people for? They lose their jobs. When they get another job, it is usually for something that pays about 50 percent of what they had before. And they are lucky to have that in this economy today. And in terms of the good jobs, I saw a study recently done in the Philadelphia Inquirer about retraining that showed that retraining really basically has not worked.

One out of ten people who are retrained are getting work today in this country. It is an abysmal number. So there is tremendous dislocation associated with this agreement. There is no money to pay for retraining. There is no money to pay for border cleanup. There is no money to pay for inspection of these agricultural products. It goes on and on and on.

Mr. HOLDEN. One more point I would like to make in the agriculture end of the NAFTA agreement, NAFTA will eliminate section 22. What that will do, it will eliminate our protection for the dairy industry.

A dairy farmer should be very concerned. I am afraid that they are forgetting the meaning that is here. If section 22 is eliminated, we will not have the protection that we need if we are going to protect our dairy farmers

from dumping. We are going to have Irish milk and British milk coming across the border, as well as Mexican milk coming across the border, coming north. And we cannot go south with our product until 15 years down the line.

I think there is a great possibility in the United States that our dairy farmers are not totally understanding the damage that can be done with this agreement. I had the opportunity to talk to Chairman VOLKMER about this specific issue. He is also concerned about that. He is very concerned about the cattle, the price of beef in this country. We have an influx right now of cattle coming north of the border. We have those cattle, we find are being contaminated with tuberculosis. That is contaminating the beef in the United States.

We have the opportunity to trace where the disease is coming from, 83 percent of it can be traced directly to Mexican beef.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say this agreement is wrong. It is bad for the American worker. It is bad for the American farmer. I agree with the majority whip that it is time to renegotiate this.

The Canadian voters have sent a clear and loud message to their government, and I think it is time that we do the same thing in this Congress.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his eloquent statement.

People say, you cannot renegotiate this. Of course, you can renegotiate this. The Europeans have spent 40 years putting the economic community together, the EC together in Europe. They have done it carefully. They have done it slowly. They have required two things before a country is accepted: that weight standards and approximate to the rest of the nations in Europe and, second, that they have a set of democratization standards: free ability of organized labor to organize freely without impediments, the ability to have a safe workplace, all the basic human rights issues that are important.

□ 1820

Before the EC accepted Spain or Portugal or Greece, they had to improve their economic or democratization process. They did. Now they require that of the Turks before they are accepted into the EC. It took them 40 years.

The Europeans have spent over $100 billion in the last 3 years just to get ready for their Common Market. We do not even have the money to replace the $2.5 billion tariff. We are trying to do this in a couple of years. I frankly think it was initiated to take care of the former President's reelection, and now Salinas is trying to get this done because he wants to make sure that the person that he chooses—and that is part of the problem—they choose the President down there, when he picks his successor, that this is done.

This is not a way to deal with people's lives. That is what we are talking about, virtually every life in Canada and Mexico and the United States hinges on this agreement to take care of the needs of two political leaders, one who is now gone, the other of whom will be gone in a very short time. It is not a good way to do business.

We are wise to renegotiate this. We are going to have to deal with our Latin neighbors in a way that is free and fair. I think every one of us here who opposes this agreement understands that, is willing to accept that responsibility to have a free and fair trade agreement with Mexico, but one that will be patterned and one we will be proud of to expand to Chile and Venezuela and Colombia and Brazil and Argentina and the rest of Latin America.

This is important, because this will set a pattern for what we do with the rest of Latin America. If we say, "OK, just because you do not have free and fair elections, just because you do not have a free judiciary, just because you do not have free labor unions, just because your human rights record is miserable, we are going to ignore all that. We are just going to do it on some theory and some economic numbers."

If we say that, by OK'ing this treaty, we are telling the rest of Latin America, "It is OK for you to do the same thing, and the United States of America will not penalize you, we will just turn a blind side to that, and we will engage in economic agreement."

That is not the way to do business with our neighbors.

When we do business with neighbors and friends, we do it on the basis of trust and on the values for which we both commonly stand. I think the Americas and the people in the Americas certainly stand for freedom, they stand for respect for work, for human dignity, and that is not what the Mexican workers are getting from their government today.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN]. Also joining us in this special order is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has spent a lot of time on this floor in special orders. I very much agree with the gentleman's sentiments expressed at the end. Integration of our economies, the United States economy with the Mexican economy, much more integration is inevitable. The question is on what terms.

I strongly believe this NAFTA does so on terms that are so likely to be disadvantageous to millions of Americans. Let me just, if I might, continue on the math issue. I want to spend a few minutes on it, because I was going through some of the remarks yesterday that were made in a special order, and I think they very much illustrate how numbers are being used sometimes to deny a problem.

The basic problem with this NAFTA is that there is an effort to put together two very disparate economies without clear attention to the attendant problems, so there is this process of denial.

At first we said, "there is no major differential in wages and salaries." Or it is argued, "Well, if there is one, it is diminishing." We have heard that, often using just erroneous numbers.

Then it is said, "If there is a major differential, it does not matter because plant decisions, decisions on plant locations, really are not made on the basis of wages and salaries anyway. It is productivity that really counts." Then there is an attack on the ability of Mexican workers and businesses to be productive.

Mr. BONIOR. Will the gentleman yield on that point, because I think it is an important point?

Mr. LEVIN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. The productivity of Mexican workers is very high. Professor Shaken from the University of California has demonstrated that in his writings and in his book and in his studies and in his visits to Mexico. We are sending down to Mexico the most high-technology and sophisticated plants. In a lot of their new automobile facilities, they have a higher quality standard, they have higher quality ratings. They are the most sophisticated facilities in the world today, and they are producing good quality stuff. We are not talking just about low wage jobs, here.

Hughes Aircraft, for instance, out of Los Angeles, ships 1,000 high-technology electronics jobs down to Mexico. They were paying $17 an hour in Los Angeles. They are paying $6 a day now to workers down there who are doing the same quality work.

Mr. LEVIN. Absolutely. I asked the question of people, "How many motor vehicle engines are produced in Mexico every year?" People sometimes say, "Maybe 50,000." It is 1 million.

Mr. BONIOR. One million.

Mr. LEVIN. Eighty percent are shipped back to this country.

Yesterday, on page 8504, this was said. There was reference to GM and the UAW making a decision to move a plant back from Mexico to Lansing, MI. There was not a plant moved back. Some production was. "Why," it was said. Because, and I quote, "The U.S. auto worker is actually nine times more productive than the Mexican auto worker." That is a figure out of thin air.

In the Hermosillo plant in Mexico, the productivity level is the same, essentially the same, as it is in Wayne,

MI. Then it was said on an earlier page, "Eighty-three percent of the items which go from the United States to Mexico stay in Mexico." Simply wrong.

Mr. BONIOR. Not only simply wrong, it is grotesquely wrong.

Mr. LEVIN. For example, you mentioned Harley Shaken. In a document he inserted in the Los Angeles Times, September 20, 1993, he goes through Mexican figures. Of the $44 billion in exports from the United States, $44 billion, more or less, when we add together the maquiladora exports, those that are shipped from the United States.

Mr. BONIOR. These are things manufactured there and shipped right across the border to these plants.

Mr. LEVIN. Usually across the border.

Mr. BONIOR. Assembled and brought right back here.

Mr. LEVIN. That is $14 billion, $14 billion of the $44 billion in parts, plus $7 billion that enters Mexico under the PITEX Program, which is like the maquiladora, that is $21 billion. Everybody understands the vast majority of the $21 billion comes back to the United States in assembled goods.

Then add the $6.6 billion in U.S. exports in capital goods.

Mr. BONIOR. By that, we are talking about factories that are constructed down there, presses that go into those factories.

Mr. LEVIN. Exactly. Exactly. Much of that produces goods that are exported back to the United States. Eighty-three percent, it is at least 60 percent of what we send there, comes back to the United States in assembled goods, paying very, very low tariff.

Mr. BONIOR. The idea was, the advocates say, this is going to create a situation in which we are going to have a Mexican middle class. They are going to buy products in the United States and we are going to make them here, and it is going to put people to work.

The fallacy of that is that they have a low-wage system in Mexico. Fifty-eight cents an hour is the minimum wage, but for those who do not make the minimum wage, the actual wage level is 32 percent lower in real wages today than it was back in 1979. They have attracted business there by a low-wage policy, which will not change under this NAFTA. People there do not have the economic wherewithal to buy an automobile. They don't have the money to buy spark plugs, for heaven's sake, let along an automobile. Eighty million people in Mexico, you have maybe 7 of the 80 million that have any purchasing power at all.

Mr. LEVIN. That was the deep disappointment of the supplemental agreements. I was hoping they would address this disparity issue head-on, and go into issues that really relate, that are relevant to the standard of living in this country, but they ducked it, as the gentleman knows.

Just a couple of other points, and then other colleagues want to join in.

□ 1830

It is so important we discuss the facts here. This issue, as you pointed out, so deserves attention to the facts.

On page 8502 yesterday it says our tariff is 2.2 percent that we impose on Mexican light trucks coming into the United States. Now look, it is a 25-percent tariff that the U.S. imposes on light trucks.

A quarter of our production, actually more is in light trucks and vans, big three production. The NAFTA proposes to cut from 25 percent, as I remember, to 10 percent all at once this tariff on goods coming from Mexico. So it is legitimate for us to ask the question: What is going to happen to light-truck production when you cut the tariff by more than half instantaneously, and then you eliminate it over a short period of time? We want answers to these questions, not general economic theory, but hard economic reality in response to these issues, and we have not received them. We have not received them. And I am deeply troubled as a result. We are determined to make sure answers are given to the hard questions before we leave. We are determined that we will not repeat in the 1990's the mistakes we made in the 1980's.

I will close with this. You, Mr. Whip, and I sat through the discussions here in the 1980's. We were part of the battle in terms of the trade deficit with Japan. To try to be realistic we said, you and I and others, loudly, look, we have a $120 billion deficit with Japan. Some of it has resulted in competition that is good for the United States. But some of it badly hurt the United States and unnecessarily because they targeted our industries and closed their markets to us.

Well, we were dismissed, we were written off, we were called everything, xenophobes, protectionists. They raised the issue of Smoot-Hawley, right? Remember that?

Mr. BONIOR. I do.

Mr. LEVIN. And they said look, there is a globalization of the economy. And if someone else rigs their markets, it is only they who are hurt.

As it turns out, the activists of the 1980's were far more right than wrong, and those who raised all of the symbols and pushed all of the buttons and said do nothing, they turned out to be wrong, at least far more wrong than right.

We cannot let our trade relationships with Mexico repeat the mistakes of the 1980's. We are determined to avoid this, not to draw lines down over us, not to build walls up in the United States, not to deny for 1 minute that there is globalization. We need a NAFTA. Not this one.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his comments. They were eloquent, and they were right on the button, and they were prophetic as he looked back into the last decade. I can assure him that from my perspective he is absolutely right in pressing the case we made with respect to trade with some of our partners in Asia. I hope we do not make the same mistakes again, and we are close to it. I mean, the fact that this treaty has gotten this far is quite an amazing story as it is. We have the chance to put the kibosh on this and make sure it is done well and done right.

The gentleman mentioned Japan, and I would just touch on that for just a second, because there is this misinformation going out there that if we say no to this treaty that the Germans and the Japanese are going to rush in and fill the void, which is utter nonsense. It just absolutely flies in the face of any logic. They were asked to come in by Mexico years ago. They did not come in for a very simple reason. They came in, in a limited way, because No. 1, there is no market in Mexico for what they produce, basically. The market is here in the United States. Second, they did not have any protection with regard to their industries down there, there was the nationalization problem, the copyright protection, the limited tariff that was a factor as well into the United States.

If we pass NAFTA, even though the Japanese are saying right now that they do not want NAFTA passed, if we pass NAFTA we will be doing them a big favor, because they will use Japan as a platform to build plants and to move stuff into our market here, which is the big bonanza for them. So let us be clear on that argument. We will be hearing that argument from our opponents in the next 3 weeks, and it is one which really holds no water whatsoever. In fact, NAFTA will accelerate the activities by Japan in our market.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Ohio [Mr. SHERROD BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the gentleman's comments about the new NAFTA math that seems to run rampant by the supporters, the proponents of NAFTA. The new NAFTA math has not just been games they have played with job loss, and wages going down, and exports, and the exporting of jobs, but it has also been, as you said on the $2.5 billion on forgone Government revenues, the money we lose that we are now getting for tariffs. They talk little about that. They say well, we want a tax increase. Well, we do not want a tax increase, the Republicans will say on this issue, and there are not even that many Republicans supporting NAFTA as of now, but they will say that we will make spending cuts for the $2.5 billion, but they do not get specific about that.

But where the real new math comes in NAFTA math, and comes with the proponents of NAFTA is that they will

not talk about the $50 billion, that this is a $50 billion new Government program. Sure, it is $2.5 billion, and they want a NAFTA tax to pay for the $2.5 billion in lost revenues. That is all they have to do right now. But they have got to come up with $10 billion, if this passes, we, the American people, this Congress has to come up with $10 billion for Texas that the Governor of Texas says they need for infrastructure rebuilding, and water, and sewer, and all of those things.

Mr. BONIOR. And Arizona and California have not even submitted their figures.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And Arizona and California have not even submitted, and that will be billions and billions more than the $10 billion more. That does not include more Customs officials because of the trucks going, the unsafe trucks, I might add, going back and forth across the border. It does not include environmental cleanup. It does not include job retraining moneys, which you have noted are significantly less than they were under even the former President. It is billions after billions after billions after billions, and they are not willing to address the $50 billion question. They are not willing to address how they want to pay. The proponents of NAFTA do not want to say how they are going to pay the $50 billion for this new program. And that NAFTA math, coupled with the NAFTA tax simply does not cut it. And I think that we need to keep in front of the American people that yes, in fact, this is a $50 billion Government program. They have got to figure out how they are going to pay for it.

Mr. BONIOR. People ought to be aware, and I am glad my colleague mentioned it, there is a NAFTA tax involved in all of this. And when people vote for this treaty they will be voting for a tax, according to the administration's latest proposal, to supplant these lost revenues.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman said that. And you know that the $50 billion does not even count the human hardship, what a closed plant does to a school system, what a closed plant does to wage-earners and families, what a closed plant does to children, and what a closed plant does to a community overall. It does not even address the social and human costs. It only addresses the initial cost of infrastructure, job retraining and all of that.

One other point that I wanted to add, we have, as you know, Mr. Whip, and as BART STUPAK, who is here with us now, a lot of people around the country tune in and watch this NAFTA discussion that we have once a week. And I got a call today from a lady from Laguna Hills, CA. I am not too close in my district, but her sentiments are so right. This is from Nancy Zeiger, and she got a letter from the chairman of the House Banking Committee, HENRY GONZALEZ, who is a strong opponent of NAFTA. And I would like to share this because I think it is one more facet of NAFTA math that we are unwilling to share. Let me quickly read this paragraph. This is a letter from HENRY GONZALEZ, who has shown great courage in the S&L scandal, and if people would have listened to him, if Ronald Reagan had listened to him, and some people in Congress would have listened to him we would not have had the S&L problem. But that is another story.

The letter says, "Although the section of NAFTA on banking and finance has generally not been brought out in the public debate, upon analyzing the text I found the financial services provisions to be the driving force behind the agreement." Some of the biggest supporters of NAFTA are banks, because they stand to make money from America's largest banks.

NAFTA will have profound implications for the safety and soundness of the U.S. banking and financial system, particularly with regard to risky investments in Mexico by U.S. financial interests, the circumvention of U.S. laws governing banking and finance, and our ability to counteract international money-laundering. I have held hearings——

Chairman GONZALEZ says,

in San Antonio and in Washington and have requested that the finance chapter of NAFTA be referred to the Banking Committee once the agreement is submitted to Congress. While proponents of NAFTA couch their support in the lofty ideology of so-called "free trade," what we actually have in NAFTA are fat cats who see fatter profits from their investments in Mexico, * * *

Two things are happening here with this new kind of NAFTA math. One is that banks will gain a lot from this, and at the same time they will avoid a lot of American regulation, which got the savings and loans and in some cases the banks into the problems that were so expensive for this country and for this Congress and for this society in the 1980's.

□ 1840

And he also hits the nail on the head when he says that we have a NAFTA with people who are going to benefit are the fat cats who see fatter profits from their investments in Mexico. This is not a trade agreement, this is not a jobs agreement. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has said, it is an investment agreement where the rich will get richer and the largest of American corporations will see bigger profits; the Mexican people are hurt, the 36 families in Mexico that control half the wealth in that country will gain, and American workers and American small business will get hurt. It is a job-killer, it is a small-business-killer, and it devastates communities.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his contribution. The gentleman is absolutely right, that it will kill small businesses in this country. This is a bad agreement. We have to defeat it when we face it in 3 weeks. And I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would just ask every person who talks to a Member of Congress on the phone or by letter to ask that Member of Congress, "If you are voting for this agreement, how are you going to pay the $50 billion? Are you going to deal with both the financial loss in this country of jobs and how are you going to deal with the social costs in the communities, the schools, the children, and the problems that happen to people when they are unemployed?"

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman. It is critically important for people in this country to raise their voices and express their views to their elected Representatives in this House of Representatives.

I yield now to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], who has been such a strong opponent of this agreement.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman.

To answer Mr. BROWN'S question, "How are we going to pay for the $50 billion," earlier there was a press conference today in which I was a part, a bipartisan press conference outlining $100 billion in cuts over the next 5 years to try to get our deficit under control. So if we are working so hard to get our deficit under control and trying to work our $4 trillion national debt, where will we come up with the $50 billion to pay for NAFTA?

We talk a lot about NAFTA math here tonight, and I would like to take a moment or two and go over the NAFTA math, the math that the U.S. Treasury Department is using.

The Treasury Department says we will pick up about 200,000 jobs from NAFTA. This figure is based on the conclusion that exports will rise about $10 billion over the next 3 years if NAFTA is implemented. The Department of Commerce says that for every $1 billion in exports we create 20,000 jobs. So, according to the administration's math, $1 billion is 20,000 jobs, so therefore $10 billion is 200,000 jobs. But the math does not add up. Take the basic American factory: After NAFTA passes, the factory closes its doors and heads to Mexico. The new factory uses Mexican wages, which is guaranteed to be cheap labor because there is no real NAFTA, no real agreement in NAFTA to increase Mexican wages to any type of respectable level. But this new Mexican plant uses the same parts supplied now from parts from across the United States. However, since those parts cross the border to Mexico, we now call them exports. And when they get to their new Mexican plant, they are called exports and the Department of Commerce says, "Here is another billion dollars of exports." But before there were no exports before the final

assembly plant was where? In the United States. So those U.S. parts stayed in the United States, went into a U.S. plant for final assembly. Now, because the parts cross the border, we have exports. Same parts. Any new jobs created? No. Just the exports of American jobs.

That is the NAFTA math that they are using to try to convince us and the American people we are going to create all kinds of jobs.

Under the administration's NAFTA math, does it mean more jobs? No, it means less jobs for the American people.

The people in this country who make their living doing the final assembly know that NAFTA will not create any new jobs.

When you demonstrate this to the administration and those who support NAFTA, what have they said? What have we all heard the Trade Representative, Mr. Kantor, say in the last few days? He says, "If we don't like it in 3 years we can get out of NAFTA, revisit it, take another vote, and get out of NAFTA." Simply not true. Nowhere in that agreement, which is some 2 volumes and side agreements, is there anything that says after 3 years we can have another vote and get out of NAFTA. It does not exist.

Mr. BONIOR. And 3 years is a lot of pain for a lot of people.

Mr. STUPAK. A lot of pain, a lot of exports, and a lot of lost jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. Lost jobs.

Mr. STUPAK. The public knows the agreement is bad, the administration is making claims that do not exist, and that is why it is so important we have these special orders to bring these things to light.

So there is no 3 years in and out, there is no magic in the afta-NAFTA math. We still have to come up with $50 billion to implement it.

So, hopefully, Mr. Majority Leader, with your leadership and that of our colleagues who have been able to join us tonight, we will be able to say "no" to the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for coming once again this evening to voice his views on this critically important issue to the people we both represent in Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his math lesson again tonight.

Clearly, the math the administration is trying to—and those who are supporting this agreement—would lay upon the American people does not add up. I think folks are figuring all that out right now.

I think at the end of the process the figures on the board will say "no" to this issue.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly right. The problem we face in these last 3 weeks before the vote is that their side has already spent $30 million and the Government of Mexico itself has spend $30 million doing something that no government has ever done, spending lavishly like that, lobbying elected officials in other countries. At the same time, USA-NAFTA, generally large corporate contributions, are spending millions of dollars lobbying Congress also. We just have a bunch of us doing this here, doing special orders, talking to other Members. We happen to have a great majority of the American people on our side. We need their help to continue to put the pressure on.

Mr. BONIOR. The final push as we head toward the vote in 3 weeks. The 17th is the schedule, the vote the administration has called for is on that date, and on the 17th of this month we need everybody's help here around this institution and around the country to make it a very good day for the American worker, the Mexican worker, as well as for our Canadian friends to the north.

I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening.

## TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the special order previously granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

There was no objection.

## FOREIGN POLICY IN MOGADISHU, SOMALIA, AND UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous consent request, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all this evening I would like to spend a little time with my colleagues to discuss two subjects that are unrelated but nonetheless I think are very important to us to spend some time on.

First of all, I would like to visit about Somalia, Mogadishu, and some other areas. Then I would like to switch some frames and go to unfunded mandates.

Let me first of all begin with Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, I think it probably would be most appropriate if I yield to my colleague, an expert in Somalia, my good friend from California, Mr. DORNAN, from the State of California. So I would yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Let me say, as I always do beginning these, that it has been months and months and months since it was promised States taxpayers, your constituents, mine, the other Members' on the floor, and about 50 or so watching in their offices, that these six taxpayer-funded cameras would stop prowling an empty hall to embarrass us and give the impression that we are speaking in a cave of winds, when we know from C-SPAN cable operators all across this country the audience is creeping past 1,200,000 people.

I went out to Chicago for our beloved colleague, Mr. CRANE, and did three events for him. At every event people came up and said, "I like to listen to some of the things you say, but I always feel sorry for you all alone in that big chamber." I said, "Yeah, you and 1,250,000 other people." I said, "If you are watching, just remember all those people are watching with you."

Now, I have mentioned several times last week and this morning that 8 or 9 days ago when I was in Somalia my Nikkon camera did not let me down, and I got some pictures that will help illustrate, as Confucius says, "One picture is worth a thousand words." And if it is a good picture, sometimes it is worth an essay.

I brought, out of about three rolls of film that I took, and this is, again—I know that camera has the technology to come down and frame this corner to corner, whether they stay way back, sitting downstairs in the control room—give me a break, guys and gals—if you stay way back, you are insulting Americans who are paying your salary. You are paid by taxpayers. Do not be so far back with your lens, which is capable of coming in on tight on this, so that the people do not know what I am referring to and make me out to be a jerk.

□ 1850

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I should have referred to the control room through the Speaker.

That was a C-5 Galaxy. That is what I flew in over there. Two refueling missions on the first flight over, this was a refueling C-135 tanker, a KC-135 out of Plattsburgh, NY, and the young man that you see up there in the Boomer's operation is from Michigan, and I am sorry, I tried to memorize his name and forgot, but that is a great team effort in that big C-5 Galaxy, which is like a flying apartment house. It is, well, not everybody in the C-5 squadrons I found out are qualified to sit in the pilot seat when they are doing refueling or doing it from the copilot's seat.

Here is what it looks like coming into Mogadishu.

Now, my pal who is an infantry paratrooper from California was with the 75th Rangers in the 173rd Airborne Brigade.

Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER of San Diego said, "Well, how can you say it is a small city when it looks so big?"

Well, the airport is so small, we had to orbit for about 20 minutes because it can only hold two C-5's at a time.

It is obviously under mortar fire sometimes.

What I meant by small city, of course, it is 700,000 people. That is about 130,000 more than the city of D.C., but nevertheless, you can see the perimeter of the desert all around the city, and when a helicopter pops up 1,500 feet to 2,000 feet, you can see the entire city.

Here is the Black Hawk helicopter. I clicked that picture as I was running to the helicopter to get on board. That is the C–5 in the background, and within less than 4 minutes on the ground, I was up in the air.

Taxiing in, I photographed the world's largest helicopter. It is not American. It is a MI–26. It is Soviet and, of course, it never goes in harm's way. It is the world's largest helicopter.

I was not in the air with the American number 2 in command, the number one in command at the United Nations forces under Admiral Howe is a Turkish three-star general, Civik B'ir. I had lunch with him, a tremendous gentleman, a little uncomfortable with most of his fighting forces under him were American, but the two-star general under him is Major General Thomas Montgomery. He met me at the airplane and took me on that helicopter.

I am now sitting at his side with a flack jacket on. I have got my armored helmet off, but I have a headset on and I am talking to him.

I look down and I say, "What are those, British Challenger tanks?"

And he said, "No, we're calling for a tank. It's painted white, isn't it? These are Russian T–72's, but they are owned by India."

I said, "These are Indian main battle tanks?"

I said, "General, tell me they were not here October 3rd during the rescue mission that took 9 hours to one site, 11 to the other." There was nobody left there. They had been overrun. Durant survived. The other five beaten to death, their bodies desecrated, alive and dead.

And I said, "What are they doing here?"

And he said, "Well, I know what you're thinking, Congressman. I called them in the dead of night and they said they had to check with Delhi," as in New Delhi, the capital of India. So much for the rescue force just maybe 8 minutes away from the K–4 circle, which we tried to go through when it was still daylight on the afternoon of Sunday, October 3rd, and the first lead truck, what the guys call a deuce and a half, 5,000 pound truck, it was hit by an RPG; two members of the 10th Mountain Division were wounded fatally. One died on the site, the other died 3 days later up in Germany at the Landstuhl Army Hospital.

As soon as we got back and started to circle the city, here is what they call Old Port. They are tiny. Why are we even in Mogadishu? They have got 5 or 6 ports. The others are just as big as this. Why did we pick Aideed's stronghold to set up in?

This is Old Port. Here is New Port.

Now, I just found out this afternoon from a Newsday reporter, Patrick told me that we lost a helicopter early in the morning on October 3. I find that out, you know, weeks later, and I am on the Intelligence Committee. It was unrelated to that attack on Aideed's men at the Olympic Hotel.

So four helicopters went down that day. One was lost 8 days earlier to an RPG on October 25. More about that in a second.

The third helicopter lost in the assault, number five overall, made it back and crashed on the dock here.

One of the Rangers from Fort Bragg has his leg blown off in that helicopter. He is alive in a hospital. I hope to see him soon in the next week.

All five from that helicopter got down all right, but the helicopter was totaled.

And I said, "Where is it? I want to see it."

They said it was packed onto a C–5 and taken back to the United States.

Here is the site of the crash right here. An ambulance got right there and they got these guys back to the hospital compound where heroic men and women do excellent work. They kept a lot of our 87 wounded alive during this October 3 and 4, a 15-hour firefight is what the Rangers up at Walter Reed Hospital told me yesterday afternoon; not 7, not 9, not 11. They told me 15 hours is how long that went.

Then we circle back around. To give you an idea of the equipment we have in there and why I plead in this well to get out of Somalia as fast as we can, meant at a minimum 2 or 3 months.

Look at the amount of equipment we have at Sword Base on the old, destroyed, once beautiful, university campus at Hunter base.

Here is a shot of the beaches along the coast. This tempts our young guys to go out when they are sweating on construction projects, go in the water. Four people have died by shark bite. Somebody told me two Americans. I can only find one who was kept alive until he got back to Walter Reed here and his family was flown to his side. They were at his side when he died, thanks to the excellent care of our Americans. He lost both his legs in that shark attack.

I know two foreigners were killed back there in the summertime. We have no control over them.

General Montgomery said his order always was and still stands, no swimming in the surf whatsoever for Americans.

General Montgomery said he has had to give orders that he will discipline any superior who allows any of his men to go in the water.

Here it gives you an idea of the air base. Now, I have excellent pictures all over the air base, Ranger compound, headquarters compound. Many of the faces of the senior older, late 20's, up to 45 years of age, and Ray Frank who gave his life for us in a foreign policy nobody can figure out, including the wounded up at Walter Reed.

But I cannot show you those pictures because they have been hit by mortar fire and they are just too good, and I do not want to show the faces of our Special Forces out of Fort Bragg. They sometimes get into movie titles, or our Rangers out of Fort Benning or the guys who train and fly them, the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment out of Fort Campbell, which I hope to visit Monday.

But this shot of the airport is kind of nondescript. It is the civilian side, two small Hughes helicopters, rotten, decaying buildings, but I want you to see the high ground here. All of the high ground, Mogadishu rises from the water's edge all the way up to a pinnacle and on that top highest ground is the Olympic Hotel.

Here it is, with God helping me with cloud cover that kind of highlighted like a heavenly light the Olympic Hotel, the big hotel across the street. This is where our Rangers fast roped down in the afternoon of October 3 between 3 and 3:30. One Ranger died in that operation. They had to cross the street, go up here to an Aideed compound where they took 24 prisoners and then hell hit.

Four of the Aideed prisoners were killed by other Somalis firing wildly into them.

They got their men into Humvees. I asked a lieutenant lying in Walter Reed, his wife, Beth, was next to him. They had saved his leg, fought all week to save it. He showed me his leg, four big pins sticking into it, but he was a tough, typical Ranger, smiling, and I said, "Well, you had armored Humvees with the special opts."

He said, "Yes, sir, armored—translate that—cardboard."

He got hit with an AK right through the side of the Humvee.

Here is where the clouds and the light are helping me again, big cloud around here. I did not touch this photograph, bright lights shining on the high ground.

You cannot quite see the rise here, but everybody at all our military installations, Old Port, New Port, the International Airport, the Headquarters of the Rangers, over Sword Base, Hunter Base, everybody could see the smoke from this fire fight coming up three to four, four to five, five to six, six to seven, when it starts getting dark, and all night long the sky filled with helicopters and exploding rocket propelled grenades, and they are not the expert marksmen I had suspected.

I asked the men at the hospital yesterday and they said, "Sir, you can't

see them going through the sky, but you can see a rocket propelled grenade when it explodes."

And they were salvoing. They had more ammunition than we could ever have conceived of. They said the AK-47 fire started within the first hour and the staccato was deafening for the next 4 or 5 hours, and we were not sniped at. It was constant, unrelenting automatic machine gun fire from AK-47's, and they said it was the worst fire fight, we all believe, since World War II, and I am not going to doubt their word.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman put in perspective for us exactly when the fire fight started and when the calls for reinforcement came, when our troops realized they were clearly outgunned, when our troops put in a call for reinforcement, when that 9- to 11-hour period transpired in perspective to the 15-hour fire fight.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, the first thing I asked when I was all through with the two aerial surveys and meeting with the Turkish general and lunch with General Montgomery and meeting Admiral Howe over at the compound, I went back to the ranger base, found out we had a two-star general there, nothing wrong with not announcing that, spoke to him. He took me to his men. I saw how they lived and where they lived.

And I said, "Does anybody know of a gunner or crewman from the third helicopter that made it back to New Port and crashed with the Ranger on board with his leg blown off and one door gunner with his hand pierced by fire?"

□ 1900

And they said, "Sure, we'll get him for you," and they got me a young man, Mason is his first name, and I said, "These two heroic rangers that should get the Medal of Honor from Fort Bragg, special, special, special ops guys," I said, "did they fast rope down into hell itself?"

"No, sir. We went right down on the deck." Three or four feet off the deck they jumped off.

"Did they have bandoleers around them, extra rifles for the crew to create a perimeter of six guys to wait for a rescue?" I said, "They have radios?"

"No, sir," he said, "they jumped right out of the helicopter, ran to Durant's helicopter, second down of three," and he said, "They got Durant out, they got Ray Frank out," 31 combat months in Vietnam, 1 year younger than Clinton. There is a story of two young Americans with different lives.

And he said, "As he got them out, we took an RPG in the side." That is when the ranger behind them lost his leg, and they pulled up, went back to Newport, leaving the Durant crew, Durant plus three, his copilot, Ray Frank, or pilots, they are both pilots—the two pilots, the two door gunners, and the two rangers left those six alone. "We never got to them ever until 11 o'clock at night, and nothing was left but blood, expended 7.6 ammo and expended 9 millimeter ammo," and Durant said himself that he fought until he was out of ammunition.

The call went out to the first helicopter within minutes, and they ginned up within minutes, so I repeat it on this floor with General Montgomery, the only time I saw him really get upset was he said, "No Malaysian had to be at gunpoint ordered to help. They all wanted to help, but, as soon as it started to get dark, they had no night vision capability. They didn't know which armored vehicle to use. The column was led up to the K-4 circle by," he said, "a deuce and a half truck that was kicked with an RPG grenade."

When the rangers came out the next morning, they came that same route, I learned up at Walter Reed yesterday, and they said, "It was an unrelenting gauntlet of automatic weapons and RPG's all the way back in the 15th hour of the fight, so the call went out immediately."

General Montgomery said he started trying to rally a rescue force because now we go from U.S. command to quick reaction force under Admiral Howe in the United Nations. They were ginned up in about an hour as they start up the road still in daylight. They hit this first big K-4 circle near the airport, and get hit with incredible fire, and the two mountain division guys and four Malaysians give their lives, greater love than this no man has, trying to reach the site. They never got any further than K-4.

From that point, while it is daylight—it was not until the dead of night, between 11 and 12 o'clock—that we got other groups, the rangers, meanwhile, from the airport to save their own. They start up a main road right from this big Catholic church area. I will show my colleagues the old downtown. They hit an ambush right away.

The Aideed forces have Motorola radios. They were up on the radios instantly. The coordination was frightening, and one of the rangers from his hospital bed yesterday said, "Sir, we were up against 20,000 men."

I said, "No people, women, children." I said, "Nobody is going to believe me if I say 20,000." I said, "If it was ten, it's frightening."

He said, "Well, let me put it this way, Congressman. In any one scene looking down a street or an alley we saw hundreds of people. My sergeant took a bullet right in his throat. He was dead instantly, dropped. I said to him, 'Officer, you want me to take that gun?' He said, 'I got up on the gun turret, 40 millimeter grenade launcher,' and he said, 'Here are women coming at me with a grenade launcher, ammunition around their bodies, these rocket propelled grenades,' and he said, 'and children at their sides.'"

And I said, "What do you do," and he said, "Fire."

Then he said, "Donovan Bliley and Cliff," and I forget his last name. I will get it and put it in the RECORD. "The two pilots from the first helicopter to go down, they didn't get hit out of the sky." He said, "We were being so massively assaulted that Cliff and Donovan came down over the crowd, bent that big H-60 up in the area." He said, "It's now light, got a 701 powerful engine." He said, "I have never seen a guy do things with a helicopter like this," and they got down over the crowd and blew people literally away with the downdraft of the helicopter, including women and children.

He said, "We're firing, and he keeps doing that with his helicopter. We're yelling for emergency help. Then they hit him with a rocket propelled grenade. He goes down hard. The pilot's body is trapped in the," and I do not know which one is trapped in the wreckage, and I want to put in an article from the New York Times, Monday, the day before yesterday, where some person in the Pentagon and the rangers up at the hospital told me about this article, so I got it. A senior military officer at the Pentagon is critical of the rangers' decision to stay with the body. It was an emotional response open to question.

They told me, "This guy, unnamed, doesn't know anything about rangers and their creed, put that in the article."

But let me quickly go through the rest of these pictures.

This is the university. Look at the size of this complex that the Italians and the British left behind that was a thriving university complex. Now it is the U.N. headquarters. A university of education turns into a war compound because of warring clans: The Daroods against the Hawayi.

Now here is again, just quickly, all the—that is one of our field hospitals. There is the Greeks'. There is the Nigerians'. All of this effort in here cannot be collapsed overnight. Here is the downtown area. I want to hold this still. I saw this big huge cathedral. I assumed, because of the Italian colonial period, it was a Catholic cathedral. "Was" is correct. There is not a roof on it. It looks like Coventry after a Luftwaffe bombing.

Mr. Speaker, half of these buildings around here are gutted. This once beautiful city is utterly destroyed. All it is now is a series of broken buildings where people can hide with machine guns, AK-47's and rocket-propelled grenades.

Just another shot of these Black Hawks. I know a contract has been let

in California to a ballistics expert to find out why these helicopters and their armor are being pierced so easily.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California yield on this just very quickly?

Mr. DORNAN. Sure.

Mr. McINNIS. On the helicopters, were our helicopters armed, and did they have .50 caliber machine guns, or were they armed or were they disarmed prior to conflict? What was the rule of engagement in regard to these helicopters?

Mr. DORNAN. No; they are armed. They have the mini Gatling guns, there are door guns from the third helicopter. I did find out they did have an extra gunner in this one that did not go down on the ground. The problem is a helicopter, and I used to fly helicopters in civilian life, it is a very delicate, sensitive instrument. It is aerodynamically instable. Even though the blades on the Black Hawks are hardened, one bullet into the transmission of the helicopter, into the very delicate, sensitive hub, the hub on a big H-53 I think is the most complex single industrial piece of aluminum equipment in the world. When I saw it up at Connecticut last summer, I could not believe my eyes. I said, "This is amazing."

They said, "Well, that's not finished. We've got to work on that and hone it down for another month or so."

It is unbelievably sensitive, so, when we are getting all this ground fire and they are salvoing without any fear of running out of ammunition, these Soviet designed—helluva weapon in Vietnam—these rocket propelled grenades that can go through the side of most armored personnel carriers, well, what do we think is going to happen when they are shooting at the helicopters who are ground level, eye level, trying to help their men or when they are orbiting in a circle overhead.

I did find out, to my satisfaction, that like Vietnam, everybody stopped everything they were doing, especially here in the daylight hours, and focused on rescuing those men. The air was filled with helicopters.

I asked one of the hero lieutenant colonels from the 10th Mountain Division—I said, "In other words it's miraculous you didn't have a mid-air."

He said, "Yes, sir. It was because everybody was focusing on firing on anything that moved on the ground and helping our men, but what we needed was armor on the ground."

And I did not ask General Montgomery; he volunteered it to me. He said, "That's why I asked for armor last month, Congressman."

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California would yield for another question, would he tell me very succinctly what was—how much time did it take the United Nations, once this is all gone? Everybody is screaming for an emergency. They want reinforcements. How long did it take the United Nations to get there? How far away was the United Nations? Were they not within a mile approximately? Was it not a fact they could not get orders from around the world and the lack of organizations that our troops surrounded, pinned down our helicopters, shot down? We could not get reinforcements?

Mr. DORNAN. Well, I am not quoting General Montgomery, but probably what he was thinking:

> Well, here is my worst fear. This is the sixth or seventh ranger raid.

All the press knows that. That is not classified.

And he said, "And here is the time that I wanted the armor. Now I don't have it. So, I've got to go to these other commands, even though I'm the No. 2 in command. Turkish general is giving me full bore to go here. I can't solve the problems of language, of night vision, to get this thing going."

By the time they cranked it up and reached Donovan Bliley and Cliff's site, the first crew, it was 7 hours. By the time—9 hours; excuse me, 9 hours. The rangers had formed a perimeter around the first crash. By the time they reached Durant's helicopter, he was gone. The other five men were gone. We saw their bodies the next evening on American television being beaten, desecrated, handcuffed, cut off, dragged around the streets. All five of those men we miraculously got back.

Why?

□ 1910

Two sets of remains we did not get back from the September 25 crash. And I have really stuck it to the Army hard, pushing them and pushing them, and they have satisfied this Member that we lost many young men, wounded, not dead, thank God, trying to get to those remains. The men went into that white hot helicopter almost, climbed up in the tail, which was separated from the explosion, could not find any remains but one set, badly burned, which they got back.

By the way, the Rangers knew that from September 25. That is why they did not want to leave one of the pilots of the first downed helicopter in the wreckage. They knew that that pilot would be dragged around the next day, dead and desecrated, and it happened, didn't it? From Donovan's helicopter the very next few hours with five men, some of whom may have been beaten to death by the crowd.

So that is why they stayed and took killed in action and more wounded, not to desert that helicopter.

It says in this article that I will put in that they finally got a Humvee, one of these fragile little four-wheel Humvees that Arnold Schwarzenegger made famous by buying a commercial red one. That is how they ripped the helicopter apart to get Donovan or Cliff's body out. If they had had a tank there, they not only would have had armored positions from four directions, but a tank in an instant could have torn the broken H-60 apart and gotten those bodies out hours earlier. So it is 9 hours to crash site one, and 11 hours to crash site two, and 4 more hours of firefight through the morning. And something that I have read in no paper, an absolute running of an Iroquois gauntlet back to the base with their wounded. No more prisoners, they had gotten them out early. And their dead, and Donovan or Cliff's body, to get back to the main U.N. compound or the airport. An unbelievable 15-hour firefight.

Mr. Speaker, let me go over the rest of the slides. Here is the crash site of the September 25 helicopter. Let me hold this very steady and point to the helicopter.

You can see that it is almost melted. My argument with the Army, these guys that I dearly respect, was if we can spend millions, and I mean millions of dollars, and have 50 or 60 people on full payroll at the Pentagon looking for a tooth in Vietnam, and that is important, I do not say that in a demeaning way. I have seen a casket with nothing but a tooth in it. I said Do the parents know? Yes, sir, we learned the hard way. Do they accept it? Yes, sir. Here is the dental records and a spectrograph. Look at that gold inlay that matches. I said it sure satisfies me. No wonder the parents agree. And they would bury that respectfully in some cemetery around middle America.

If they can get a tooth, I said, why can you not go into this crash site right here and get those remains?

And a two-star general who has the responsibility on this said to me, "Congressman, I am convinced by good men who I trust, including a classmate of mine, Thomas Montgomery, that we will get in one hell of a firefight."

I said, "You mean on the perimeter, where you allowed me to fly over?"

"Yes, sir. We can't even go near the Olympic Hotel and the two helicopters shot down on the third, the third one being destroyed at Newport, because we know that is a death trap. But even on the perimeter, if we were to land and try to show you that helicopter's remains, or this Humvee in the middle of the street where four men died," and I just got off the phone 30 minutes ago with Jody Pearson, and she said to correct something. The Army did not tell her that they buried that Humvee out of respect to the four MP's that died there. She said a soldier who went over after her husband, who knew her husband Keith, he told her it had been buried. So I have to apologize. Anything I indicated last week, that the Army should not have given that information out if it was not true, the Army did not

do it. A sergeant probably saw the Humvee buried from January, another one from July where men were wounded and one died. They maybe got to those before this thing heated up and buried those out of respect.

By the way, I thought my overhead shot might be a shadow of the burned debris and burned tires. But then I took it from an angle, and this shows you that that is the full Humvee. You cannot get there with a flatbed and 10 M-1 tanks without the danger of taking more casualties. And yet I call it an evil fountain or memorial in the middle of a major intersection downtown. And the hand of this young door gunner, I am sorry, I did not get his name, he was the first air on the ground, he called it. He landed right in front of all these burned out trucks. By the way, there are pillboxes on all these buildings around. He landed right there, jumped out of his helicopter, and reached Keith Pearson, Jody's husband, who was the only man not killed instantly, he died 2 hours later in the hospital. He wrote me a letter that I have not received yet that I will read on the floor here next week.

Mr. McINNIS. Could you in the last few minutes here, our troops over there were so underarmed, could you specify again for the American people what your perceptions were?

Mr. DORNAN. I could do 20 seconds of slides to show how we closed the barn door after the horse was out and 18 men died, a 19th by mortar fire 3 days later.

Now we have the gunships, the big HC-130 Specters. These guys consider themselves fighter pilots. All 10 crewmen consider themselves flying the biggest fighter aircraft in the world with a cannon for punch. They brought these down from Jabouti. Why were they not there when they were asked for a month earlier?

Here is the first M-1 tank on the scene. I could only see on the ground that I was able to photograph. Guess what? We had an M-1 tank at Waco. Janet Reno sent one to Waco. Maybe we should have asked Janet Reno to send that same tank. But there is the first one of our big M-1 Creighton Abrams tanks sitting there in the compound.

I don't want to show this last shot anyway, because that is one of our young Rangers and Mason, and I do not want to compromise the security of where the Rangers live.

But this is over the European compound. This young guy stopped me, maybe from the 10th Mountain Division, about to go back on the Blackhawk. Here is a U.N. soldier. They wear green berets in the U.N. compound, although they are U.S. soldiers.

And he just asked me right there, Scout's honor, "What am I doing here now? Do you have any idea, Congressman, what my mission is?"

This brings me to the close, so you can share with other Members on important domestic issues here.

Mr. Speaker, I will put in Larry and Gail Joyce's letter. I am going to read this into the RECORD next week. But in the interest of time, I want to put in a few letters on Halperin, who is not even confirmed, so he is breaking the law to counsel our pal Les Aspin on whether or not to send tanks or gunships or anything else over there. I already asked permission for the fateful decision on the pilot's body.

I will just read the Rangers' Code, and then sum up in a minute on where we go from here. The Ranger Creed, drilled into new volunteers, instructs each soldier to complete the mission, though I be the lone survivor, and never to leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy.

It says that they knew that Aideed's deputies were claiming that they were holding up charred body parts from the crash 8 days earlier. They knew what might happen. And still it is contentious whether they were holding up animal parts. Lying. Whether that is true or not, it sure happened in spades to 5 of our heroes 8 days later.

One Ranger says there was no question in anybody's mind that we were going to stay there until we got the pilots' bodies out, and those are the words also of Lt. Col. Danny McKnight, who was wounded and stayed there all night, was not evacuated, and came out in the morning.

Now, for a close, do you know what Jody Pearson, who lost her husband August 8, an MP in that Humvee crash, said? She said, "Congressman, Mr. Clinton is going to Russia soon. He has not been back there since '69." She said, "Isn't anybody going to Somalia to visit our troops?"

The security would be formidable. There would be a way to do it. He could also land way out in the country and have some of our guys come out there to see him, as George Bush and Barbara went over to Desert Shield before the war started and had Thanksgiving with our troops over there.

She said, "Does anybody care about our troops?"

Let me tell you what I thought driving in. I got on my car phone and called my daughter who lives in Virginia. I said, "Terri, remember when you got Ricky and Tara and Anna to write and their whole classes to write letters to our guys in Desert Shield and then in Desert Storm and then the hospitals when they got back? And Robin did it with Colin and Kevin out in California?" I said, "Let's do that again. Let's get letters going to these guys at Walter Reed."

My daughter Theresa Ann Dornan Cobban said, "Dad, Thanksgiving is coming up. Do it on the House floor. You are a Congressman. Ask the whole Nation to write to these guys in the hospital at Benning, at Fort Bragg, and to write to them at Fort Campbell, and write to them at Walter Reed. I am going to get the Army to give me every hospital. And I said, "Jody, I asked my staff about the dead. Would it create pain for you if little kids wrote you to thank you for your hubby, Keith Pearson, giving his life?"

And she said, "Congressman, I would cry, but I would feel great to know that somebody knew the sacrifice of my Keith. Yes, don't leave us out, the loved ones of the killed in action."

So I am going to build on this, and I know America will respond. Those guys up at Walter Reed would like nothing better than to read letters from grade school kids and high school kids and college people all across this country discussing with them the good part of what they did, saving 350,000 lives.

□ 1920

And the difficult part is trying to get the warlord who fought in these ego battles, while 350,000 of his countrymen died for his militaristic fantasies.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

To the gentleman from California, I think that your conclusion there, requesting that we consider Thanksgiving and the response, I would ask, within the next few days, during special orders, you certainly make the addresses available via C-SPAN or any other way that you can for Walter Reed Hospital and so on and the names, because I think your idea is excellent.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following documents:

*Chicago, IL., October 22, 1993.*

Hon. ROSCOE G. BARTLETT,
*Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARTLETT: My son, Sgt. James Casey Joyce, was one of the U.S. Army Rangers killed in the October 3 Somalia ambush in Mogadishu.

Even though I served two combat tours in Vietnam, I could rationalize Bill Clinton's protesting the war in Vietnam. Now, I'm struck by the irony of his objection to American policy in Vietnam, and his support of a similar policy for U.S. involvement in Somalia. It's similar, at least, in its vagueness, its politicization, and its misguided use of the military. My son opposed my support for Bill Clinton. His death in Somalia—brought about by weak and indecisive amateurs in the Clinton Administration—confirms my son's wisdom and my naiveté.

Senior military officers, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell, repeatedly requested armored and mechanized vehicles for Somalia. Secretary of Defense Les Aspin denied each request. Armored and mechanized units are essential reinforcements for the highly mobile but lightly armed Rangers my son was so proud to join.

Those reinforcements might not have helped my son, because he apparently was one of the first killed. But, they certainly would have helped many of the other 17 soldiers who were killed and the scores of others who were wounded. Army Rangers are the most highly trained and motivated soldiers this country ever produced. To put

them, or any other soldiers, into combat with no way to reinforce them is criminal.

Americans, especially the casualties and their families, deserve answers. Congressional hearings should be held immediately to determine what went wrong in Somalia so those mistakes are not repeated. We must know who, specifically, made the disastrous decision to change the American military posture in Somalia from one of humanitarian relief to one of offensive combat and why this decision was made.

Did someone in the administration make that decision? Or was the President, the secretary of state and the secretary of defense simply asleep at the switch? Who decided Rangers should be used to arrest general Aidid? Why? If his arrest was so essential, why did we suddenly decide to reverse course after my son and 17 other American soldiers were killed on October 3? Who so grossly underestimated his generalship in urban guerrilla warfare? Why? Is Aidid perhaps the only stabilizing influence in Somalia? If so, why did it take so many American casualties to learn that fact? Didn't we learn anything from Vietnam, where our obsession with Ho Chi Minh drew us deeper and deeper into that quagmire?

These are just a few questions that are begging for answers. I urge you to call for an investigation and congressional hearings so we can set our foreign policy straight and make proper use of our military in enforcing that policy.

Questions also need to be asked of the military command in Somalia. Why were Army Rangers inserted into what we now know was a deadly ambush without United Nations Forces—in place—to reinforce them? They were not American, but certainly, Malaysian and Pakistani tanks and armored personnel carriers were better than none at all. They did eventually arrive—ten hours late.

Today's army is far superior to the one in which I served in the 60s and 70s. The young men and women who serve in the defense of our country are a national treasure. In the future, let's ensure they get proper direction and support they need and deserve no less. Please let me know how I can help.

Respectfully yours,

LARRY E. JOYCE,
*Lt. Col. (Ret), U.S. Army.*

---

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 27, 1993]

CIA KEPT QUIET ON HALPERIN

(By Bill Gertz)

The White House yesterday blocked CIA Director R. James Woolsey from briefing the Senate Intelligence Committee chairman and two other senators on secret documents related to the Defense Department nomination of Morton Halperin.

The intervention by White House Counsel Bernard W. Nussbaum is the latest skirmish in a high-level political battle over Mr. Halperin, who has been chosen as assistant defense secretary for peacekeeping and democracy:

Mr. Nussbaum kept Mr. Woolsey from meeting with Sen. Dennis DeConcini, chairman of the intelligence panel, and Republican Sens. Trent Lott of Mississippi and John Warner of Virginia. They wanted the CIA to reveal what it knows about Mr. Halperin's travel overseas.

"It really looks to me like they're trying to stonewall," Mr. Lott said.

Mr. DeConcini's office did not return repeated phone calls, but a source close to the decision said the Arizona Democrat was "disappointed" the White House prevented Mr. Woolsey from testifying.

The White House would not comment.

Mr. Nussbaum said he ordered Mr. Woolsey not to brief the senators on Mr. Halperin's past because the nomination is an FBI matter and not the CIA's responsibility. The FBI routinely conducts background checks of nominees.

Under current law, however, the CIA director is required to report to Congress in a timely fashion on all intelligence matters.

Mr. Woolsey has said he views Congress as his "board of directors" equal to the president. He reports to the Senate through Senate leaders and the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Mr. Halperin has come under fire from Senate Republicans for his liberal views, including his outspoken opposition to U.S. military intervention and covert operations.

The White House's refusal to allow the CIA director to testify sparked ire among both Democrats and Republicans, who see the matter as a "politicization" of intelligence—preventing politically neutral spy agencies from supplying information needed by Congress to do its job.

Senate sources said that impeding the Intelligence Committee's probe of the Halperin nomination is viewed as an unprecedented political interference in intelligence matters.

"All the members are upset by the White House," one aide said. "If there are documents [related to Mr. Halperin], this is the politicization of intelligence—the White House is preventing the CIA director from executing his responsibility under the law to keep Congress fully informed."

If the CIA does not have the documents requested by the senators, Mr. Woolsey still has a legal responsibility to appear before the Senate and explain what he knows to the best of his ability.

Republicans are delaying passage of the fiscal 1994 intelligence authorization bill until Mr. Woolsey testifies on the Halperin nomination.

Senate aides said yesterday the delay will remain on the bill until Mr. Woolsey testifies.

Mr. Woolsey, in response to questions from Republican members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, had agreed to meet in secret with senators to discuss CIA files on Mr. Halperin.

But Mr. DeConcini was notified Monday night in a telephone call from Mr. Woolsey that Mr. Nussbaum had blocked the meeting and that it was canceled.

It could not be learned which type of information the senators have requested from the CIA, whose spokesman declined to comment.

Mr. Halperin traveled to Britain in 1977 to testify at a deportation hearing in support of Philip Agee, a former CIA officer who defected to Cuban intelligence.

His contacts with Agee, who was engaged at the time in exposing the identities of CIA agents, would have attracted the attention of the CIA, experts say.

Meanwhile, Sen. John McCain, Arizona Republican, said he received a letter from Frank Wisner, undersecretary of defense for policy, that appears to contradict Defense Secretary Les Aspin on Mr. Halperin's role in Somalia policy.

Mr. Aspin stated on Oct. 15 that Mr. Halperin was unaware of a request for four tanks and 14 vehicles sought by U.S. field commanders in Somalia.

But Mr. Wisner stated that Mr. Halperin wrote two memorandums on the request and "has also participated in discussions within my office about Somalia policy." The letter did not elaborate.

In a related development, Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said yesterday secret documents confirm that Mr. Halperin improperly tried to order Army Gen. George Joulwan, commander of U.S. forces in Latin America, to cancel a military exercise in Guatemala.

The senator said in a statement issued in response to a report in Monday's editions of The Washington Times that "information I have received from the Pentagon, including classified documents, leaves no doubt this story is true."

"A nominee has no business, and no authority, calling a field commander to offer recommendations, directions or advice," Mr. Thurmond said. "When the chain of command is not respected, a breakdown of command and control is the inevitable outcome."

Mr. Thurmond has stated publicly that he opposes the confirmation of Mr. Halperin and has described him as "dangerous" to U.S. national security.

At the Pentagon, spokeswoman Kathleen deLaski said Mr. Halperin called Gen. Joulwan on May 21 to "gather information," which she said was permitted by guidelines for unconfirmed appointees.

"He called General Joulwan informally and General Joulwan informed him that the operation would end the next day," Ms. deLaski said.

U.S. officials, however, said the exercise began in January and ended June 22. Ms. deLaski could not explain why Mr. Halperin says the exercise ended the day after his telephone call to Gen. Joulwan.

According to a document produced by the Joint Staff, Mr. Halperin tried to have Gen. Joulwan end the exercise early. The document said the request by Mr. Halperin was "a knee-jerk reaction made with incomplete information."

---

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1993]

FATEFUL DECISION: STAYING TO GUARD PILOT'S BODY

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON, October 24.—As the bullets and grenades whizzed through the streets of south Mogadishu on the night of Oct. 3, the Rangers made a fateful decision: after they retrieved two wounded soldiers from a downed Blackhawk helicopter they stayed to guard the body of a dead pilot caught in the wreckage.

"Some people may think it is not normal to stick around a dead pilot," said Robert Gallagher, 31, a platoon sergeant who was wounded in a firefight near the Olympic Hotel. "But when you work with people on a daily basis, you develop a bond. Whether you are killed or wounded, you need to have someone look after you."

Although it would seem there must have been a moral question about whether to risk more lives by guarding a dead comrade, the Rangers say they never agonized over that decision.

There is no Army requirement to retrieve the dead if lives are in jeopardy. And at the Pentagon some military officials question whether Rangers should have put themselves at risk, and suffered additional casualties, for a dead soldier.

But the elite Army Rangers go by their own ethic.

In conversations with the Rangers, this is how they describe the code: In a world where, at any moment, they could be dropped into a country to fight with clans or oust a dictator, their loyalty to those fighting beside them is as intense as their loyalty to their country.

"The Ranger Creed," the code drilled into new volunteers, instructs each soldier to "complete the mission, though I be the lone survivor," and never to "leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy."

When the Rangers set out on that raid to capture Gen. Mohammed Farah Aidid's deputies, they knew that after three American soldiers were killed when their helicopter was shot down on September, 25 Somalis loyal to General Aidid had gleefully waved what they said were charred body parts.

When a Blackhawk helicopter from the Army's 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment which trains and fights with the Rangers, was shot down in the raid, the Rangers fought their way to the crash site and rescued the wounded only to discover that the pilot's body was pinned in the wreckage and could not be removed without special equipment.

The Rangers, said Lieut. Col. Danny McKnight, the commander of the Ranger battalion, could have fought their way out, bringing their wounded along to less hostile territory so they could be taken out by vehicles or picked up by helicopter. But that would have meant leaving the body of the pilot behind.

NO QUESTION IN ANYBODY'S MIND

"There was no question in anybody's mind that we were going to stay until we got him," Colonel McKnight said.

It was not until 5:30 a.m., more than 12 hours after the helicopter was downed, that the Rangers completed the extraction of the dead pilot using a Humvee to help pull apart the wreckage

One senior military officer at the Pentagon who is critical of the Rangers' planning challenged the decision to stay with the body. "It was an emotional response that was open to question," he said.

But the Ranger creed, officers say, turns on sacrifice, not arithmetic. "War is not a matter of cost accounting," a special operations soldier said.

---

THE CASE AGAINST MORTON HALPERIN

Morton Halperin has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping, a new position created by the Clinton Administration. Mr. Halperin:

Is a principal architect of Presidential Decision Directive #13, a blueprint for largely subsuming U.S. participating in "peacekeeping" to UN command and control.

Favors considerably augmenting the capabilities and responsibilities of the UN, to include the authority to raise revenues by taxing multilateral transactions such as arms sales, telecommunications, and multinational corporate sales.

Has, since the early 1970s, consistently strongly opposed U.S. covert operations abroad (He now claims that within the last two years, he has changed his mind.)

Has participated in leadership positions with radical leftist groups engaged in public campaigns to shut down the counterintelligence capabilities of the FBI and Justice Department and to reduce drastically the foreign intelligence capabilities of the CIA.

Considers his role in defeating Senator Dole's constitutional amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the burning of the American flag a crowning career achievement.

Opposes the unilateral use of U.S. force except in very limited circumstances (e.g., opposed American intervention in Grenada and Panama).

Opposes random drug-testing for federal employees, including those in sensitive positions such as air traffic controllers and national security officials.

Consistently excused the actions of the Soviet Union and its clients like Cuba at the height of the Cold War, characterizing their intentions as benign.

Spent five months leading Daniel Ellsberg's defense team and testified on Ellsberg's behalf, characterizing the Pentagon Papers as inconsequential to U.S. national security interests.

Flew to the U.K. to testify on behalf of Philip Agee, CIA renegade who exposed the identities of hundreds of American intelligence agents, including Athens CIA Station Chief Richard Welch who was subsequently murdered.

Filed a "Friend of the court" brief in defense of David Truong, a Vietnamese expatiate convicted of espionage on behalf of communist Vietnam and theft of government property.

Played an integral role in orchestrating the Clinton Administration's campaign to allow gays in the military.

Considers such issues as mental health, prior arrest record, drug or alcohol abuse, or membership in the Communist Party irrelevant questions to be asked for security clearance background checks.

---

A CHRONOLOGY OF RELEVANT ASPECTS OF MORTON HALPERIN'S CAREER

Present: On 31 March 1993, the White House announced the President's intention to nominate Halperin to the newly created position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Human Rights. Since that time, he has been working in the Pentagon nominally as a consultant but on an essentially full time basis and in a manner that appears to exceed congressional and departmental restrictions on the involvement of nominees in policy-making prior to their confirmation.

Halperin is formally still listed as a Senior Associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Baker Professor at George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs.

1984–1992: Director of the Center for National Security Studies (CNSS), originally an offshoot of the hard left-wing Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). Halperin was also the director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), with responsibility for the national legislative program of the ACLU.

1977: One of the founders and the director of the Campaign to Stop Government Spying, which changed its name the following year to the more benign Campaign for Political Rights. Like CNSS, the Campaign was populated with personnel associated with the Institute for Policy Studies and dozens of other dubious organizations (e.g., the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, reportedly a Communist Party front).

Also in 1977, while serving as the deputy director of the Center for National Security Studies, Halperin went to London to help in the defense of Philip Agee. At the time, Agee was in the process of being deported from Great Britain as a security risk for collaborating with Cuban and Soviet intelligence.

1969–1973: Senior Fellow associated with the Foreign Policy Division of the Brookings Institution.

1969: Member of senior staff of the National Security Council during the Nixon Administration with responsibility for program analysis and planning. During this period, the information concerning secret U.S. bombings of targets in Cambodia was leaked to the New York Times. Then NSC Advisor suspected Halperin and colleague Anthony Lake of the leak and authorized FBI wiretaps on their office and home phones.

1966–1969: Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, with responsibility for political-military planning and arms control.

---

NOTABLE HALPERIN QUOTES ON SELECTED TOPICS

ON THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE COLD WAR

"The Soviet Union apparently never even contemplated the overt use of military force against Western Europe. . . . The Soviet posture toward Western Europe has been, and continues to be, a defensive and deterrent one. The positioning of Soviet ground forces in Eastern Europe and the limited logistical capability of these forces suggests an orientation primarily toward defense against a Western attack." (Defense Strategies for the Seventies, 1971)

". . . Every action which the Soviet Union and Cuba have taken in Africa has been consistent with the principles of international law. The Cubans have come in only when invited by a government and have remained only at their request. . . . The American public needs to understand that Soviet conduct in Africa violates no Soviet-American agreements nor any accepted principles of international behavior. It reflects simply a different Soviet estimate of what should happen in the African continent and a genuine conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union." ("American Military Intervention: Is It Ever Justified?", The Nation, June 9, 1979)

ON U.S. INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS

"One of the great disappointments of the Carter Administration is that it has failed to give any systematic reconsideration to the security commitments of the United States. [For example, President Carter's] decision to withdraw [U.S. ground forces from Korea] was accompanied by a commitment to keep air and naval units in and around Korea—a strong reaffirmation by the United States of its security commitment to Korea. This action prevented a careful consideration of whether the United States wished to remain committed to the security of Korea. . . . Even if a commitment is maintained, a request for American military intervention should not be routinely honored." (The Nation, June 9, 1979)

ON THE USE OF U.S. MILITARY POWER ABROAD

"All of the genuine security needs of the United States can be met by a simple rule which permits us to intervene [only] when invited to do so by a foreign government. . . . The principle of proportion would require that American intervention be no greater than the intervention by other outside powers in the local conflict. We should not assume that once we intervene we are free to commit whatever destruction is necessary in order to secure our objectives." (The Nation, June 9, 1979)

ON THE U.S. DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Referring to the Reagan defense buildup: "Are we now buying the forces to meet the real threats to our security? Unfortunately, there is little reason to be confident that we are." (New York Times, June 7, 1981)

"In the name of protecting liberty from communism, a massive undemocratic national security structure was erected during the Cold War, which continues to exist even though the Cold War is over. Now, with the

Gulf War having commenced, we are seeing further unjustified limitations of constitutional rights using the powers granted to the executive branch during the Cold War." (United Press International, January 28, 1991)

ON THE U.S. INTELLIGENCE ESTABLISHMENT

"Using secret intelligence agencies to defend a constitutional republic is akin to the ancient medical practice of employing leeches to take blood from feverish patients. The intent is therapeutic, but in the long run the cure is more deadly than the disease. Secret intelligence agencies are designed to act routinely in ways that violate the laws or standards of society." (The Lawless State; The Crimes of the U.S. Intelligence Agencies, 1976)

"You can never preclude abuses by intelligence agencies and, therefore, that is a risk that you run if you decide to have intelligence agencies. I think there is a very real tension between a clandestine intelligence agency and a free society. I think we accepted it for the first time during the Cold War period and I think in light of the end of the Cold War we need to assess a variety of things at home, including secret intelligence agencies, and make sure that we end the Cold War at home as we end it abroad." (MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour, July 23, 1991)

"Generally, secrecy has been used more to disguise government policy from American citizens than to protect information from the prying eyes of the KGB. . . . U.S. government officials admit that experts in the Soviet Union know more about American policies abroad than American citizens do." (The Lawless State)

". . . The intelligence [service's] . . . monastic training prepared officials not for saintliness, but for crime, for acts transgressing the limits of accepted law and morality. . . . The abuses of the intelligence agencies are one of the symptoms of the amassing of power in the postwar presidency; the only way to safeguard against future crimes is to alter that balance of power. . . .

"Clandestine government means that Americans give up something for nothing—they give up their right to participation in the political process and to inform consent in exchange for grave assaults on basic rights and a long record of serious policy failures abroad." (The Lawless State)

"Secrecy . . . does not serve national security . . . Covert operations are incompatible with constitutional government and should be abolished." ("Just Say No: The Case Against Covert Action," The Nation, March 21, 1987)

"The primary function of the [intelligence] agencies is to undertake disreputable activities that presidents do not wish to reveal to the public or expose to congressional debate." (The Lawless State)

"CIA defenders offer us the specter of Soviet power, the KGB, and the Chinese hordes. What they fail to mention is more significant: they have never been able successfully to use espionage or covert action techniques against the USSR or China, which are the only two nations that could conceivably threaten the United States . . . The 'success' of covert action and espionage, of which the CIA is so proud, have taken place in countries that are no threat to the security of the United States." (The Lawless State)

"Spies and covert action are counterproductive as tools in international relations. The costs are too high; the returns too meager. Covert action and spies should be banned and the CIA's Clandestine Services Branch disbanded." (The Lawless State)

ON BEHALF OF EXTREME INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

"Under the First Amendment, Americans have every right to seek to 'impede or impair' the functions of any federal agency, whether it is the FTC or the CIA, by publishing information acquired from unclassified sources." ("The CIA's Distemper: How Can We Unleash the Agency When It Hasn't Yet Been Leashed?", The New Republic, February 9, 1980)

"Lawful dissent and opposition to a government should not call down upon an individual any surveillance at all and certainly not surveillance as intrusive as a wiretap." ("National Security and Civil Liberties," Foreign Policy, Winter 1975–76)

In opposition to draft legislation setting heavy criminal penalties for Americans who deliberately identify undercover U.S. intelligence agents: "[Such legislation] will chill public debate on important intelligence issues and is unconstitutional. . . . What we have is a bill which is merely symbolic in its protection of agents but which does violence to the principles of the First Amendment." (UPI, April 8, 1981)

In criticizing scientists who "refused to help the lawyers representing *The Progressive* and its editors" in fighting government efforts to halt the magazine's publication of detailed information about the design and manufacturing of nuclear weapons: "they failed to understand that the question of whether publishing the 'secret of the H-bomb' would help or hinder non-proliferation efforts was beside the point. The real question was whether the government had the right to decide what information should be published. If the government could stop publication of [this] article, it could, in theory, prevent publication of any other material that it thought would stimulate proliferation." ("Secrecy and National Security," *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, August 1985).

In response to government attempts to close down the Washington offices of the PLO: "It is clearly a violation of the rights of free speech and association to bar American citizens from acting as agents seeking to advance the political ideology of *any* organization, even if that organization is based abroad. *Notwithstanding criminal acts in which the PLO may have been involved*, a ban on advocacy of all components of the PLO's efforts will not withstand constitutional scrutiny." (*The Nation*, October 10, 1987)

In arguing that the random use of polygraph tests to find spies was unconstitutional: "Congress should strip these measures from the bill and start attacking the genuine problems, such as over-classification of information." (Associated Press, July 8, 1985)

ON U.S. AID TO FOREIGN PRO-DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS

Regarding President Reagan's veto of a bill tying U.S. military aid to El Salvador to improved human rights, "[This action] makes clear that the administration has reconciled itself to *unqualified support* for those engaged in the systematic practice of political murder." (*Washington Post, December 1, 1983*)

Halperin called U.S. aid to the pro-democracy Contra rebels "ineffective and immoral." (Associated Press, October 2, 1983)

ON NUCLEAR STRATEGY AND ARMS CONTROL

As reported by the *New York Times* on November 23, 1983: "Mr. Halperin said the most important contribution American officials could make to stability would be 'to renounce the notion that nuclear weapons can be used for any other purpose than to deter nuclear attack.' He also argued that the United States should abandon plans to attack Soviet missile silos in responding to a nuclear attack. For one thing, he said, the missiles would probably have already been fired. Also, he said, a high degree of accuracy would be required."

As reported by the Chicago Tribune on December 11, 1987: "Halperin explained the NATO deterrent strategy known as coupling, whereby a Soviet conventional attack in Europe would be met with Allied tactical, and if the Soviets persisted, strategic nuclear weapons, in this way: 'First, we fight conventionally until we're losing. Then we fight with tactical nuclear weapons until we're losing; then we blow up the world.'"

Referring to the Nuclear Freeze proposal: "Sounds like good arms control to me." (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March 1983)

ON CLASSIFICATION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION

"While the most flagrant abuses of the rights of Americans Associated with the Cold War are thankfully gone from the scene, we have been left behind with a legacy of secrecy that continues to undermine democratic principles." (Boston Globe, July 26, 1992)

Halperin called the government's prosecution of Samuel Loring Morison, who was convicted of disclosing classified satellite photos of a Soviet aircraft carrier under construction "an extraordinary threat to the First Amendment." (Washington Post, October 8, 1985).

[From the Center for Security Policy]

THE "HALPERIN SYNDROME": CLINTON APPOINTEES' ANTIPATHY TO CIA, MILITARY SETS STAGE FOR DEBACLES IN HAITI, BEYOND

WASHINGTON, DC.—The world is now being treated to the spectacle of a U.S. president determinedly pursuing a policy toward Haiti predicated upon a man whom the American intelligence community believes to be a psychotic manic depressive and involving a use of the armed forces opposed by senior military commanders. Unfortunately, the bizarre overinvestment by the Clinton Administration in Jean-Bertrand Aristide is not an isolated incident. Rather, it seems the product of a dangerous predisposition shared by many of Mr. Clinton's senior security policy advisors, and perhaps by the President himself.

While much of the focus to date has been on a dubious commitment to multilateralism that is rife in the senior echelons of the Clinton Administration, another—arguably more insidious—mindset appears to be at work: a deep-seated mistrust of, if not outright contempt for, the Central Intelligence Agency, its sister organizations and the American military. Unless there are wholesale changes in the Administration's foreign and defense policy team, it is predictable that such a predisposition will produce even more serious and expensive debacles for the United States than that entailed in trying to restore Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power and to assure his survival once there.

THE HALPERIN SYNDROME

For want of a better term, this mindset might be called the "Halperin Syndrome" since Morton Halperin, Mr. Clinton's nominee to become the top Pentagon policymaker responsible for democracy-building and peacekeeping in places like Somalia and Haiti, epitomizes the phenomenon. In over two decades of public advocacy and agitation

prior to beginning work on the Clinton Defense transition team in 1992, Halperin repeatedly and unambiguously made clear his low regard for what he has called the "massive undemocratic national security structure [that] was erected during the Cold War."

In particular, Halperin has consistently excoriated the U.S. intelligence community. To cite but a few illustrative examples from Halperin's copious writings, public statements and congressional testimony on the subject (emphasis added throughout):

"Using secret intelligence agencies to defend a constitutional republic is akin to the ancient medical practice of employing leeches to take blood from feverish patients. The intent is therapeutic, but in the long run the cure is more deadly than the disease. Secret intelligence agencies are designed to act routinely in ways that violate the laws or standards of society." (The Lawless State: The Crimes of the U.S. Intelligence Agencies, 1976)

"You can never preclude abuses by intelligence agencies and, therefore, that is a risk that you run if you decide to have intelligence agencies. I think there is a very real tension between a clandestine intelligence agency and a free society. I think we accepted it for the first time during the Cold War period and I think in light of the end of the Cold War we need to assess a variety of things at home, including secret intelligence agencies, and make sure that we end the Cold War at home as we end it abroad." (MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour, July 23, 1991)

Halperin concluded a favorable review of CIA turncoat Philip Agee's book Inside the Company: CIA Diary by pronouncing: "The only way to stop all of this is to dissolve the CIA covert career service and to bar the CIA from at least developing and allied nations." (Center for National Security Studies newsletter First Principles, September 1975)

HALPERIN AS POLICY-MAKER

Even though Morton Halperin has yet to be confirmed as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping, he has been one of the principal authors of the Clinton policy toward Haiti. It is hardly surprising that a man with such a low opinion of the U.S. intelligence community would be inclined to give short shrift to warning signs produced by that community.

What is more, Halperin has recently been implicated in two decisions that suggest an equally cavalier attitude toward the American military. Notwithstanding formal denials by Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, there are persistent reports that Halperin contributed to the decision not to approve the repeated requests for additional armor to support U.S. armed forces deployed in Somalia on the grounds that doing so would not square with the Administration's political agenda. This decision contributed to the loss of 18 American servicemen in Mogadishu on 3 October.

While Halperin's exact pre-confirmation role in that tragic episode remains a matter of dispute, his reported involvement in the Somalia decision is of a piece with another confirmed instance of subordinating military requirements to a perceived political agenda: According to yesterday's Washington Times, Halperin has acknowledged asking that a joint U.S.-Guatemalan exercise be terminated prematurely to protest the alleged involvement of Guatemala's military in the escape of an individual convicted of killing an American. This direction was, properly, ignored by the U.S. military as it came outside of the normal chain of command and from someone who—by virtue of being only a consultant—had no authority to issue such guidance.

THE HALPERIN SYNDROME AND CLINTON POLICY TOWARD HAITI

Morton Halperin's disdainful attitude toward the U.S. intelligence community and the American military appears to be shared by other Administration officials, as well. At the very least, such widely shared sentiments seem to be driving factors regarding the Clinton policy toward Haiti.

As President Clinton, himself, put it on 22 October: "The CIA would be the first to tell you that they get a lot of information. It's not always accurate. It's not always determinable." the unsaid implication of this statement: In the case of the intelligence community's assessment of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, its information is simply inaccurate.

And yet, the information being thus discounted is compelling. According to press accounts of the congressional briefings presented in recent days by a 30-year veteran of the Central Intelligence Agency (who has served for the past three years as its senior national intelligence officer for Latin America), Aristide takes medicine to treat "psychotic manic depression" which can have such symptoms as suicidal tendencies, delusions of persecution and hallucinations. The briefing also confirmed reports that while president of Haiti, Aristide encouraged the "necklacing" of his political opponents, the practice of lighting gasoline-laden tires placed around the victim's neck. Aristide said of necklacing:

"What a beautiful tool, what a beautiful instrument, what a beautiful device, it's beautiful, yes, it's beautiful, it's cute, it's pretty, it has a good smell. Wherever you go you want to inhale it."[1]

Importantly, according to the 24 October edition of the Washington Post, the briefing represented "the consensus judgment of the entire spy community, including the Intelligence and Research branch of the State Department." On Thursday, CIA Director James Woolsey endorsed the conclusions of the briefing before members of the House and Senate intelligence committees.

Speaking on ABC-TV's "This Week" on Sunday, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole said that the CIA briefing unearthed "very disturbing" information about Aristide's mental stability, his treatment of political opponents and his "commitment to democracy." Sen. Dole averred that, in light of what he had heard, he "certainly wouldn't risk one American life to put him back in power."

DON'T BOTHER ME WITH THE FACTS

Two particularly noteworthy manifestations of the Halperin syndrome have recently been reported. According to the 25 October edition of U.S. News and World Report, Phil Peters, a spokesman for the State Department's Bureau of Inter-American Affairs called the CIA accusations about Aristide's mental health part of "a full-scale attack on the President's policy." According to Peters, the Pentagon (i.e., the uniformed military—as opposed to Halperin and the civilian leadership) and other agencies "don't think it is worth doing anything to reinstate Aristide, despite the fact that President Clinton decided on that course."

Meanwhile, syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reported yesterday that Deputy National Security Adviser Sandy Berger angrily ordered the Pentagon to proceed to deploy the USS Harlan County to Haiti three weeks ago over the objections of senior military commanders who were recommending a postponement of its embarkation. Berger is said to have overruled the military—setting the stage for the ensuing embarrassing withdrawal of the vessel in the face of a small number or armed protesters—on the grounds that "We committed ourselves publicly in the campaign, and we're going to do it."

IF MICHAEL BARNES SAYS IT'S SO . . .

Such is the influence of the Halperin syndrome that Clinton Administration officials who exhibit its symptoms are prepared to rely upon the self-serving judgments of interested parties—rather than the findings of U.S. intelligence. As President Clinton himself put it on 22 October: "No one knows whether [the CIA's allegations about President Aristide's mental illness] were true or not" but that the "sustained experience" of U.S. advisers working with Mr. Aristide "tended to undermine those reports."

One of those advisers upon whom the President and his staff are apparently relying is the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Michael Barnes. Rep. Barnes has recently been playing a highly visible role so a witness to President Aristide's mental fitness. He has gone so far as to claim that Mr. Aristide "has not suffered from nor been treated for any mental problems." Rep. Barnes may have at least as compelling—and certainly a far more tangible—stake than Mr. Clinton in arriving at such a conclusion, however: He is reportedly receiving $50,000 per month to serve as counsel for President Aristide.

THE BOTTOM LINE

What has become evident in both the Somalia and Haiti debacles is that the Clinton Administration is prepared to discount the advice of the U.S. intelligence community and the military, a modus operandi that has already had tragically fatal consequences in the first case and humiliating effects in the second. Unless a thorough housecleaning of those prone to such attitudes is accomplished at once, it seems inevitable that additional—and probably more serious—disasters lie ahead.

This is not to say that the intelligence community is infallible or that civilian control of the military should not be exercised. It is, however, to say that the nation is poorly served by an Administration staffed in key positions by those who have an ill-concealed, visceral and apparently immutable distrust of the U.S. intelligence agencies and the armed forces as institutions and of their activities. Such individuals are unlikely to be able either to utilize the products of intelligence properly or to exercise the kind of effective civilian control of the military that is clearly required.

The Center for Security Policy believes, in addition, that an urgent effort should be made to declassify—and present publicly—the CIA analysis of Jean-Bertrand Aristide's mental health and his record with regard to democracy during his brief presidency. The fullest possible transparency is in order before the American people are asked to entrust additional American lives, treasure and prestige to policy-makers who have already demonstrated proclivities that could result in a further squandering of these precious assets.

UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California said, this

[1] Incredibly, some of Aristide's defenders contend that this statement was actually made in reference to the Haitian constitution adopted during his brief presidency.

previous 30 minutes has been spent on the international situation. I think it is time we now shift to the domestic situation.

Of course, one of the biggest problems that we face domestically, that has to be resolved and that cannot continue along the same path that it is, is unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. He has been very kind to share his time with us this evening.

For those Members who have been planning to speak on the unfunded mandate portion of the evening, this is it. If they are out there and they want to come over, we would love to have them.

This is a special order, and it is an important special order. It is important, because it deals with the most pressing issue facing States and local governments today. That is beginning the issue of unfunded mandates.

As many of us know, today has been designated as National Unfunded Mandate Day, a day in which local officials across the country were to begin educating the public of the devastating consequences of unfunded Federal mandates.

I was told by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which was the primary sponsor of the National Unfunded Mandate Day, that over 1,000 local officials around the Nation held events in which they singled out unfunded Federal mandates as the biggest problem they face.

In these communities, the message to the Congress was clear: Stop approving legislation that imposes requirements on local governments without containing the resources necessary to carry out that mandate.

This August, I and a number of Members of Congress have formed the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Mandates in order to bring together Members of Congress who agree that this body must honestly address this issue.

Since August, we have 84 Members of the Congress who have joined the caucus on unfunded mandates.

As anybody who knows me can attest, I am not a frequent participant in special orders. However, I feel that this issue is so important to our Nation that it deserves the topic of discussion on the House floor. In addition, I feel that a special order devoted solely to unfunded Federal mandates is appropriate activity for National Unfunded Mandate Day.

I am proud to join with my colleagues and local government across this country to try to educate Congress and the American people about unfunded mandates. Unfunded mandates is what we call in the business "feel good legislation." That is where we in Congress get to feel good and pass the cost on to local governments.

We have got to put a stop to that. There are a group of Members of Congress who have come together to try to find a bipartisan solution. This is a bipartisan issue. Democrats and Republicans have come together to try to come to a consensus about how we deal with the unfunded Federal mandate issue, and we do have limited time this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some profiles of cities that are being adversely affected by unfunded Federal mandates. For instance, the city of Phoenix, AZ, could provide substantially lower water and sewer rates to its citizens if they did not have to commit much of their local revenue to unfunded mandates.

In Fresno, CA, the city estimated the costs of closing a landfill, without Federal mandates, to be $10 to $12 million. However, because the landfill is included as a Superfund site, the cost of closing the facility will range from $35 to $60 million. You should note that all of the costs will be borne by the city's solid waste ratepayers.

In Los Angeles, unfunded mandates will have a detrimental impact on the city's ability to provide essential services. Mayor Richard Riordan has told me that he could put many more cops on the streets if the city did not have to comply with so many unfunded Federal mandates.

In Philadelphia, an Environmental Protection Agency requirement that the city develop an advanced wastewater treatment system to improve the oxygen levels for fish in the Delaware Water Basin will cost Philadelphia upward of $500 million. The mayor of Philadelphia, Ed Rendell, has told me that he will not comply with this mandate because there is no way that he can justify this expenditure to the citizens of Philadelphia.

Merced, CA, located in my congressional district, will incur $1.4 million in unfunded Federal mandates in 1993–94. In order to balance this year's budget, Merced had to cut over 30 staff positions. Remember, Merced only has a population of 53,000 people and it is suffering in the worst sort of way because of unfunded Federal mandates.

In Modesto, CA, also in my congressional district, the city will spend $5.8 million on nine Federal mandates over the next 6 years. This money could be used to hire 150 police officers.

In Stockton, CA, the San Joaquin County district attorney was contemplating laying off one-quarter of his prosecutors because of unfunded mandates. However, a temporary extension of the 1-cent sales tax surcharge allowed the county to retain its prosecutors. Nevertheless, if a permanent solution is not found, the DA will be forced to let these prosecutors go, thus leaving the citizens of San Joaquin County unprotected from crime.

In California, the classic example of an unfunded Federal mandate is immigration. Our immigration policy is solely the province of the Federal Government. Congress and the administration determine who may enter this country, and to a great extent, they determine where these immigrants reside. However, the State of California and its counties are responsible for the education, health, and welfare of these people. For this year, Governor Wilson has stated that providing social services to these people will cost the State at least $1.4 billion.

It should be clear to those listening to this debate that unfunded Federal mandates are a problem. What can we do in Congress to mitigate the problems of unfunded Federal mandates? Well, we can prevent future unfunded Federal mandates from being enacted. Since last year, I have tried to offer floor amendments to any legislation considered by the House that contains unfunded mandates.

Last Congress, the House considered the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992. This legislation mandated that States and local jurisdictions, containing large minority populations, print voting materials in the native language of those groups. This mandate will no doubt increase the normal costs of running elections. When the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992 was considered on the House floor, I offered an amendment that would have required the Federal Government to reimburse local governments for the increased costs due to this mandate. Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated by two votes.

This Congress, I wanted to offer a similar amendment to the National Voter Registration Act, more commonly referred to as motor-voter. It was estimated that motor-voter would cost my State of California $26 million a year. The Congressional Budget Office estimated the cost of compliance for all of the States to be $200 million. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not allow my amendment to be offered and the Congress went ahead and pushed another unfunded mandate onto the States.

Last week, I, along with Congressman GOODLING, offered an amendment to the Education Goals 2000 that clarified that the bill would not become an unfunded mandate on States and school districts. I am proud that our amendment was unanimously approved by the full House.

It is my full intention to continue offering these sorts of amendments to unfunded mandates that make their way to the House floor. I would appreciate the assistance of my colleagues in this endeavor.

Besides offering floor amendments I believe that this body needs to consider specific mandate relief legislation. To that end, I have introduced H.R. 140, the Federal Mandate Relief Act of 1993. My bill is very simple. It merely states that compliance with, or implementation of, an unfunded Federal mandate is voluntary for States and localities until the Federal Government provides the funding needed to pay for the mandated requirements. The bill is not retroactive and would only apply to mandates which take effect on or after the date of enactment.

By requiring the Federal Government to put up the money before it can enforce any future mandates, my bill accomplishes exactly what local governments are requesting. That is why H.R. 140 has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Towns and Townships, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of State Governments and the National Taxpayers Union.

Currently, H.R. 140 enjoys the support of 108 Members of Congress. I hope that my colleagues who are not cosponsors of H.R. 140 will take a look at the legislation and consider adding their names as cosponsors.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling this special order on this very important subject and for giving us this time.

As a member of the Congressional Unfunded Mandates Caucus, I am certainly pleased to do my part, as the other members that are here tonight and have waited so long in order to speak on this particular issue and to figure out exactly the financial burdens that we are placing on the States and the local governments as time goes on.

I have long spoken out against the Federal Government conducting its social engineering designs through mandates on the private sector. These burdens certainly increase costs. They destroy jobs and are exactly a hidden tax on all Americans.

With a restricted budget and unrestrained desire to expand the total reach of government, Congress has more recently turned to State and local governments to finance its desires. In the areas of social services, transportation, environment, public safety and health, which I will talk about briefly in a minute, Federal mandates are escalating costs and restricting the flexibility of local governments to meet their own unique problems.

In Colorado, for instance, the State government has identified 195 Federal programs containing mandates for State and local agencies, 195. It has got to be a lot more than that in California. Over 100 of these mandates are direct orders which the State or locality must comply with in order to participate or to receive Federal funds. It will cost the State of Colorado $794 million this fiscal year alone to comply with these mandates.

One of the most outlandish areas of Federal abuse comes in health care, and we are about ready to take up this particularly whole new issue again. Recent changes in Federal social service programs have nearly doubled the cost of Medicaid coverage for some while certainly causing dramatic cost inflation in nearly all categories. Unfortunately, Congress found a real taste for dishing it out and its problems keep going on to others.

Just in the past few months, Congress has added major new mandates under the Motor-Voter Act and the 1993 reconciliation bill, in other words, the budget bill. And there is little relief in sight for the folks back home.

Congress is currently considering 60 bills, 60, which contain some form of mandate or requirements for State or local governments.

The sad truth is that Members of Congress have found that through mandates they can gain all the political benefits of creating new entitlements for their constituents without having to face the political pain of paying for them.

The unfunded mandate caucus is dedicated to restoring accountability to Congress by forcing Congress to prioritize its spending desires and to fully fund mandates on the State and local governments.

In closing, many of us served in State legislatures, and we also know that our individual State governments are having a tough time having revenues meet expenditures. And many times, and I can recall sitting there and saying, why is the Federal Government doing this to us. You start a program that is funded 80/20 Federal money. The next year it may be 60/40. Pretty soon there is not any Federal money but the mandate stays.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman from California conducting this special order tonight. I am sure lots of my other colleagues here have a lot to say about this.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his words. I would like to remind those Members who are watching that the unfunded mandate caucus has created what we call an alert, and we are going to alert Members, as the issues come up that the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, anything that comes on this floor that has an unfunded mandate to it, we are going to put out an alert, ask Members to make a decision, knowing that they are creating a mandate on local government. They may agree with the public policy, but they then have got to determine whether it is worth putting the cost back on local government. That is one of the endeavors that the unfunded mandate caucus is gong to attempt to do. Mr. GEREN has taken responsibility to do that.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], who is conducting the special order under the generous time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McInnis].

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

There was no objection.

□ 1930

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] for taking this time. The gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] has reserved an hour later on unfunded mandates. I reserved an hour. Obviously, because of the lateness of the day and Members' very, very busy schedule, this is the unfunded mandates special order.

I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] for his very unique and persevering leadership to bring us together. Here is the list, if you will, of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus, 84 strong. Members will notice that there are senior members, junior members, all committees, Republicans, and Democrats. The gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] is a cochair. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is a cochair. We have six on the steering committee, and quite a posse, really, hopefully riding in the direction of less regulations, less red tape, and less mandates. It is bipartisan, as I have said before.

If I am any judge of the mood in regard to this Congress, I think it could be exemplified by what I experienced when I went on my district tour. I have the privilege of representing a district almost as big as the State of Wyoming, represented by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], 66 counties. It takes me 5,000 miles and about 3½ weeks to tour the district.

Let me assure the Members that this is a big-time priority problem for rural and small town America, just as it is a problem for the mayor of Philadelphia and the thousands of county officials and State officials and mayors who really tried to bring the point home during National Unfunded Mandates Day, so we are really joining that effort.

What kind of an issue is it? When I reported to the press on the number one issue of concern to the people of the big First District of Kansas, they said, "What about health care?" Yes, they are concerned about health care. "What about agriculture?" Obviously, they are always concerned about agriculture. "NAFTA?" Certainly. "Crime?" Certainly.

The number one issue of concern: Federal regulation of trash. Many members of the press said, "What? I beg your pardon? What is going on here?" I will tell the Members what is going on in St. Francis, KS, America, way out in the north corner of Kansas, way out in the prairie, with 3,600 people.

Seven hundred and fifty of them got together, signed a petition, many over 65 years of age, senior citizens on fixed incomes, asking their Congressman why under the Clean Air Act, and with the EPA riding shotgun on this act, are they going to have to close their local landfill that is perfectly safe, and charge those senior citizens ten times as much to close the landfill and ship the trash, if you will, to a regional landfill that does not exist?

Where are we going to send it? What, to Denver? Denver does not want it. It is 250 miles away. Do you know what is going to happen to the trash? I will tell you what will happen. That elderly citizen will call the grandson over and say, "Bring the pickup. I want to put the trash in the pickup." It will end up in every ditch, in every creek bed all throughout the first district. It will be blowing all over the country. It is the law of unintended effects that is happening to every hospital board, every school board, every business up and down main street, every local official who writes me, not on behalf of legislation, but writing me, "What in the Lord's name are you doing back here, saddling us with more paper work, more regulations, more red tape that is terribly counter productive, sapping the average budget of our counties out there by half or a third when they must have those funds for other essential projects?"

I thank the gentleman, and I thank my colleagues. The gentleman is exactly correct. We are going to have a red alert down here, so when Members come on the floor and they have 5 minutes to vote, one of the things they are going to look at is the cost of these mandates, and take a second look.

Again, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT]. We are committed to this. It is going to be a long, slow, tough, fight, but we have signed up, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD information regarding the problem of unfunded mandates:

[Remarks by Congressman Pat Roberts before the Legislative Policy Group, Sept. 18, 1993]

THE MANDATE REBELLION

As you know, I have the privilege of representing the 66-county "Big First" district, a district that is larger than most states, 57,000 square miles of rural and small community America. And, as some of you doubtlessly know, once again, we have just completed our annual 5,000 mile, month long tour of the "Big First"—visiting our friends across the western two-thirds of our state. I want to thank those in attendance here today who attended some of those meetings.

And, those of you who did take time from your busy schedule to visit with us heard our constituents reiterate concern and frustration that is alarming but also represents public support for positive reform and action.

Bluntly put, American taxpayers and citizens are fed up to the point of grassroots rebellion against Federal mandates and regulation that are burying local governments, businesses and individuals. This regulatory flood tide comes with costs that threaten to bankrupt and dismantle rural America. And, the alleged "benefits" in regard to safety, health, environmental clean up, consumer and minority protection—when measured by any common sense cost-benefit criteria—are questionable to say the least and result in wasting funds that could be used for urgent and priority community needs.

What would you guess would be the number one issue of concern, the concern most often raised in town hall meetings in 66 counties of our state? Health care? The recent budget and tax bill? NAFTA? To be sure, these issues were discussed but the number one issue was Federal regulation of trash! Landfill regulations if you will, and that issue immediately led to further discussion of other mandates and regulations that have become so pervasive throughout our economy and that adversely affect our daily lives and pocketbooks.

It is truly overwhelming and extremely frustrating. Like the floods of this spring and summer, this regulatory floodtide is such the waters rise faster than we can sandbag or bail out. But, the message from farmers, ranchers, business owners, local government, our essential services—our schools, hospitals, lending institutions—and from just plain Joe Q. Taxpayer, was simple and clear: The mandates being passed along by the Federal Government must stop. We cannot afford them. They are counterproductive!

Now, I know what you are thinking. Congressman, this is nothing new. We have all been singing this same hymn of protest from the same church, same pew, same hymnal, same page, for years. The complaints you get at your city and county meetings have been mirrored in hundreds of letters and calls and personal pleas to my office. We get approximately 150 letters a day, scores of telephone calls, and we travel many miles throughout the district.

You know, I don't get letters asking me to pass this bill or that bill—oh, perhaps a few form letters from various organizations—but, the majority of letters and calls and personal visits pretty much say the same thing. "What on earth is Congress doing back there passing all of these mandates and saddling us with regulations, paperwork and red tape that are about to put me or my community out of business?"

Several decades ago, my predecessor said it was more important for Congress to prevent bad legislation from passing than it was to add more to the books. Keith Sebelius was right then and that admonition is even more important today.

So, what has changed? Why has the problem of unfunded mandates and regulation become so crucial? Upon my return to Washington, I set out to research with my colleagues how we could take advantage of the growing public outcry for mandate reform.

My conclusion was that nothing had really changed, except the rate and the cost of federal mandates continue to rise and the negative financial impacts are now taking place at record levels. The cumulative effort now threatens to dismantle our rural infrastructure!

The difference between several decades ago and today is a little frightening:

It is estimated today that the cost of federal regulations is more than $400 billions annually. That exceeds the size of the deficit!

The federal government has about 122,000 regulatory personnel, up from 114,000 in 1980.

In recent years, the Federal Register has grown from 55,000 pages to 70,000.

The key problem in today's economy is a justified lack of confidence in the Federal government and its ability to make rational policy decisions. Too many times, government is an adversary, not a partner.

The Kansas Association of Counties pretty well summed it up last month in Topeka. The KAC told the Kansas press that 12 mandates cost 22 counties in Kansas more than $200 million during fiscal year 1992—nearly half of their total expenditures. Bottom line, federal and state government are setting policies while forcing counties to cover the costs.

And, it's not just rural America. Last week the newly created Mandate Caucus in the House of Representatives met with the Mayor of Philadelphia—you should hear his problems in regard to the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Delaware River Basin Authority!

In the 1980's, Congress passed 60 unfunded federal mandates on state and local governments. In the 1990's, that figure is expected to rise to 100 or more that will have to be paid for and implemented on the local level.

WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

Today's best known federal mandate, I would guess among all of you, is the soon-to-be-implemented, but soon-to-be-officially delayed for some, always confused, stop again-off again-on again, solid waste disposal regulations. These regulations are intended to safeguard public health by closing many of our nation's landfills—particularly those in rural areas.

Problem is, the alternatives to today's landfills are not only costly, but in many areas alternative regional landfills simply do not exist. This has left small communities and state officials scrambling to find alternative dumping sites and leaving the average citizen perplexed with the suddenly announced trash disposal rate increase of double, three times and even five times their normal annual cost. Why? What's the benefit compared to these dramatic costs?

The examples can go on and on regarding confusing and seemingly senseless federal regulations and the costs being pushed on local government and small business. In our district alone, I think of:

A community faced with paying for the entire cleanup cost of a superfund site that would equal the entire annual operating budget of the community government—despite the limited benefit such an extensive cleanup would have compared to alternative ways to respond to the problem.

A town required to install a water treatment facility costing ten times the city's annual operating budget—despite the fact that no one has ever reported any health concerns or health-related effects. The required improvements only result in marginal changes in drinking water quality and were forced upon the community by regulatory rules changes.

On a summer afternoon the only thing moving in a square mile area of rural Kansas is the farm tractor. New federal regulations say that tractor is causing pollution and must in the future have costly emissions equipment installed. Tractor emissions are a problem? Give us a break, Washington.

It is senseless, but the bad news is, more is on the way. Communities and businesses are facing a dark cloud of additional regulations and mandates, including:

The Clean Air Act—which requires the creation of multi-colored diesel (to be separated for differing uses). and which will result in the installation of various air quality equipment for off-road vehicles, such as farm tractors and construction equipment that provide no net gain in air quality improvements.

The Clean Air Act—a law that requires the permitting of "storm water runoff," so when it rains on your property—you are responsible for everyone up and downstream.

Americans with Disabilities Act—a law whose accompanying regulations are far more restrictive than ever intended and is

forcing billions of dollars in additional structural and outfit modifications.

Solid Waste Disposal Act—as I've already mentioned, is requiring the long distance transport (then disposal) of trash with limited or net gain in environmental quality.

Safe Drinking Water Act—a law and accompanying regulations are requiring all drinking water sources to be tested for chemicals and contaminants that have never been found in drinking water sources. This wasteful, unneeded, costly testing will result in the dissolution of many rural water districts that were organized to protect drinking water supplies—that will now be forced to dissolve and require individuals to seek wells and other water sources outside the testing requirements.

Endangered Species Act—Intended to protect bio-diversity, it has been interpreted and twisted to take away many individual private property rights.

The list can go on.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

First, the Administration has just announced the National Performance Review, a project intended to end government waste, streamline government and (most importantly) begin to stem the cost of government over-regulation and end further unfunded mandates.

While this report has been received with understandable skepticism in some quarters, I believe strongly in the need for these objectives and have already begun a campaign among my Republican colleagues to embrace the proposals and begin to draft legislation to put many of the recommendations into place.

But, let me issue a word of warning. One of President Clinton's first acts in assuming office was to abolish former Vice President Dan Quayle's Competitiveness Council, which had the goal of reducing regulation on business.

Separate from the reinventing Government project, the President will soon order sweeping changes in the way the government issues regulations. The new order will give Vice President Gore and his team the lead role in shaping the Administration's regulatory priorities and in settling disputes.

Under the new policy, White House reviewers at the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs will have a "broader definition" of costs and benefits. Reinventing government to reduce government and make it a partnership with people is one thing. Reinventing government by providing more regulatory power is quite another.

Well sir, with all due respect, I have a litmus test for the Vice President and the Administration's reinventing government plan. This coming week, we will be meeting with the Vice President to discuss the proposals. During this meeting, I will present him the letter and list of the major mandates that are causing us problems here in rural and small-town America. I will urge Vice President Gore to take immediate action as part of his efforts to streamline the federal government. As well, I am urging the Vice President to support legislation in the House that would prevent the passage of any mandate that does not contain the funds for implementation for state and local governments.

In addition, I have helped organize a bipartisan caucus of House members known as the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Mandates. We met last Tuesday and began organizing a steering committee and a legislative agenda with the intention of passing legislation that would prevent the future enactment of any unfunded mandates.

Our agenda is clear: Stop the unfunded mandates. End the arrogant and elitist shotgun approach of current regulatory policy where everyone, regardless of local circumstance, is guilty until proven innocent. Rely on local government and local citizens in regard to cost sharing and flexibility and yes even compliance. After all, it is our water, our soil, our air, our families, our homes, our businesses and our economic future. You are damn right we care and we can, in fact, do a better job making our environment a better and safer place in which to live and raise our families. But, we also have to make a living!

Did you know that back in 1980, Congress passed something called the Regulatory Flexibility Act. It required Federal agencies to monitor their regulations to see if they are needed or could be modified to lessen regulatory burdens. Agencies were to do this annually for a period of ten years. The Mandate Caucus intends to inspect those ten year review records. it should be interesting!

All of these actions are a long way from your homes here in Kansas. But, they are positive steps. Word is beginning to get out among my colleagues that enough is enough and serious action is needed. That is certainly good news and we must take advantage of this new political climate. In Washington the rule is that legislators legislate and regulators regulate. It may take a revolution in the Congress to end this mind set but it's a revolution long overdue.

Part of our problem is that these mandates and resulting regulatory costs are so numerous, pervasive and complicated that we have trouble even keeping track, defining them or defining the issue both for our constituents and especially to the press.

Let's face it, "unfunded mandates" is just not a hot button issue. Talk about landfill regulations and the reporter's eyes glaze over. But, if we talk about "big brother" government forcing 900 senior citizens living on fixed incomes in Cheyenne County, Kansas to pay five times their current trash fee ($50!) to haul their refuse to a regional landfill that does not exist, the attention span gets refocused.

We have to do a better job of communicating the seriousness of this problem before we bankrupt and dismantle rural America. And, it is an issue that is much larger than landfill regs or water testing or endangered species. Make no mistake about it, this somewhat esoteric battle goes to the heart of democracy. Our objective is to preserve regulations that truly protect the safety, welfare and health of the American people. But, we must remember unnecessary red tape and needless litigation add nothing to our economy and excessive regulation simply serves to throw people out of work, lower production, reduce consumer choice, and erode our standard of living. Somehow, some way these regulations and the nonelected special interest groups and bureaucrats who propose and administer them must be held accountable to individual citizens.

The strength of America lies not with Government or regulations. It lies in the spirit of the American people and our ability to compete, create, innovate and generate opportunity. It is a paradox of enormous irony that while citizens of the former Soviet Union endeavor to embrace these strengths at considerable risk and with personal deprivation, this country seems to be on a treadmill towards greater Government control, national bankruptcy and a regulated social welfare state.

Certainly, there comes a point where regulation becomes so onerous, so costly and so unmanageable that citizens have no choice but to refuse to comply. My friends, we are not far off from that point in this country.

Quite frankly, this nation faces the real possibility of domestic rebellion by local governments, business and individuals over their frustration with federal mandates. Such action has been threatened by a number of city mayors and county commissioners. With all due respect, that is newsworthy! Think of the consequences of having the federal government say, "Close your landfills," then having every community in the nation say "no, thank you."

Your organization and similar groups must continue to work to educate your membership and all of our citizens on the impact of unfunded mandates, their costs and how they are hurting your communities. This education is critical. Only when it is fully realized—that these legislative good intentions are actually hurting us all—will the politicians wake up to their constituent demands to stop.

Only then can we stop the special interest groups that are so often behind these mandates in efforts to further one cause or another.

In closing, let me stress, I don't mean to make this a doom and gloom message. The political climate in the Congress is changing. Those of us who believe the philosophy I have outlined believe that with your help, we can make a difference. The time to act is now.

I hope you found my comments helpful. I am open to any suggestions. Only if we work together will we be successful in restoring the political power to where it belongs in our great nations—back to you and back to our people.

Thank you.

Mr. CONDIT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas. It brings up the question of why should the American people care about unfunded mandates. They should care because it is a hidden tax. It is a hidden tax to them. When these mandates are passed, and passed through the States and the counties and cities, what happens if the cities and counties and States are forced, then, to take their budget money and apply it to that mandate?

It takes away the choice, the local autonomy of city councils, of country supervisors, of State legislatures. They have to make a decision that they are locked into making. They are not able to decide whether or not they are going to add law enforcement people to their budget, whether or not they are going to build a new park, because their money is already consumed with this mandate.

It is important to the American people to understand that we have got to set priorities for this country.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate joining with my friends to talk about this issue. I really think it is one of the most important issues before the Congress. Frankly, I must tell the Members that I am surprised that there is not a little bit more interest in it, if

the cities over the country and the town are as interested in it as the cities and towns are in Wyoming.

Last year I had, because of the opportunity of serving on a subcommittee, a chance to be a member of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission. That is a federally mandated, I think it is funded, however, operation. It brings together both the Congress and the Governors and the mayors and so on. That was the principal issue that these folks talked about, was unfunded mandates.

One of the communities, I think it was Columbus, OH, did an excellent portrayal of where they were. They talked about the mandated costs. As I recall, it was about 90 percent of their increased revenue they would have over the next few years was committed to unfunded mandates, so the choices they had to do the thing that their people wanted were simply taken from them in terms of unfunded mandates.

There are lots of examples. Let me talk, just a second, though, about what I think is an element of good government. It seems to me that one of the issues that is really involved with good government is that of the taxpayers being able to measure the value of what is done with their tax dollars, being able to measure the cost-benefit ratio.

When we remove that from the local area and take it to the Federal decision, then the guy who pays his taxes in Cowley, WY, or Greybull, WY, has no impact at all over how those dollars are spent. I think that is bad government. I think we really ought to allow that taxing authority to remain at the local level. We ought not to have an activist Congress who wants to do a ton of things with no money to do it with, and simply mandate or command that it is done on the local level.

The old idea of "one fits all," of course, does not work. What fits in Philadelphia does not fit in Cowley, with 500 people. That is exactly what we run into with all the testing that needs to be done on water, with solid waste disposal.

I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] for what he has done. He and I serve on a subcommittee together. I am pleased with what he does, and I appreciate the effort to highlight this question of unfunded mandates.

Mr. CONDIT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman from Wyoming very much. He reminds me of a comment I heard here where one of the Members told me, "Well, if we do not have these mandates, my city councils will not do the things that I think they should do." With that attitude I take issue. I really believe that people, local people that are elected by their constituents and their neighbors, are responsive to them. I believe that they want to do what is right.

I believe that local governments, county governments, State governments, want clean water. They want clean air. I think that they are the closest to the people and are able to make some discretionary decisions about how they had best achieve those things.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Let me add my words to those of the others who have complimented the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] on his leadership on this issue, as well as the other members of the caucus. It is extraordinary when we have an issue that so unifies everyone in your district, but seems to not get a whole lot of attention here in Congress. For the gentleman's help in bringing attention to this issue, I really am very grateful.

It is also good to see my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] sitting in the chair, my colleague from my freshman class.

This morning during our press conference I had just a minute of time, Mr. Speaker, to share some examples of this problem. I thought tonight I may be able to elaborate a little bit more on those examples. I took the opportunity on Unfunded Mandates Day to call some of the mayors in the communities who had already written to me about this issue and asked them if they would take some time and some of their staff time, which I know is precious, to try and give me some examples, and maybe even some totals, of the amount of money that the Federal Government has mandated that local governments spend.

I have a few responses that I think are worth paying some attention to.

□ 1940

I would add before I read these that this does not mean that either the mayors who have written these letters to me or I feel that every one of these laws was not well-intended. Nor do either of us believe, either the mayors who wrote this or I, that we should not try and accomplish the public policy goals that underlie these laws that Congress passed. We do not necessarily disagree with the purpose of these laws, but we believe that if the Federal Government wants to accomplish these goals that they ought to do so in a cooperative way working with the local government rather than mandating it on them.

I will read these examples quickly. From the city of Strongsville, a letter from Mayor Ehrnfelt of the city of Strongsville, which I represent, which provides a list of nine different Federal mandates which total over $3 million in total costs to the city of Strongsville, $3,085,000, which represents 13 percent of the budget. These are different laws, and the mayor said this is not necessarily an all-inclusive list, but represents the best evaluation and estimate of the current expenditures required to meet the major mandates. This does not include the minor mandates.

From the city of Walton Hills, a very small community, Mayor Ed Thellman wrote me a letter which provided me four different areas just off the top of his head of unfunded mandates totaling $4 million.

From the city of North Royalton, again a small community in my district, Cuyahoga County, nearly $21 million. That is a community that repeatedly has been forced by the Federal Government to go back and change their wastewater treatment rules, and upgrade their facilities over and over again to the tune of millions of dollars.

From the city of Bedford, which is a community of 15,000 people, they have provided me with a list of unfunded mandates totaling $14.5 million.

Just from those four communities we have $42,585,000 in unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I have other letters from other communities which I will submit for the RECORD. Just two examples that I think might provide some fodder for how silly sometimes these get, or how funny it would be if this was not our taxpayers' money that we were playing with, the city of Geneva-on-the-Lake, which is a picturesque tourist community right on the shores of Lake Erie, and I encourage anyone to come and visit there, they are mandated to test frequently for heavy metals which are the product of manufacturing, even though their only industry is tourism.

Another example from the city of Painesville, and I know that this happened in a lot of communities around the country, they spent millions of dollars in the last decade to separate out their water treatment system wastewater and storm water. Having finished that task, the EPA has now decided that they should put them back together again, because they should meet the same standards, and they are now being required to spend the money to put it back together again.

Again, these are the types of examples I know you are talking about, and I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, unfunded mandates have become Washington's preferred method of curing a problem while passing the costs off to State and local government. Washington takes the credit; Utah pays the bill. As one of Utah's

Representatives in Washington, I believe this should not be allowed to continue.

Generally, one-third of State revenue growth will be consumed by Federal mandates. The costs to Utah of only the most recent of these mandates runs into the millions of dollars.

Some of these mandates are downright nonsensical. For instance, why should Utah water be tested for chemicals which are used only on crops which have never been grown in the State of Utah? Well, EPA does not care; you have to test for a whole list of insecticides anyway, with the cost to Utah of $37.9 million per year. Other mandates are well-intentioned, but expensive. Washington now requires States to have motorcycle helmet and seat belt laws to remain eligible for Federal highway funds. The cost of compliance in Utah is $1.1 million per year.

The bottom line is even more staggering. The Governor's office estimates that total cost of Federal mandates imposed upon Utah each year is $170 million.

Our governor, mayors and council members have a hard enough time balancing their State and municipal budgets while funding the services their constituents need, let alone being mandated to finance the services the Federal Government says their constituents need.

The problem is not going away. The last Congress enacted 15 major new unfunded mandates on State and local governments. There are currently over 90 pieces of legislation pending that would require some type of State administrative or financial participation, without hope of reimbursement.

Recently I asked State legislators, county officials, mayors and town council members across my district about the problem. Their response was overwhelming. It was also instructive, because it shows how out of touch Washington has become.

The plight of most of rural America is reflected in a letter from Orlin Howes of Junction, UT, in my district. After I wrote to elected officials in Junction about unfunded mandates, Howes wrote back stating that he is gratified that a Member of Congress:

> * * * really does understand our problem—a tiny county and town such as ours with a small tax base trying to raise funds to comply with laws passed in far away Washington.
>
> We in Junction town are 130 people strong. Only 1250 in the entire county of Piute. We are strapped * * * For instance, not many years ago my water for my home and about 30 cattle was $2 per month. Now I pay $45 per month. Now we are told we must build a central disposal place and have our garbage hauled * * * We certainly want to comply with the laws you people keep passing but we cannot.
>
> We have been toying with the idea of dissolving our town and turning it back to the B[ureau of] L[and] M[anagement] * * * Sad indeed, sir, because I was born here.

Mr. Howe's letter is only one of scores I have received detailing the burden that small and large communities carry, trying to comply with unfunded mandates which sometimes bear little relationship to wise public policy and end up bankrupting communities across my district and the Nation.

Several bills have been filed to resolve the problem of unfunded mandates. I have cosponsored three of them. H.R. 140 provides that no mandate is valid unless funded. H.R. 1295 provides for an evaluation of Federal legislative and regulatory requirements on State and local governments. H.R. 886 sets up a procedure for terminating or suspending unfunded mandates. Each of these bills would help to alleviate the difficult situation which all States and most local governments face in trying to comply with the laws we pass.

I believe that if it is important enough to mandate State action, it is important enough to provide the funds necessary for State compliance. If Congress is not willing to provide funding, then Congress should not issue the mandate.

I congratulate the founders of this caucus for doing its part to make Washington aware of this issue. After so many years of passing the buck, there are signs of progress in Washington.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we should address the subject of unfunded Federal mandates in the days approaching Halloween, because for many State and municipal governments, unfunded mandates is indeed a frightening and ghoulish issue. Like a proverbial curse, they continue to haunt the efforts of administrators and legislators to achieve responsible fiscal planning for their communities. While the Federal Government presents the "treat" of many laudable and constructive projects and regulations, by refusing to provide corresponding funding it then reveals the "trick" of shifting the cost to pay for the "cumulative burden" on to the States and ultimately down to the local levels. It is wrong for the Federal Government to literally "pass the buck" on these issues and contribute to the fiscal frustration of local governments. Those of us in Congress and in the executive agencies can and should put a stop to the gruesome specter of unfunded mandates.

On this, the first National Unfunded Mandates Day, I join my colleagues in the Congressional Unfunded Mandates Caucus in pledging to concentrate our efforts to end Federal unfunded mandates. It is estimated that unfunded Federal mandates cost the American economy $480 billion annually—almost twice the size of our annual Federal budget deficit. The Congressional Budget Office figured the cumulative cost of new regulations imposed on State and local governments from 1983 to 1990 to be between $8.9 billion and $12.7 billion. According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Federal Government imposed only 17 cost-bearing regulations on cities and States between 1960 and 1985. From 1988 to 1992, the Government mandated 88 such regulations in the area of toxic management alone.

Each time the Federal Government hands down one of these mandates without providing the necessary funding, it causes States and local governments to redirect their spending priorities. It takes away money that could go to upgrade firefighting capabilities, provide extra police protection, maintain streets and roads, construct new hospitals, or build parks and recreational facilities. Basically, it hinders them from providing the necessary services to their communities that they, at the local level, know best what their communities need. In 1992, Tennessee projected that 27 percent of its revenue growth would be consumed by Federal mandates. This year in Michigan, the State calculated that 30 percent of its revenue growth would go toward paying off Medicaid mandates alone. In the words of Mayor Wellington Webb of Denver, "Mandates in some cases are important, and if they are important enough for the Congress to pass, the Congress should also be willing to appropriate the money for local governments to help implement them."

No one here is criticizing the merits of mandates. The intentions behind the National Voter Registration Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Crime Control Act, to take a few examples, serve laudable purposes and aim to improve the quality of life for all Americans. However, without providing the corresponding funding, Washington is sacrificing local priorities at the expense of Federal initiatives on the altar of unfunded mandates.

Yet, some of the regulations coming from Washington do give one cause to wonder about their utility. There are also valid questions about whether mandates are, according to the Heritage Foundation, "passed independently of one another * * * with little regard for [or knowledge of] their cumulative impact on lower levels of government." So, to draw attention to the impact of unfunded mandates, and with sincere apologies to David Letterman, I have compiled a "Top Five" list of ridiculous unfunded mandates and their effects on local governments:

No. 5: A Federal court order that requires the city of Philadelphia to install curb cuts on streets as they undergo repair. The definition of street repair includes the filling in of a pothole. As a result the mayor of Philadelphia estimates that it will cost the city one-third of its $15 million street resurfacing budget to install curb cuts;

No. 4: A Federal law that requires the signature of a single city health official on all 120,000 Medicaid reimbursement claims the city of Chicago submits. The mayor's staff spent 4000 hours just signing the official's name to the forms;

No. 3: An environmental regulation that mandated the city of Phoenix to clean its river to 99 percent purity—the city had already spent $450 million on sewage treatment to achieve 97 percent purity. Problem: the riverbed is dry 10 months of the year, so most of the time the effluent is the river. It is understandable that it would be difficult to achieve 99 percent purity under these circumstances;

No. 2: An insecticide law that requires Columbus, OH, to spend $20,000 to test its

drinking water for a pesticide that was banned in 1977 and is used mainly in Hawaii to protect pineapples; and, the No. 1 ridiculous unfunded mandate . . .

No. 1: A law requiring Anchorage to remove 30 percent of the solid wastes from its waters. The water around the city is so clean that it is difficult to remove 30 percent, so in order to comply with the regulation, the city allowed a couple of fish processing plants to dump their waste into the sewers so the city could remove it again.

Although these represent some of the more incredulous examples, these and other admirable federally mandated regulations have one thing in common: the cost of compliance is passed down to the State and local level, and eventually the taxpayers.

My own State of Maine has not escaped the burden of unfunded mandates. Lewiston, Maine's second-largest city, completed its own study last year on the effects of unfunded mandates. City officials found that the projected cost of adhering to Federal regulations through the year 2000 totaled $61.2 million for a city of 40,000. That amounts to a burden of $664 per year, per household in Lewiston. When asked how this impacted the city's plans for local programs and services, administrators responded that they had to cut back on fire protection resources, forego expansion of the police force, and abandon plans to minimize property tax increases.

In Bangor, city efforts to comply with clean water requirements on the sewer system will cost $22 million, a project totally funded by sewer rate payers. Another $11 million will be spent over 5 years to address combined sewer overflows. As a result of these construction projects, sewer user fees have increased 10 percent every 6 months for the last 5 years and the same rate of increase is expected for the next 4 years.

City officials in my hometown of Auburn estimate that to comply with Federal unfunded environmental mandates alone will cost the city $2 million. Federal drug testing and physical examination rules add costs to the mass transit budget that average out of $200 per bus driver. The cost is passed down to the taxpayers who partially fund the subsidy for the bus service.

In Maine's capital, Augusta, Federal mandates under the Safe Drinking Water Act will result in a tripling of the water district's revenue requirements between 1988 and 1993. Besides raising user costs, this mandate translates into additional fire protection charges to the city of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars on this one item alone. Implementation of new sewage treatment requirements could raise the average yearly user charge by more than $1,500 per year over a 30-year period and could threaten the viability of some local businesses. While quick to point out that Federal mandates have made significant contributions to the city in the past, the lack of Federal funding tends toward diminishing municipal services.

When considering the impact of unfunded Federal mandates on States and municipalities, it is also important to consider the implications on rural communities and small communities, where the impact of unfunded mandates hit hardest and have a disproportionate impact. For instance, the Safe Water Drinking Act is an example of unfunded environmental mandates which impose heavy burdens on small communities like Southwest Harbor and Bar Harbor on Mt. Desert Island in Maine.

The Federal Government shares a large portion of the responsibility for unfunded mandates, but I am encouraged to see that Congress and the administration are taking steps to rectify this problem. According to one study, 244 bills containing mandates were proposed during the 102d Congress. Now there are at least 11 bills, including my own, H.R. 369, pending before Congress aimed at eliminating or mitigating the impact of unfunded mandates. My bill proposes that no State or local government shall be obligated to take any action required by Federal law * * * unless the expenses of such government in taking such action are funded by the United States. The Vice President, in the National Performance Review report on reinventing government, recommends limiting the use of unfunded mandates by the administration. These efforts are a good start on the part of the Federal Government to live up to its responsibility to provide funding for programs it requires States and municipalities to implement.

Mr. Speaker, it is within our prerogative to relieve the burden of unfunded mandates and help restore confidence to fiscal planning at the local level. On this, National Unfunded Mandates Day, we in Congress should commit to doing our part to eliminate unfunded mandates. To paraphrase Mayor Ed Rendell of Philadelphia: if we pass the bill, don't pass the buck!

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Jacksonville City Council for 8 years, I saw first hand the impact of unfunded Federal mandates and regulations. That is why I add my voice to the protests today, National Unfunded Federal Mandates Day.

When asked for horror stories about misguided and unfunded mandates that drain local budgets, officials in my district could go on for days. The plain truth is that elected officials in Washington have overextended their credit and are now spending money for businesses and local governments.

Local officials would like to put more police on the streets and invest in our schools. Unfortunately, the burden of Federal mandates leaves little flexibility for local officials to pursue worthwhile programs. Smaller municipalities in my district cannot even begin to deal with the one-size-fits-all mandates and regulations that have been imposed by the Federal Government.

Here are just a few of the examples of Federal mandates around the five counties of my district:

Jacksonville: For 1993, the city will spend an estimated total of $6.6 million in order to comply with the Underground Storage Tank Regulations, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, EPA asbestos rules, Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

By the year 1998, the cost of compliance with Federal asbestos regulations is estimated to reach $17 million. The current regulation discourages the demolition of dangerous buildings containing asbestos. Under the current regulation, Government entities performing condemnation or demolition activities must comply with the EPA's asbestos regulations. Individual owners need not.

Neptune Beach: With a population of 6,500, a violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act cost them $100,000. That left no money to actually fix the problem. All they can do is wait for the next fine.

Nassau County: Due to the expansive size of the county, rural areas depend on volunteer firemen. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, professional firemen who wish to volunteer on their off time cannot do so without compensation. This restriction causes great hardships on small communities where funding and human resources are limited.

Flagler Beach: The city faces similar problems as Neptune Beach on the need for water treatment and maintenance to comply with the Clean Water Act.

Ormond Beach: Unfunded mandates mean that up to a quarter of its budget is out of the control of local elected officials. Recycling requirements, EPA regulations on lead and copper in water, and the implementation of storm water treatment are just a few of the mandates that will cost the city millions of dollars.

As a Federal legislator, I realize that the Congress can enact some worthwhile programs. However, as a former local official, I know that mandated programs that come from Washington without the funds to implement them often do more harm than good. Unfortunately, many unfunded Federal mandates do not account for the ability of some of our smaller municipalities to comply, they are implemented with rigid guidelines and penalties, and they do not provide any means by which to implement them. We cannot continue to pass laws and mandates on to the people back home and refuse to back them up with the resources necessary to get the job done.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in observance of National Unfunded Mandates Day. As we well know, an unfunded Federal mandate is a requirement imposed by the Federal Government on another government entity, private business, or individual without the appropriate financing to meet that requirement. These mandates on State and local governments and the private sectors, have grown since the 1970's. More than 60 unfunded mandates were enacted in the 1980's alone. It is estimated that these programs cost the U.S. economy $430 billion annually—approximately $4,000 per American household.

Prior to my election to Congress, I had the privilege of serving in the Suffolk County legislature in New York, which was responsible for raising and allocating $1.5 billion each year. My colleagues and I were constantly faced with the difficult and, sometimes, impossible task of complying with increasing Federal demands and decreasing Federal support. For example, over the past 5 years, Suffolk County has seen the seven largest mandates they are required to implement grow by 85 percent. The largest of these will cost the country an additional $17 million in fiscal year 1994—a staggering 120 percent increase since 1989.

Most recently, the Suffolk County Board of Elections notified the county legislature that the motor-voter bill, which was passed and signed into law earlier this Congress—without my support, I might add—is going to cost my constituents at least $2.2 million. I don't envy

the task that they and many others local municipalities now face in finding this money, because, it will surely come from the pockets of the taxpayers. For taxpayers in my congressional district, who already pay some of the highest taxes in the country, this prospect is daunting.

Mr. Speaker, in my short tenure here, I have come to realize that unfunded Federal mandates, for the most part, are usually enacted with the best of intentions. They generally meet legitimate and important policy goals, and by definition, do not increase the Federal deficit. But, this is accomplished through cost-shifting. So while we may be able to go home and say we passed important legislation and didn't increase the deficit, we cannot go home and tell our hard-working constituents we relieved their financial burden. There is no free lunch.

I am glad there is a growing awareness, in Congress and in the administration, of the burdens imposed by mandates. I am a part of the largest freshman class in 45 years, many of whom, like me, served in local government and saw the other side of Federal mandates. I am pleased that there is now a bipartisan caucus of Members, to which I belong, who are concerned about this issue and who are working towards its end.

There are over a dozen bills currently before the House which address this issue. And, the administration's recent proposal on reinventing government also addresses this issue, which I find encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress sensitized to concerns that State and local officials and private individuals and businesses have about Federal mandates. I hope that the efforts put forth today by our Governors, mayors, local officials and the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Mandates, have heightened our colleagues' awareness of this issue.

It is time for Congress to stop passing the buck. We must be honest and acknowledge that unfunded Federal mandates mean that Federal politicians may take the credit for solving the nation's ills while local officials, and ultimately, taxpayers take all the pain.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, National Unfunded Mandates Day is about responsibility, or may I say, characteristic lack of responsibility, with regard to Federal actions toward State and local governments. Congress and the executive branch have been making policy for years now with reckless disregard for the crushing blow such policies—and their cost—can have on State and local entities.

The old joke, "We're from the Federal Government, and we're here to help you," can be updated to say, "We're here from the Federal Government, and we're here to help you go bankrupt." It's 1990's-style federalism, characterized by a Congress unable to exercise any self control and an executive branch unwilling to put some muscle behind its mandate relief rhetoric.

Two days ago, the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations held a hearing in Harrisburg, PA, on the impact of unfunded Federal mandates on State and local governments. The tales of woe we heard from State and local elected officials were worthy of any Halloween horror story.

Port Allegany Borough, in my district, is a rural community home to approximately 2,400 people. Two manufacturing plants have sustained the job base of this borough for many years. Yet the cost of compliance with unfunded Federal mandates threatens to drive property taxes higher, which in turn acts as a disincentive for businesses to stay in this small town. The loss of a manufacturing plant would be devastating to the citizens and other businesses of Port Allegany Borough. Like so many small communities affected by unfunded mandates, this town faces its future with a little trepedation, and for good reason: if current trends continue, the borough may not have a future at all.

County governments, responsible for most of the human services provided on the local level, bear a substantial burden for unfunded mandates. Just consider one statistic: in Clinton County, PA, over 80 percent of the county's budget is either federally or State mandated. Eighty percent. That leaves precious little funding for the county's own priorities, and even less for the health care reform and welfare reform roles the Federal Government expects counties to play.

Mr. Speaker, this unhealthy dependence on State and local treasuries to meet Federal objectives must end. I urge my colleagues to take the message of National Unfunded Mandates Day to heart, and to get serious about real mandate relief for our Nation's State and local governments.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of calling to the attention of the public and Congress the adverse impact of unfunded Federal mandates on State and local governments.

I represent Nashville, TN. While Tennessee is known as the Volunteer State, we Tennesseans did not agree to volunteer all our resources to meet the mandates of the Federal Government.

Tennessee, like almost every other State in the union, continues to experience a tight budget. We have experienced the same increase in demand for services coupled with a sharp decline in revenues. In addition, Federal aid as a share of the total State budget in Tennessee has declined since 1980.

Unlike the Federal Government, Tennessee must balance its budget. But in either case, both Tennesseans and the American taxpayers are no longer able to pay for all the laws Congress has passed over the years.

Earlier this year I called for a joint Tennessee leadership—congressional delegation meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the future of Tennessee as well as improve communications between those of us at the Federal level and those at the State level. The number one issue discussed at the meeting was Federal mandates on the States.

Managing Federal mandates imposed on Tennessee has become an ever-increasing financial challenge. According to recent estimates, Federal mandates imposed on Tennessee since 1986–87 have grown to $153.8 million annually. Tennessee now estimates that by fiscal year 2002 Federal mandates will cost $242 million a year in State general fund appropriations. This is just for laws on the books before 1993.

Based on Tennessee's tax structure, funding of $242 million in Federal mandate costs through State tax increases would equate to a one-half cent increase in the State's 6 percent sales tax or a 9 cent increase in the 20 cent per gallon gas tax.

While much of the legislation we pass in Congress has merit, we must all become more sensitive to the problem of shifting costs to the States to pay for Federal programs. That's why I am here today supporting this event. The Congress must begin to understand that there are Members here who will not continue to compound the burden of Federal mandates on the States.

As a result, I have joined the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Mandates. The caucus will work to pass several bills which I have cosponsored. The first bill, H.R. 140 was introduced by Representative GARY CONDIT. Under this legislation, States and local governments would not have to comply with Federal requirements unless all funds necessary to pay the direct costs are provided by the Federal Government. H.R. 1295, introduced by Representative JIM MORAN, would require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a fiscal impact statement legislation considered in the Congress will have on State and local governments. The fiscal impact statement must be available before we vote on the legislation. I urge my colleagues who have not done so to cosponsor these bills.

Unfunded Federal mandates are a serious problem for State and local governments in Tennessee. This is one member who will not let the Federal Government pick-the-pockets of Tennessee's working people to pay for Federal programs. My constituents demand that this practice end and I agree with them.

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the plight of city, county, and other municipal governments across the country. Today, on National Unfunded Mandates Day, we in Congress are recognizing the harmful impact Federal mandates are having on local governments across our Nation.

Over the past two decades, Washington has created a whole host of new programs that local city and county governments are forced to fund. This practice only puts in a bind Americans who must ultimately pay the local taxes required to fund these programs. These higher local taxes come on top of the taxes we pay to the IRS in Washington.

At last count, there were 172 separate pieces of Federal legislation in force that impose requirements on State and local governments. Millions of dollars from local residents go to fund these programs. If taxpayers in towns and counties could decide what to do with their dollars, they would likely choose to focus on projects of local interest, such as improved schools, new parks and recreation facilities, and better roads.

I have joined in sponsoring the Federal Mandate Relief Act to provide protection to local governments. This legislation was introduced in response to the deep concerns of mayors, county judges, and other local officials from across the country. They want Congress to recognize how mandates are straining the budgets of local governments and constricting municipalities from providing adequate services to their residents. Local leaders rightfully point out that paying for all the programs

placed on them by Congress and the administration can prevent them from fulfilling their obligations under State and local laws.

The Federal Mandate Relief Act would require the Federal Government to conduct sharply focused studies on the effects unfunded mandates have on local communities. Mayors, county judges, and other officials must have a strong say in how Washington would design legislation and programs. Taxpayers at the local level will benefit from having to pay for fewer costly programs that provide limited definable or needed benefits.

Another very promising development to come out of Washington is the reinventing Government initiative. This proposal calls for strictly limiting unfunded mandates. The administration will direct each agency to review all mandates under its jurisdiction and eliminate those that prohibit local governments from effectively serving their constituents. This is a good first step in the right direction.

I will be working hard to get the Federal Mandate Relief Act passed and signed into law as quickly as possible. I have joined with other Representatives in the House to press for quick passage of this legislation. There is strong support in our Nation for reinventing government and making it operate more effectively and efficiently. It is my hope that the Federal Mandate Relief Act will be a major part of the effort to relieve local governments of the burden of unfunded Federal mandates.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today has been declared National Unfunded Mandates Day.

As a former mayor of Carlsbad, and a Member from California, I am all too aware of the fiscal burden unfunded mandates place on our State and local governments.

Unfunded mandates are laws passed by Congress which require State and local governments to render services and meet certain regulations. However, funding to meet these mandates is not provided by Congress.

Federal immigration law provides the most vivid example in California.

Under current Federal law, State and local governments in California are required to provide certain social services to illegal immigrants. However, Congress does not provide the money to pay for these services. The resulting shortfall produces a huge strain.

A recent study found that the net State and local government annual cost of providing these services to undocumented immigrants in California was $5 billion a year. This is outrageous.

It is also interesting timing that Unfunded Mandates Day is today, as the White House introduces its legislation on health care.

The Clinton health care legislation will be the biggest mandate of all. The regulations that the Clintons have proposed in order to produce a Government-run system of health care will give new meaning to the word "excessive."

The Clinton health care proposal means: a Government-run system, the creation of 100 new Government bureaucracies to micromanage and regulate decisions and mandates on business.

I predict that if the major provisions of Clinton's plan are passed it will unleash a regulatory juggernaut that we have never witnessed before and thus, destroy the quality of our health care system.

The bottom line is that when the Federal Government passes mandates, businesses and individuals suffer.

States currently face an unprecedented fiscal challenge because of the Federal Government's practice of passing unfunded Federal mandates. California is no exception.

Although mandating programs often have merit, the Federal Government needs to take greater responsibility in financing their implementation.

First, Federal immigration law: It has been estimated in a recent report that the net State and local cost associated with providing services to undocumented immigrants throughout California is approximately $5 billion annually. In San Diego County it is $244,287,699.

Second, Federal Clean Air Act—The Federal Clean Air Act mandates California's air pollution control program to meet specified Federal clean air requirements. Estimated cost to the State of California to operate the State air resources board for 1 year: $69 million.

Third, Cal/OSHA Compliance Program—The Federal Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 provides for up to 50-percent funding of an approved State OSHA plan. The Cal/OSHA Program has not been provided 50-percent Federal funds since fiscal year 1983–84. However, the Cal/OSHA Program is the largest State plan in the country and receives approximately 25 percent of all moneys appropriated by Congress to the 25 States with their own State OSHA plan. Cost to California: $37.2 million.

Fourth, National Voter Registration Act, so-called motor-voter legislation—The second bill signed into law by President Clinton is estimated to cost California $26 million to implement.

Fifth, Fair Labor Standards Act [FLSA]. This law requires the State to pay employees at a rate of 1½ of the regular rate of pay for all hours beyond 40 in a 7-consecutive-day workweek, $86 million.

Sixth, Federal Clean Water Act—The Federal Clean Water Act mandates California to regulate the discharge of pollutants into California's waters. It is estimated that additional resources for permitting monitoring and assessments, and the development of water quality plans would be necessary to fully comply with this Federal mandate. Annual cost to the Water Resources Control Board: $37.4 million.

Efforts to reduce the financial burden of Federal mandates is supported by the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Federal Mandates, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Governors Association, the Association of Counties, and the National Association of City Supervisors.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today is National Unfunded Mandates Day. All over America, State and local officials from both parties are coming together to tell Congress one thing loud and clear: no more unfunded Federal mandates.

As my colleagues are aware, many State and local government budgets are straining under the onerous burden of unfunded Federal mandates. It is estimated that unfunded mandates cost the States as much as $500 billion a year. State and local spending to implement Federal mandates has increased from 30 percent of their budgets in 1962 to a whopping 50 percent in 1992. Additionally, many States are being forced to raise taxes or cut services to comply with the new Federal mandates routinely passed by Congress.

Recently, I introduced an amendment to the U.S. Constitution with bipartisan support—House Joint Resolution 254—that would force Congress to pay for any new Federal programs it mandates on the States. My legislation, which has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union and the National League of Cities, would relieve the States of any obligation to comply with a new Federal mandate unless that mandate was fully funded by Congress. This amendment is necessary because Congress' increasing appetite for unfunded Federal mandates shows no signs of abating. Furthermore, many States fear that Congress will solve the Federal budget problem by simply transferring more and more unfunded mandates to the States.

I believe amending the U.S. Constitution is necessary in this instance because unlike statutory law, my amendment would force Congress to face up to its own fiscal responsibility. Currently, the rules of Congress are too easy to evade, and statutory law too frequently waived, for any legislative avenue but a constitutional amendment to end this pressing problem. While Congress could pass a bill banning new unfunded mandates, I remind my colleagues that Congress tried this tactic earlier to hold down spending, with dismal results. In fact, one pundit compared Congress trying to stop unfunded mandates without a constitutional amendment to a drunk who locks away the booze but keeps the key in his pocket.

I am not alone in my analysis that a constitutional amendment is needed. Sharpe James, the Democratic mayor of Newark, recently wrote a letter to me endorsing my legislation. In his letter, Mayor James wrote:

> I agree with you that a constitutional amendment is the only sure way to overcome the problem of unfunded mandates. I hope that your constitutional amendment meets with success.

My legislation enjoys broad support across my home State of New Jersey. All together, 31 New Jersey municipalities and 1 county have passed resolutions endorsing my legislation. These communities include the largest city in the State, Newark, as well as communities that I represent, such as Fanwood, Roselle Park, North Plainfield, Watchung, Union, South Plainfield, and Green Brook. Communities supporting House Joint Resolution 254 outside of my congressional district include: Cedar Grove, Barnegat, Berlin, Aberdeen, Maywood, Mansfield, Closter, Ocean Gate, Hampton, Frankford, Carteret, Boonton, Bordentown, Northfield, Fort Lee, Estell Manor, Margate City, Lopatcong, Northvale, Bernardsville, Neptune, Monroe, and Hardyston. Morris County has also passed a resolution supporting enactment of House Joint Resolution 254.

Mr. Speaker, mandates are as pervasive as they are onerous. A tally by the National Conference of State Legislatures finds 172 Federal laws that require State and local governments to spend money on federally mandated

programs. I believe that one reason this issue is gaining so much attention recently is because most mandates were passed only in the last 10 years, with some 15 mandates added during the last congressional term alone. Statistics show that Congress enacted 27 major laws that imposed new or expanded mandates on the States during the 1980's, while 20 such statutes were enacted in the 1970's, 12 in the 1960's, 0 in the 1950's and 1940's, and only 2 in the 1930's. Clearly, the growth of mandates has grown out of control.

The cost of unfunded mandates is staggering. Although only rough estimates exist on the true cost of all mandates nationwide, anecdotal evidence shows that the cost of mandates must be high. Consider that in 1990, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] predicted that by the year 2000, cities and towns will have to spend $12.8 billion annually just to comply with Federal environmental mandates that are currently in effect. Or that Maryland's State Budget Office calculates that one-quarter of its budget is directed by the Federal Government through mandates. Or that mandates will cost Ohio $307.9 million this year. Or that mandates account for approximately 13 percent of Newark, NJ's 1993 budget. Or that environmental mandates account for 11 percent of the budget for the city of Anchorage, AK. Or that New York City will spend $4.6 billion over a decade for environmental mandates. Or that a study for the city of Columbus, OH, found that complying with Federal environmental mandates alone will cost the city up to $1.6 billion over the next decade, for an annual cost of $856 a household. Or that according to Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan, his city will spend $576 million to comply with Federal mandates this year. In addition, Los Angeles will spend over $6 billion on capital expenditures over the next 5 years to comply with Federal mandates. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on detailing the list the burden unfunded Federal mandates place on our Nation's States and cities.

Mandates can also be downright ridiculous. This is because most mandates are one-size-fits-all—they tell the States and cities not only what to do, but how to do it, preempting State and local initiatives and impeding innovation and efficiency. I ask my colleagues to consider the most egregious examples of waste by mandate I could find from two cities: Columbus, OH, and Philadelphia, PA.

Under the Safe Water Drinking Act, Columbus spends $24,000 a year to test for 43 pesticides that are not used in Ohio. Among these 43 pesticides is one that was used only on pineapples in Hawaii and was banned in 1977.

Columbus estimates that it will have to spend $190 million over the next 20 years to reduce the level of artizine, a corn herbicide, in its water supply to a level of less than three parts per billion, or the equivalent of one-half an aspirin tablet per 16,000 gallons of water.

Under the Motor-Voter Act, all polling places in Philadelphia will be required to be accessible to the handicapped. Unfortunately, 35 to 40 percent of the polling places used by the city are only rented for 2 days.

The EPA has required that Philadelphia build an advanced wastewater treatment system to improve oxygen levels for fish in the Delaware Water Basin. This will cost Philadelphia upward of $500 million, irrespective of the fact that Philadelphia has been tottering near bankruptcy for a number of years now.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to stop Congress from passing legislation where Congress gets the political credit and the States, counties, and municipalities are forced to pay the bill. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, House Joint Resolution 254, to put an end, once and for all, to new unfunded Federal mandates.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today, across the country, businesses, city councilmembers, mayors, county supervisors, Governors, State legislators, and even Members of this body are demanding the end of the practice of handing down fiscal responsibility for a mandated program. No longer can lower governments and businesses pick up the tab for the unfunded programs of a higher government.

Budget woes are not unique to the Federal Government. Our State and local governments are also feeling the effects of shrinking coffers and greater demand for services. We should not be a party to further straining the solvency of their budgets by imposing on them the costs for Federal programs. It is an unfair and needless burden for them to assume.

I urge my fellow colleagues at all levels to embrace a new philosophy—pay for the programs you require lower governments to adopt. It's just that simple. If the program costs are too high, adjust the program's requirements accordingly until it is affordable for the Government implementing the program. Don't expect others to pay the bill—we can't afford any more free lunches.

Today, join in the nationwide efforts to stop passing the buck for Federal programs to State and local governments. Cosponsor legislation, such as my bill, H.R. 410, which prevents Congress from continuing on this disastrous path and reimburses State governments for additional direct costs of federally mandated and unfunded programs.

Local governments are clearly in a better position to determine the needs of their citizens and how their taxes should be spent to benefit its resources. The Federal Government should not receive money from State and local budgets to finance its programs. Let's stop taking credit for national policy goals for which we are not financially responsible.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's State and local elected officials have long pleaded with Congress to stop passing unfunded Federal mandates. By passing legislation requiring State and local governments to comply with Federal mandates, without providing the funds to do so, Congress forces States to stretch their budgets, cut programs, or raise taxes.

We know even better the cost to Ohio since Gov. George Voinovich issued a comprehensive study of unfunded Federal mandates on our State. The statistics are alarming. According to Governor Voinovich, Ohio will pay $1.7 billion over 4 years to comply with Federal mandates.

Medicaid, a federally mandated entitlement program, is particularly costly to States. Currently this program accounts for 17 percent of all State spending. By 1995 it will consume 25 percent of all State budgets. That means States will have 8 percent less money to spend on other pressing needs.

Recently I introduced the Medicaid Health Allowance Act of 1993, which enables States to redirect Medicaid funds into health allowance programs that enroll eligible individuals in private market plans. It promotes State flexibility to meet local health needs. Many States are ready to initiate this Medicaid managed care program now, but they are blocked by Federal barriers.

Another example of mandates costly for States includes environmental mandates. The Safe Drinking Water Act requires States to test drinking water for a total of 83 contaminants. Well meaning in principle, this one-size-fits-all Federal mandate requires testing for chemicals not even used in Ohio.

As a former State senator, I am particularly sensitive to the many costs that are transferred to State and local budgets to pay for Federal mandates. So one of my top priorities in Congress is the elimination of unfunded Federal mandates. I am a cosponsor of several legislative initiatives either to require that the Federal Government pay for these mandates or to require a local impact and cost analysis.

For example, I have cosponsored the Mandate and Community Assistance Reform Act (H.R. 886). This bill establishes a commission to set standards for mandates and eliminate those mandates which do not meet the standards. It also gives local governments more flexibility in using Federal funds, allowing local officials to tailor social service programs to meet the specific needs of their community.

Congress has finally started to take notice on this issue. The budget alternative proposed this year by House Republicans, cutting spending first, included a provision requiring that all Federal mandate costs be reimbursed. Although our provision was not included in the President's budget, it sends a signal that many Federal lawmakers understand the problem with Federal mandates: Balancing the Federal budget on the backs of State and local governments is no solution to the Federal budget crisis.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, there are two realities: one the normal kind of existence, and the other is the twilight zone of unfunded Federal mandates. In normal reality, I stepped into a taxi. The cab started and the meter read $1; $1 quickly became $2; $2 rapidly turned into $5. At my destination the meter stopped. I paid my fare. However, in the twilight zone of unfunded Federal mandates the meter keeps on running, the fare keeps adding up, and the ride never ends for the American taxpayer, who continuously pays the monster Federal cabby.

I am introducing legislation which will amend the Clean Water Act's storm water provision. The provision has forced my hometown, San Antonio, TX, to raise taxes. This provision has given my constituents a tax increase. This provision has given the job providers—the small-business people—the monthly water statements have gone from $30 to $200 a month. Help me, help our constituents, by supporting my bill, which like Rod Serling used to say, "is submitted for your approval."

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the congressional unfunded mandates caucus, I am pleased to do my part to bring

much-needed attention to the financial burdens Congress is placing on State and local governments.

I have long spoken out against the Federal Government conducting its social engineering designs through mandates on the private sector. These burdens inevitably increase costs and destroy jobs and are really a hidden tax on all Americans.

With a restricted budget but unrestrained desire to expand the reach of government, Congress has more recently turned to State and local government to finance its desires. In the areas of social services, transportation, environment, public safety and health, Federal mandates are escalating costs and restricting the flexibility of localities to meet their own unique problems.

In Colorado, for instance, the State government has identified 195 Federal programs containing mandates for State and local agencies. Over 100 of these mandates are direct orders which the State or locality must comply with in order to participate or receive Federal funds. It will cost the Colorado State government $794 billion this fiscal year alone to comply with these mandates.

One of the most egregious areas of Federal abuse comes in health care. Recent changes in Federal social services programs have nearly doubled the costs of Medicaid coverage for some, while causing dramatic cost inflation in nearly all categories.

Unfortunately, Congress has found a real taste for dishing its problems off on others. Just in the past few months, Congress has added major new mandates under the Motor-Voter Act and the 1993 Reconciliation Act. And there is little relief in sight for the folks back home—Congress is currently considering 60 bills which contain some form of mandates or requirements for State or local governments.

The sad truth is that Members of Congress have found that, through mandates, they can gain all the political benefits of creating new entitlements for their constituents without having to face any of the political pain of paying for them. The unfunded mandates caucus is dedicated to restoring accountability for forcing Congress to prioritize its spending desires and fully fund its mandates on State and local governments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] has expired.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

---

## TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the 1 hour allotted to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

There was no objection.

---

## NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

### UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

Mr. CONDIT. I thank the gentleman for the time. I have several speakers that I would like to yield to, and I hope we can squeeze everybody in here.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California allowing me to speak tonight and bring focus to this issue that he has done a great job in bringing a lot more focus to here in the Congress, the issue of unfunded mandates. As many speakers have already said tonight, and as the gentleman from Utah just said, Congress and Federal agencies must stop imposing crippling legislative mandates on State and local governments without providing the funding to carry them out.

It is all too easy for Congress to accept credit for noble legislation but then sidestep the costs by passing them along to States. But it is not only easy—but also dishonest—a dishonest way of accomplishing Federal objectives without the pain of increasing Federal spending or expanding our already burgeoning annual Federal deficits.

In the past 2 years, there have been a number of studies measuring the direct impact of unfunded Federal mandates on specific States or localities. One of the best was done in Ohio by Governor George Voinovich. This comprehensive report concludes that between 1992 and 1995, the cost of unfunded Federal mandates to the State of Ohio alone, not to other local governments but just the State government, will be a whopping $1.74 billion.

I recommend the Ohio study to those interested in understanding better the impact we have here in Congress.

Nine Ohio cities report 10-year costs of $2.8 billion to comply with various environmental mandates. Among those, for example, is a questionable Federal rule that requires Ohio communities to test water for an herbicide used on cotton—a crop not ever grown in Ohio.

In another example, the Safe Drinking Water Act requires each and every local government to test for 83 chemicals, many of which are no longer in common use. This is representative of the one-size-fits-all kind of mentality in Congress.

Every year, the Federal Government approves laws and regulations that cost not only State and local governments, but also taxpayers and consumers billions of dollars. Inevitably, it is the taxpayer who will be asked to foot the bill, either in the form of higher State and local taxes or cuts in important community services.

The Federal Government must be aware of these high costs before it passes laws and regulations impacting States and localities.

I agree with the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1950

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to be quick because the gentleman has talked so well already. I would like to just give you a couple of statistics from my home State of Georgia that I think are pertinent. Georgia has 39 unfunded mandates right now that elected officials have to work with. The total cost of these 39 unfunded mandates is $1.2 billion. Sixty-nine cities in Georgia have passed resolutions asking us to stop unfunded mandates. To give you some specific examples, the city of Atlanta alone spent $6 million last year just for public school unfunded mandates. The city of Waycross has to spend 45 percent of its property taxes on unfunded mandates; $2 million for example comes out of the water and sewer budget; $300,000 for solid waste. All of these then deny the city of Waycross other uses for this valuable money.

Finally I want to mention the city of Savannah. They spent $1,045,000 for mandates which include landfill liner, water pollutant test, lead and copper corrosion control. The Federal contribution for this was less than half. This has to stop. It is taxing our own constituents and it is killing the elected officials because there are tax increases here and we ought to own up to it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONDIT. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS]. I have other speakers, but the gentleman has been so kind with these 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. The time is growing late and I would be willing to yield another couple of minutes if that would help. We have been patiently waiting.

Mr. CONDIT. I would like to get Mr. SWETT and Mr. MORAN on. They have both been very active.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to come before the House and to talk about the unfunded mandates problem. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle but certainly with the leadership of GARY CONDIT from California have recognized this and have organized a body of Members to do what I think is substantial and substantive work in this regard.

I have a very short story that I would like to tell that illuminates and brings to light the problem that New Hampshire is facing.

I am from the Second District of New Hampshire. There is a small town called Jaffrey, NH. When I first was elected to this body in 1990 the first town I happened to be traveling through after the election was Jaffrey. I went into the town hall, introduced myself, and before I knew it I was pinned against the wall by the town manager, who proceeded to tell me about how the small town of 1,500 people, experiencing a 20-percent unemployment rate, was being saddled with a $4.5 million water purification facility. Their water test had even showed that over the past 30 years it had never changed and it was just the changing technology that was forcing them to have to adhere to these unfunded mandates. This was a very clear and real situation.

I saw how it was putting this poor community flat on its back.

I think we have got to stop this practice of unfunded mandates, bring some responsibility into the process and ultimately, I hope, return back to the local communities the responsibility of their being able to conduct their lives in a way that is best for the safety and health and welfare of their citizens.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I understand the need to wrap this up because the Republican side has been very generous with their time.

But, GARY, since we introduced our bill a couple of years ago I think there is reason for some optimism. The fact is we have had twice as many cosponsors, States, and localities across the Nation are aware of what is happening to them. I think the American people are beginning to realize that they are losing the control they ought to have over their local money which has to go into schools and police and fire protection and their own local priorities. It cannot because it is going to fund unfunded mandates. The fact is States and localities spend more money today on unfunded Federal mandates than all of the Federal assistance they get. And the other fact is that they are less able to do so. So the best thing we can do for them right now is to stop passing the bill and then passing the buck onto other local governments and the private sector and to stand up and say "Look, we are going to let you determine what your priorities are." That is what this issue is all about.

I think it is time to bring government back to the American people and we appreciate all of our cosponsors and appreciate the generosity of the Republican side letting us share this time and emphasizing this subject.

Mr. CONDIT. I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS] thank you very much. The gentleman has been very kind. I appreciate it and maybe I can return the favor sometime.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. As a product of local government, I understand where the gentleman is coming from.

I thank the Speaker for allowing us to give a little bit of time to the gentlemen.

What the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] and I would like to talk about this evening is not a new subject to you.

I was quite taken aback earlier this evening by some of the comments made by the majority whip and the information he and those who participated in that special order were passing on to you and the audience and any Members who may be listening. I take great exception to the level of misinformation that has surrounded this subject.

In my time in public office I have never been involved in anything where so much information was taken virtually as gospel about the subject.

So I want to take some time here this evening along with my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, to talk about some of the areas in which this misinformation most pointedly takes place and share with you a little bit about the 4 days we collectively spent in Mexico reviewing some of this information which almost all of a sudden we began to believe relative to labor and the environment.

So let me start with a little story here about the Government of Mexico, where we have come from, in terms of the policies of the Federal Government of Mexico.

The Mexican Federal Government was moving toward a socialistic order back in the sixties and seventies to the degree that they expropriated most of the major industries in Mexico. They finished that up in 1982 by taking over all of the financial institutions. That meant that if you are a stockholder in a private bank you were no longer a stockholder in the private bank, it belonged to the Mexican Government.

That began to show that it was a real problem on the economy and on the development of Mexico and to create a better standard of living which was the intent. It did actually the opposite.

What happened? Inflation set in. Inflation got out of hand. It got to the point where people could not buy anything.

So as the administrations passed in Mexico we had a change in the general philosophy of what direction the Mexican nation should go to provide a standard of living for the people that was acceptable, from which then they could build on to a better standard of living.

Ladies and gentlemen, that was the major reason, that era was the major reason for the influx of illegal immigrants into the United States. They could not feed their families in Mexico with 1200-percent-per-year inflation. That is how huge it got.

So then we start a new trail with President Salinas' predecessor, President de la Madrid. President de la Madrid decided that we were on the wrong course, that is the Federal Government of Mexico, that we needed to change course.

In so doing we needed to address the issue primarily of inflation, to permit individuals the amount of money necessary to even buy the basics for living.

President de la Madrid proceeded then on a course which President Salinas has followed. It is interesting to note that at this point we had a Secretary of Treasury by the name of Jim Baker. In 1985 Jim Baker was up to his eyeballs in what they referred to as a Third World debt and how nations could not pay this debt, that is Peru, Mexico, and others.

□ 2000

So after a period of time the Treasury Department came out with what they referred to as the Baker initiative. One of the important cornerstones of this was that the nations who wanted to change and wanted to become meaningful members financially and to pay off their debts and retain their integrity had to do certain things that they were not doing or had not been doing in the history of their country, one of which was to privatize industries, the opposite that had been taking place in Mexico.

The other was to have a program within the nation that would attract foreign capital, which Mexico and the others had not had.

There were a number of other issues, not the least of which was you have got to take a look at the kind of government you have, bite some political bullets and make some sense out of it so that it is productive.

It is interesting to note that the Baker plan and the evolutionary process from socialism to capitalism in Mexico transcended one another as we moved into the 1990's.

So we have now a President who is in his fifth year, President Salinas, who understands economics, who has a Ph.D. from Harvard, and is one who is trying to bring about the next step in the Mexican culture, and that is to bring the standard of living up.

Since that time, now, we must understand, since that time the inflation has dropped to 8 percent, a tolerable level.

As an agreement during that period of time, the Mexican Government worked with the unions and said that there is no point in chasing the stars because inflation is out of control. If you will bite the bullet, we will bring back the wages, but there will be a time here because of the inflation that we are not going to be able to offer anything in the way of increases. And so all of a sudden you have the offer.

That means then that the labor unions are in bed with government? The opposite is true. It was a working agreement for the benefit of the future of Mexico.

Now they are back at it and they are beginning to bring back, as they have the last 5 years, that particular level of increase in pay which is now approximately 50 percent greater than they had.

So the purchasing power that was referred to earlier in the other special order has increased now, and on October 1 they increased it still again, and the labor unions are back now in their normal position after having worked with the government during that tremendous crisis of inflation in Mexico.

So when we talk about labor unions, we are talking about a very strong part of the Mexican society that is not under the thumb of the Mexican Government.

And you say, "Oh, MCCANDLESS, you have been reading too many articles."

In this 4 days, we spent time with not only our labor attaches, but time with the labor union leaders, and I will get into that in a little bit; but now I would like to yield to my colleague, who also took our Government Operations Committee trip, sponsored by our chairman. It was an eye opener, and a revealer and a confirmation of many of the things that I felt were true, but needed to have that confirmation.

I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

We had quite a trip. As the gentleman was, I was very impressed with President Salinas and his cabinet, top grade, top level people. What he has done since 1986 has been rather dramatic. We had a chance to observe that first hand.

The last time I was in Mexico City was over 10 years ago. We could see a tremendous change in terms of environmental concerns, in terms of poverty; but since 1986 the Salinas government has done exactly what the gentleman says it has done. It got lower inflation rates. It has gotten lower interest rates. It has frozen its spending. It is starting to live within its means.

As a result of that, their economy is starting to grow. As a result of that, their cost of living and their opportunities to buy more, have more disposable income, buy more products from the United States, have grown as well.

Since 1986, Mexico joined the GATT.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. For our listeners, that is the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, which is an international organization.

Mr. ZELIFF. That is correct, which has brought down tariffs and expanded their trade, so rather than building walls, they tore walls down. As a result of that our trade in the United States to Mexico has grown from a $4.9 billion negative balance of trade to some $6 billion positive.

Now, if you assume—and the gentleman has a chart over here and I will let him point it out—but for every billion dollars worth of export business, it equates to some 20,000 or 22,000 jobs. I think that is the key ingredient here.

Since 1986 we have gone from a negative $4.9 billion to a $6 billion-plus, backed up by the people who made those products that went into that export, and certainly we were able basically to increase the job level as a result of trade with Mexico.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. I think it is important at this point that we bring in another part of the equation.

I talked about privatizing industries. When all these industries were run by the Federal Government, they did not have to report a profit. They did not have to pay taxes. As a result they were a liability, rather than an asset of the Federal Government composition.

President Salinas has privatized somewhere in the neighborhood of over 700 of the previously government-owned agencies. The sale of the telephone company, the sale of the banks and financial institutions, the sale of the airlines, the steel companies and major, major types of industries, has brought $23 billion to the Federal Treasury, as well as making those private enterprises which now still employ people, but pay taxes to the Federal Government, which then permits the Federal Government to move into the country and do things that it was not able to do, which raises the standard of living and the ability of people to communicate and help the overall picture.

I might add, we do not want to get too technical here tonight, but as a result of what they have been doing, for the last 2 years the Mexican Government budget has had a surplus, last year $22 billion.

It is interesting to note that Mexico's percentage of gross national debt to gross product is less than either Japan or the United States, so that the Third World country that we talked about just briefly a little bit earlier has moved from a position of begging people to extend their loans, not knowing how they are going to pay for them, to paying off loans to the point that they have decreased their international debt by 51 percent and are running a surplus.

I think this is important, because as we talked about the jobs, we have to talk about, "Well, that's great, Bill and Al, but who is going to buy these goods and services?"

The idea is that the Mexican economy is growing now, that jobs are becoming available. People are working, and as a result they now have an average income of $4,000 per capita, which is something far greater than they have had at any time in the history of the country.

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

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. It is interesting, in an earlier special order the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] talked about the fact that there is no market in Mexico for our goods. It was his special order and I did not want to interrupt him.

But I have to just show this, you cannot see these on the TV set, but here is an end cap display of Pampers, another end cap, a whole wall display of Rubbermaid products made in the United States; Prestone antifreeze, made in the United States; Budweiser beer, Marlboro cigarettes, Carnation milk, shampoos, you know, one after another.

You know, 70 cents on the dollar from Mexican imports goes to United States goods.

Again, I think the gentleman mentioned $450 per capita, which is one of the highest, and that is the chart right next to the gentleman there, in terms of the average amount of goods, American goods and products that people in Mexico buy from the United States.

So I think the fact that there is no market down there is kind of a myth. I would just like to correct that. I wish I could have shown these pictures, but there is a great opportunity to expand our markets.

Let us take a look at the automobile industry, and the gentleman has some experience in that. The gentleman might just mention a little bit about that. We went to a couple factories. The gentleman went to Delco, for example. The gentleman might just mention a little bit about that.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Yes. That is a very interesting part of the industrial complex. I think it is important to anyone who might be listening that we use that as an example of the problems that will be corrected and can be corrected to our advantage when we look at the second chart here. We see a little brick wall.

□ 2010

Mexican tariffs average 10 percent, United States tariffs average 4 percent. I might add that almost 50 percent of the Mexican goods being imported do not have tariffs at the current time.

Now why I am mentioning this to my colleagues is that Mexican wall, when it comes to United States products, that is automobiles or trucks, is a 50-percent wall. So, if that car is judged to be a $10,000 value, then there is a $5,000 fee paid before that car can move inland into interior Mexico.

As a result, over the years, because the market has improved, the United States manufacturers of automobiles, General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler,

could not find it competitive to pay for that import, so, because the market was enough, they went and built assemply plants in Mexico to avoid the 50-percent tariff.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. McCANDLESS. I see we are joined by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH], and, yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. McCANDLESS] for yielding because it is not only just the tariff on automobiles, but Mexico also has local content laws that affect, that acted as a barrier to automobiles, and it is very interesting to compare what NAFTA requires, specifically in the automobile sector of the United States into Mexico.

The United States under NAFTA would reduce a tariff on Mexico automobiles, but the tariff right now is only 2.5 percent. That tariff would go to zero. On the other hand, why Mexico has not been a good market for United States automobiles is because not only their high tariffs, but also their domestic content. NAFTA would require Mexico to reduce tariffs on United States cars from 20 to 10 percent immediately and then to zero in 10 years. It would immediately eliminate the coil on new car imports which is now 20 percent of their market. It would phase out the trade balance requirements which force United States producers to locate in Mexico and would replace a Mexican content requirement with a North American content requirement that would give American automobile manufacturers preferential treatment in the Mexican market. Japanese cars, West German cars, would still face the high tariff, but American cars would not.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Right. I think we should know these figures. Now that we have the manufacturers in Mexico producing United States vehicles, there is a 20-percent content requirement that means that 20 percent of that going into that car has to be manufactured, produced, in Mexico, and we talk in terms of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We are talking in terms now of a car sold in Mexico, sold in the United States or sold in Canada that would have to have 62½-percent content from one or more of those countries in order not to have the tariffs that would be applied to other types of cars and trucks, and so that becomes a real boon to the North American manufacturers of automobiles, and for the life of me I have trouble visualizing the fact that this is going to lose jobs because article after article, and I would quote one, Forbes, April 12 of this year, spent quite a bit of its issue talking about the Ford manufacturing complex in Mexico and how many of those units would be manufactured after NAFTA in the United States, and particularly Thunderbirds and Cougars in Ohio, and shipped and completed ready to deliver into Mexico because it would be cheaper.

Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that cars manufactured in the United States and sent to Mexico would run about $400 less a copy.

Mr. ZELIFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCANDLESS. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. ZELIFF. That is confirmed by Lee Iacocca, and we were talking to him last week when we were at the White House, and what he and also the Department of Commerce estimates is that NAFTA will create $1 billion in new sales for U.S. auto makers for the first year, and he very eloquently took the time and pointed out that productivity is the key. That car can be made in Detroit cheaper than it can be made in Mexico, and that this the key to the whole ballgame.

It is interesting. In my district we have a firm, Davidson Textron in Dover, NH, that manufactures and supplies dashboards and arm rests for the automotive industry. With NAFTA a proposal that Textron supports the market for the auto industry open provided more opportunity for the firm such as Textron to increase its sales, so they supply all kinds of products for Detroit, all three of the car manufacturers. Those products will increase. They will ship them to Detroit. Detroit will make the cars, ship them to Mexico, expand our market.

We are talking about 1 billion dollars' worth of a new market.

Mr. McCANDLESS. I think that is just one example. Let me give my colleague another one.

One of the luncheons that we had in the city of Chihuahua in the State of Chihuahua which is north central Mexico was with local businessmen, and then later we met with labor in the area, and one of the businessmen is a Caterpillar tractor distributor for the State of Chihuahua and the adjoining state, and he said within the last 5 years that Caterpillar tractors, and we are talking about the major unit, the purchases of those since the GATT agreement, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and since Mexico in 1986 readjusted their approach and joined GATT, that Caterpillar had sold last year 1250 units instead of the previous couple of years back 250 units, and I think that is an example of what we are looking at here in terms of products and markets.

Another thing I think we need to talk about here in terms of Mexico and how are they going to pay for these various and sundry types of goods and services is, and I must point this out to the gentleman, that 45 percent of the United States deficit of trade is oil that we import. Mexico has a large reserve, a huge reserve of oil, and that oil is in the process and can be developed into a very productive flow to the United States instead of our buying the oil overseas.

We also have many of the minerals in the metal field that we import from South Africa and other parts of the country that are available to Mexico, but the wherewithal, and the knowledge and the equipment is not available to develop these minerals in present day, but would be in the future.

Therein lies a trade of materials which we need for our industrial complex for finished goods that they need for theirs.

I would like now to talk about something that has become key in this argument relative to the NAFTA program, and it deals with Mexican labor, and I mentioned to my colleagues earlier that the labor unions agreed with the government, until they got through that inflation crisis and that terrible situation that they had relative to their economy, that they would work with the government as best as they could. Quite by accident at one of the activities sponsored by the embassy in Mexico City I ended up at a table with the gentleman who is the president of one of the unions representing 3 million workers, and at that table we had also the labor attaché from the Embassy and also the agricultural attaché, and it was very interesting because I was asking this gentleman point blank out, as politely as I could, all of these things which have been a part of those who oppose NAFTA relative to labor is in bed with the Federal Government, and he assured me, and was very polite about it, that, as president of a union, he was not in bed with the federal government, and he went into detail about what we talked about relative to their crisis.

The Mexican Constitution sets up the fact that workers will have rights to organize and freedoms of association in collective bargaining. That is in their Constitution. Mexico, believe it or not, is a highly unionized country, and about 9 to 10 million workers are in these unions or about 30 to 35 percent of the work force.

Now, we have heard about maquiladoras. Those are the agreement manufacturing or processing plants along the border and now inland as far as Guadalajara. Their unions are not too strong in the Baja area, but in Matamoros and Monterrey they are heavily unionized.

I want to emphasize this:

According to those in our United States embassy in Mexico City there is no knowledge or no evidence of the Mexican Government suppressing any type of union activity, particularly in the maquiladora unionization areas. Incidentally, the Mexico workers will work with their employer after the

union has reached certain types of agreements with a new administration in Mexico.

□ 2020

It is a little different than us. You say well, yes, but that is like going to bed. And I posed that question to the gentleman who is president of the union.

He said, "Well, over the years, Mr. MCCANDLESS, we have been able to get such things as Social Security, retirement, health benefits, and so on, as unions working with the Federal Government because those were Federal Government programs. And then we sit down with the labor unions."

I said, "Wait a minute now. What if you can't get agreement with the Federal Government?"

He said, "Well, then the Federal Government has got a lot of problems."

I said, "Has this happened?"

He said, "Yes, a couple of times since my union was formed back in 1919." But he said, "Usually we are able to work things out with a new administration so that we understand and they understand that certain things are going to have to happen during that administration as it relates to labor and labor policy. Then we sit down and negotiate with our employer the various benefits and things and working conditions and so on."

Mr. ZELIFF. If the gentleman will yield, we hear a lot about the 58-cent-an-hour so-called Perot sucking sound of jobs leaving the United States. In our trip down there we talked to many employers. I think the gentleman was there when we asked the question, we found many employers were paying on an average of, some, anywhere from $2.76 to $3.86 an hour, plus benefits.

The key factor here is that when you look at productivity, and I think that is what the bottom line here is, basic wage rates it is about 10 percent.

I can remember when I ran the Xerex anti-freeze business for Du Pont. Freight was some 10 to 15 percent, and wages was less than 10 percent. The key thing is all the costs that go into that product. That is what is going to determine our ability to compete worldwide.

If we look at Mexico in terms of the bigger picture, we have got a chance with the North American Free-Trade Agreement to combine forces in a partnership with three countries that will allow us to come up with a $6.5 trillion market and 370 million people. That will give us an ability certainly to take a trade agreement that was conceived by Ronald Reagan, negotiated by George Bush, and implemented by Bill Clinton, to create jobs and provide us an opportunity to compete worldwide.

Does the gentleman not think that is where we are heading?

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Yes. Let me continue on the wage thing. In 1991, and these are the figures given to us by the Embassy, real average cash wage in Mexico for a factory laborer was $2.17 per hour. This is real cash. We are not talking about the fringe benefits, the bonuses that the industries pay at the end of the year, 10 percent of their profits. We are not talking about the health benefits that they get through the employer deduction. We are not talking about the child care that they participate in, and a number of other things which are employer-paid, not employee-paid.

Two dollars seventeen cents per hour for a factory laborer, $4.90 per hour for clerical help, $3.40 per hour for semi-skilled workers, and $22.70 per hour for professionals and managers. In 1993 the wages will go up as far as the lower part is concerned. The unions are now negotiating for the coming years, and we will be looking at an increase, and the Federal Government is not involved. The deal that they had with the Federal Government in the 1980's is gone. They are now involved in negotiating again as regular unions in a regular set of circumstances.

I might add that as a part of that trip, we talk about the labor in Mexico and how things are cheaper there and how supposedly everybody is going to move south to Mexico to manufacture something. In the town of Chihuahua we met with a gentleman, as I mentioned at lunch, who owned the Inter-Ceramic Tile plant. They make floor tile, beautiful floor tile.

We went out to his plant and went through it, and I have not seen a better designed, better operated plant than this particular one.

As a result of that we got into quite a conversation relative to his operation. We were interested in learning that because of certain types of materials and because of markets that currently exist, irrespective of NAFTA, Inter-Ceramic Tile is building a plant outside of Dallas. They are coming to the United States.

So we got into a little bit of mathematics there. I asked him about wages. I asked him about this. And he said when all is said and done and that piece of tile is in a box ready to ship, we are looking at probably about a 5 percent additional cost on that tile, which is more than made up by the problems we have in getting the tile to the United States for sale by the trucks and the other activities that they use for transportation purposes.

Those people in that plant earn $1.88 per hour, plus 81.35 percent in supplemental benefits, for a total compensation package of about $3.40 per hour. Middle level factory supervisors make $23,144 a year, with a 69.19 percent amount in supplemental benefits, for total compensation.

Now, what I am trying to point out here is that not everything in Mexico, and I am not saying there are not some, but not everything in Mexico is a sweatshop, with smoke and fumes and environmental problems, and that people live in fear for their lives because of the working environment they are in.

Every country has that. We have it in the United States. When it is found, it is corrected. In Mexico when it is found out, there are means by which it is corrected. So we are not talking here about sweatshops in the sense that they are being pictured by our opposition.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. If the gentleman will yield, I want to underscore four points that I believe you made and I think are worthy of some repetition, because it goes to the facts of the relationship between the Mexican and the United States economies, rather than the fears that people have.

The first point is that Mexican wages have been rising steadily since 1987–1988. As you pointed out, the Mexican economy was inflicted with chronic inflation, which in 1988 was 150 percent a year. Through concerted action with the government and labor unions, that inflation rate was brought down to under 5 percent.

During that period from 1988 to 1992 Mexican wages went up 135 percent. In real terms they increased 19.3 percent. So it is not true that the statistics you are hearing about low Mexican wages or the rate of growth of Mexican wages, if you take in the period that included the oil boom and the hyper-inflation. But if you look over the past 5 years, since the economic reforms, Mexican wage rates are higher than has been stated. They are increasing. They will be increasingly linked with productivity according to the proclamation by President Salinas. So the wage differential is not as has been portrayed.

Second is actually Mexican wage rates increasing is a tremendous benefit for the United States. It helps create a Mexican middle class, which today is larger than the entire population of Canada. We already know that Mexican citizens are tremendous customers of United States goods. On a per capita basis they buy far more than Japanese citizens do, even though the Japanese have far more income. They are tremendous customers. It is a rapidly growing market, and it is one that we can get preferential access to through NAFTA.

The third point I think was mentioned by the gentleman when he talked about the plant moving back to the United States. A lot of the opponents of NAFTA are talking about wage costs as if those were the only thing that mattered in making a business decision.

It is not. It is total costs. And total costs of production include the infrastructure, the productivity of the workers, it includes proximity to market, the transportation costs. All those things work in.

The gentleman from New Hampshire spoke earlier about how labor costs were actually a relatively small percentage, and, in fact, for many products are exceeded by the transportation costs, or in this country perhaps by the cost of health care.

There are many other factors that go in this other than just wage rates. If wage rates determined all those decisions, then extremely low wage countries, like Haiti, Bangladesh, and Burkina Faso, would be our true economic competition. They are not. Our competition are higher wage countries.

If wage rates were everything, then BMW and Mercedes would have chosen to locate their new plants in Mexico and not in the United States.

The last point that I wish to emphasize from what the gentleman said is that our well-being as a country is going to become increasingly linked to the countries to our south.

□ 2030

Our economic growth will be increasingly derived from exports. Latin America is our natural market. It is the market where we have a natural advantage, and NAFTA begins the process of giving us a preferential advantage in that market ahead of our greatest competitors, the Japanese and the Western Europeans. But even more so, our fight against drugs depends upon stable governments in Latin America. Our immigration problems in large part are caused by the fact that the economies of those countries have not been able to keep pace with the demands of their population. As those economies grow, the governments become more stable. They will be able to assist us to a greater extent on those issues.

The final point is with the environment. There are environmental problems along the border, but I just do not see how we deal with those in the absence of NAFTA, in the absence of a Mexico that is economically strong enough to start dealing with the environment. And should NAFTA be defeated, I do not see any mechanism out there that those problems will finally be addressed either on the United States side or the Mexican side.

There are so many reasons why the free-trade agreement is a good deal for the United States, but I think you have hit on so many of them that the reasons a lot of the opponents give for fearing the agreement actually, when you look at them and you look at them in the way our economy works now, actually are reasons that we should support it.

Mr. ZELIFF. It is interesting, back home in New Hampshire, we have articles, and again, you have fear and misinformation. You go down to Mexico and the folks down there have fear and misinformation, because they, too, think that they are not going to be able to compete in a world market. And there are some sectors of our country that feel the same way.

It is interesting, a country the size of the State of Illinois, with 4 percent of our gross domestic product, is certainly, in my judgment, if we cannot compete against them, then how are we ever going to compete in a worldwide market.

The other thing I would like to toss in, and I think you made some excellent points, when we were down there, we talked with President Salinas. We spent over 2 hours with him. Prior to his election, I think many of the politicians in Mexico campaigned on an anti-American campaign theme. Now we have an opportunity, with a President that is making a commitment to a partnership to the north in a partnership with the North American Free-Trade Agreement which will allow us a gateway from Mexico into Central America, into South America. And, again, as we develop trade partnerships and markets in our own hemisphere, then we have a better ability to compete with the Asian rim countries, Japan, and certainly Western Europe.

So I think, again, it is a win-win, as you so ably mentioned.

Mr. McCANDLESS. I would like to talk a little bit, when I talked about the tile plant in Chihuahua, I was talking about the fact that they are keeping that plant and building one in the United States, which is kind of an interesting scenario in view of the fact that everything that we have been talking about allegedly is going to move south. Let me talk about the environmental aspect, because this has been a concern to a lot of people who are sincere about wanting to learn about the elements of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mexico has not been noted for its environmental concerns. I can attest to that, having been born in the Imperial Valley just north of Mexico in the little city of Brawley, which is about 15 miles from the border. The New River flows out of Mexicali into the Salton Sea, part of which now is my congressional district. For 50-some-odd years, we have been trying to do something with that, which is a multinational problem.

We have our Border Commission. Those people have put together plans and agreements. But we have never been able to get them financed. So when we talk about environment in Mexico, one has images of smoke stacks and trash and waste all over the terrain around the town. And in many cases, you have a tendency to believe that because you have seen it, if you have taken a trip through Mexico, I can assure you not all of the towns in Mexico are like some of those that you see along the border.

What I want to make in the way of a point here is that the current administration realized that it had to do something with the environment so it took the necessary steps and developed the necessary legislative base to create roughly an equivalent to the EPA about 3 years ago, possibly a little longer than that.

As a result, they are in the process of developing then this table of organization which includes a branch of the attorney general's office, environmental auditing, compliance and inspection, and urban development and the overall direction of this.

They have been in operation for 3 years, and they have made reasonably good progress. Those who criticize Mexico's environmental department are looking at what our EPA has been doing for over 25 years, and they are trying to bring some kind of a standard equivalent to that, when these people are just beginning to get their organization together and perform the job and services that they have been mandated by the Federal Government and the laws that created them.

So you say, OK, we have talked now to five people who are in charge of the various branches of the environmental protection program: the attorney general for environment, the deputy attorney for auditing, the deputy attorney general for compliance, et cetera. Is this a paper tiger that has been designed as a facade for purposes of local consumption?

And so we asked the young lady who is with us, who is an attorney and a member of the Mexico City Embassy staff from the EPA, I want to know from you straight out what we have here. And she says, well, I work with these people. And I know that they are working toward getting this thing together. They have made moves.

One of the most painful moves that was made by the Mexican Government in their environmental protection is to move a petrochemical company owned by the Federal Government, a refinery, out of the vicinity of Mexico City, which cost 6,000 jobs to that community, because of the level of pollution that was taking place.

When the Federal Government takes a federally owned, and the gasoline refining distribution system is still federally owned, takes that plant by legislative process, by administrative process, closes it down and moves it, then to me that means that they are sincere about what it is that they have in the way of an environmental protection program.

Mr. ZELIFF. The World Bank and Mexico recently signed an agreement to finance the $3 billion for pollution cleanup in Mexico. The funds, to be spent between 1994 and 1996, consist of $1.8 billion in World Bank loans and $1.2 billion from the Mexican Government. The NAFTA environmental side agreement creates a new financial authority, which will be capitalized by

Mexico and the United States equally, about $225 million each.

There is a myth, and the myth is that Canada is not paying anything for the border cleanup. And frankly, I do not think that they should. They are not on the border. It should be equally cleaned up between Mexico and the United States. Mexico is making a major commitment beyond that.

During our meeting with Brownsville government officials we learned of their close working relationship with the government of Matamoros as well as the Maquiladora industries in the area. According to Brownsville councilwoman, and you and I both interviewed her, Jackie Lockett, NAFTA has already leveraged new laws and environmental regulations in Mexico, even before it has passed. So they have made tremendous progress, and I think these side agreements codify those commitments they have made.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. The gentleman already mentioned oil refineries near Mexico City. A tremendous number of jobs in a government-owned enterprise that were lost because the government determined that the ecological cost, the damage to the environment caused by that facility was simply too great to justify.

There are a number of examples about Mexico becoming more concerned about the environment. In 1991, Mexico was able to enter into the world's first debt-for-nature swap, where some Mexican debt was used to finance biodiversity programs. In 1992, there was a landmark decision to relocate a major highway connecting central and southern Mexico to preserve one of the country's oldest nature preserves.

Nationally, Mexico is committing over 1 percent of its gross domestic product, which is proportionately more than France, to environmental protection. And it never ceases to amaze me people who are concerned about the border environment and the problems that do exist along the border. They have never been able to explain to me in any coherent way how defeating NAFTA will change that.

□ 2040

NAFTA changes the whole framework by making all of Mexico a duty-free zone. It eliminates the incentive to locate along the border. By raising the Mexican standard of living, it not only creates a better market for our goods, but gives Mexico more ability to finally deal with its environmental problems.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Good point. Let me kind of draw this to a conclusion by leaving our audience with a few thoughts. In the 2 hours we spent with the President, a great deal was said about the various aspects of what we have discussed here tonight, and we have just scratched the surface with the three charts, and my colleagues and their wonderful input.

The subject came up with the President, "Well, we can renegotiate this, Mr. President." I do not know exactly how the subject surfaced, but that was the intent of the question. President Salinas all during this meeting was a perfect gentleman. I might add, he had no staff people in the room. All of the questions, all of the information that was asked by the delegation, he responded to without notes.

He said, "Well, you know, you are not the only country that has a certain level of opposition to this agreement. I have many people here in Mexico, people of means, who are concerned and are not supporting this agreement because they have fear. They have fear that the United States economy will simply absorb the country of Mexico as another state or community, and that we will lose our identity, our heritage, and the things that make our country great.

"I have convinced these people, or at least they have been neutered, that we have here something that is good for the country." He said, "It took us the better part of 3 years to negotiate this contract, this trade agreement. As a result," a great deal, in his words a little differently, "a lot of water went under the bridge. A lot of concessions were made on both sides. It is an agreement we felt was in the best interests of the countries involved.

"Now you are saying, let us renegotiate it. I do not think that Mexico is going to be ready to renegotiate this contract for at least the next 8 years."

Mr. ZELIFF. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would just like to add a couple of things. This is a trade agreement. What many of our colleagues are doing, I believe, is that they are going to try to weave into this, and we did get these sidebar agreements, but many people, and on our trip we know who they were, they went down and they would like to change the whole Mexican society.

It is not about social change, it is about tariff change. It is about change in terms of opportunities for jobs, creating economic development opportunities. I think that is the thing we have to keep very foremost in our minds.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. The unique thing about NAFTA is that it is the first trade agreement that does begin to address some of these issues. The word "environment" does not appear once in the entire General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. ZELIFF. It goes way beyond a normal trade agreement.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. It addresses a number of those issues, because Mexico is our neighbor. It is not going away. It is a proud and independent society, and people need to think very seriously, as the gentleman from California [Mr. McCANDLESS] said, of the consequences of rejecting NAFTA, of what that means for our political and diplomatic relationship with one of the fastest growing markets in the world.

Mr. ZELIFF. It would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. McCANDLESS. We no longer have the European Community, as such, as a big customer. We cannot seem to make much progress in the Asian Rim as a customer. It is up to us, if we are going to maintain what we have in the way of a political, social, and economic structure, which has a lot to do with the economics of day-to-day life, that we are going to have to develop and work with new markets.

Members say, "Well, yes, Mexico is 80 million people. As soon as they all have a TV, then there will not be any more TV's sold." This is the tip of the iceberg. Everybody in Central and South America is looking at this North American Free-Trade Agreement and the United States and Mexico, and whether or not this relationship will bring fruition. Our future is in the Western Hemisphere, Central and South America, as we develop these markets.

As we have pointed out this evening, Mexico has developed as a nation and has the purchasing power now, and that purchasing power will increase to buy more goods and services.

Mr. ZELIFF. Five Presidents, five Presidents, both Republicans and Democrats, have endorsed this. Certainly Bill Clinton, George Bush, Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter, Jerry Ford. Almost every single economist in this country has felt that this is a win-win, a job creator, an economy booster.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. This debate in many ways is about our future. It is about our economic future. If we look at where the jobs of tomorrow will be, where the economic growth of tomorrow will be, it will largely come in exports. Those are the goods, those are the services, those are the jobs that are higher value-added where America has an advantage over the rest of the world.

It also looks to our future in the Western Hemisphere: What will our relationship be with our neighbors, not only to the north but also to the south? Will they have stable governments? Will they continue to grow? Many people forget that probably free trade and economic growth is the single most important thing we can do to encourage democracy, to encourage exactly those parts of the Mexican middle class to assert greater political independence and their rights, to take care of their environmental problems.

All of those issues are really tied into NAFTA. It is a small step, but it is a very significant one, because it says which direction this country will go, whether we will go into the future or whether we will try and face the past.

Mr. ZELIFF. The key to our future in New Hampshire is international

trade, certainly our ability to compete as a State and as a country.

When we take a look again at the country, the size of Mexico is equal to the size of our State of Illinois. It is 4 percent of our gross domestic product. We have nothing to fear. We have the greatest opportunity in the world to improve our economy and create jobs. That is what NAFTA will do.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. For those of us in southern California who have taken the big hit relative to defense industries, this is the newest, best possibility if we can pass this agreement, to take care of the vacuum that has been created and build on that vacuum the jobs that we need.

I leave the Members with this thought. Can five past Presidents, living, be wrong? Can 40 Governors be wrong? I thank the Members for joining me tonight. It has been a pleasure.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. MATSUI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

---

## OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING THE PLIGHT AND STRUGGLES OF THE LUMBEE INDIAN TRIBE OF ROBESON COUNTY, NC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of a bill that will be brought forth tomorrow in this Chamber, I have decided to take this special order to share with my colleagues and the American public some observations concerning the plight and struggles of the Lumbee Indian Tribe of Robeson County of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of our Indian Affairs Subcommittee, Congressman BILL RICHARDSON, for his leadership and initiative to take up this piece of legislation through the House Committee on Natural Resources and our hill committee chairman, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, for his support and leadership to bring this bill to the floor tomorrow for consideration.

In accordance with the provisions of H.R. 334, introduced by Congressman Charles Rose of North Carolina, this piece of legislation will finally grant to the Lumbee Tribe their rightful status as a federally recognized tribe. The Lumbee struggle for recognition is over one hundred years old, and I urge my colleagues to give their attention to this matter. The Lumbee Indians of North Carolina do not view this issue as one of partisan politics. Neither should we. This is not a heartening issue that makes you want to wave the American flag, either. It is not often that we take up issues that make us consider events that occured decades, let alone a century ago. Unfortunately, this is often the case when we meet to discuss legislation that involves Native Americans. In its true light, H.R. 334 is a bill about an elected body of our national leaders taking the initiative to finally take corrective action against 110 years of wrongdoing against the Lumbee Tribe. This is about removing the only barrier that stands in the way of rightfully recognizing the Lumbee people for who they are and what they rightfully deserve. That barrier, and cynics would say this is no surprise, is our own United States Government.

Anthropologists, historians, and even the North Carolina state government have had no trouble recognizing the Lumbee people as a tribe. Now is the time, after one hundred years of stubborn resistance, to give the Lumbees what is rightfully theirs. The Lumbee do not need to be told to be patient; they have been patient. They do not need to be told to follow the "process"; they have endured one hundred years of what you may call the process. They do not need to be told to work with their government; they know that the problem is the government.

We have to be honest enough to realize that when we say the words government, or process, any Native American could justifiably think of a host of negative things. They may think of a parade of broken treaties. They may think of being legally forced off their ancestral lands. They may even think of brutality and violence. Some historians characterize our government's general policy regarding the American Indian through 1812 as one of systematic extermination. Today we would call this genocide and, indeed, American Indian sympathizers have even filed charges against the U.S. Government before U.N.-sponsored working groups on human rights violations. It is not surprising that the treatment of native inhabitants from North, Central, and South America can easily be categorized as genocide.

As our institutions of higher learning expand, and there is more documentation of the American past, the more the shocking plight of the American Indian is brought to light, and the more outraged the American people are becoming. Helen Hunt Jackson sadly called the American 1800's "a century of dishonor." Some American Indians call their history with our government, as do the Cherokee, "a trail of broken treaties." So today, when we tell Indian tribes that they must go through the process to obtain Federal recognition, it is understandable that they will respond by saying they have had enough of the process.

Just what exactly is the process that our government has forcibly imposed on Native Americans for so long? By our admission, I believe we can divide the evolution of the process into six periods.

As noted, the first process has been referred to by historians as one of extermination. This is interesting considering our government's stated policy during this earlier period was actually to "make friends with the Indians." "The pious ones of Plymouth," remarked William Evarts, "who, reaching the rock, first fell upon their knees, and then upon the aborigines."[1] The unofficial record may provide us a more accurate picture of the sometimes harsh realism of this period, such as General Philip Sheridan's blunt statement "[t]he only good indian I ever saw is a dead indian."[2] Or how about "[a]ttack and kill every male Indian over 12 years of age"—This order came from the mouth of General Patrick Connor before his troops slaughtered 263 Paiutes at Fort Reno in 1864. Most scholars agree that this horrendous extermination period ended in 1812, but that by no means was the end of mass killings of American Indians. A noble group of people in South Dakota will attest to this.[3]

The second process imposed by our national government on Native Americans was removal. This was the forced removal of American Indians to lands west of the Mississippi termed Indian territories. Today, we call this exile. One elected official put it this way: "No state can achieve proper culture, civilization, and progress in safety as long as indians are permitted to remain."[4] That was President of the United States Martin Van Buren in 1838. Thousands of Cherokees died of exposure on the infamous "trail of tears" when they were forced off their Georgia homelands to travel west. Today, we would call this an outrage or unconstitutional. The government called it Manifest Destiny.

The third process was assimilation. Never mind their centuries-old culture and religious heritage, these "savages" did not know any better was this period's rationale. One prominent civil servant condescendingly said, "To tame a savage you must tie him down to the soil. You must make him understand the value of property, and the benefits of its separate ownership."[5] That statement was uttered in 1851 by the Secretary of the Interior. How helpless would you feel petitioning for aid from the Secretary of the Interior? His statement epitomizes the process of assimilation, and the process continued to leave the American Indian with a very dubious future.

The fourth process was termination. It was an extension and institutionalization in the 1950's of the assimilation

---

Footnotes at end of article.

policy. The relationship between the Federal Government and tribal governments was terminated during the 1950's in an effort to eradicate past fiscal inefficiencies and to reverse a trend of dependency on Federal aid in Indian communities. This new process, intended to help free American Indians, only contributed to their continuing disappearance as Congress also decided to terminate out of legislative existence the legal meaning of the words tribe, nation, and people.

Imagine Congress announcing today that terms concerning heritage like Jewish or British-American no longer exist. Frankly, that sounds like something out of a Marxist regime.

On May 1, 1961, the Menominee Indian tribe of Wisconsin was officially dissolved in Washington's halls and courts. This was not the first time though, that an Indian tribe had to fight the government's chosen "process" for its very survival. The Menominee tribe was re-recognized in 1973 only after years of fierce lobbying. As the Chairman of the Menominee Tribe, Glen Miller, testified a few years ago, "[w]e were the Menominee Tribe in 1491, before your boats reached our shores, and for the ages before that time. We knew our history."[6] Other tribes have not been so fortunate.

This stark termination "process" meant a callous disregard for not only the sacred culture, but the health and stability of many Native Americans. It meant termination for many in already poor reservations of needed health care benefits from the Indian Health Service and lost eligibility for grants, loans, and scholarships from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[7] Perhaps most importantly, this sudden shift meant also that they had to pay property taxes. When they could not pay, they sadly lost portions of their land.[8]

Thus the "process" perpetuated the ever weak legal position of Native American interests. This century, the American Indian has suffered sometimes arbitrary deprivation of health care, land, and educational aid. Many even have had portions of their ancient graves dug up and sifted through for study. I can only imagine the anger, frustration, and resentment I would feel if my ancestors were on "display" in some museum, whether my tribal leadership authorized it or not—especially if my religion placed so much emphasis on the dead and their honor. Ironically, anthropology is the Native American ticket these days to federal recognition in today's "process." The more your burial grounds were exploited, the better chance you have of proving now, because of the documentation done by academics, that you are a real American Indian tribe.

In any event, however, this flawed "assimilation" process, though perhaps well-intentioned, sadly fueled the continued descent of the American Indian into yet another "process."

As the "assimilation" process died as a policy, tribal status was being restored through either the Congress, court rulings, or the Department of Interior. The fifth "process," that of recognition, introduced in 1978, was calculated to establish uniformity in recognition standards.

The recognition process, however, has not promoted uniformly. There are still three other alternative legal avenues available to tribes who do not want to deal with an overly-expensive and exacting administrative process.[9] This policy has only continued to incite division and fighting among tribes, and perpetuated the familiar pattern of frustration and inefficiency in our U.S. Native American government relationship.

In an effort to improve the administrative process through which Indian tribes can receive Federal recognition, I introduced H.R. 2549 in June this year—a bill I hope will significantly improve the recognition process. Today, with a limited appropriation for the BIA, tribes know that every additional recognition means less funding will go around to each tribe. This is undoubtedly a sign of how the "process' has practically destroyed the dignity and self-esteem of our Native Americans. Before Europeans began settling this land, inter-tribal conflict was more of a spiritual subject, proud tribes clashing in defense of their land and honor. Today's "process" has tribes squabbling over health benefits and federal hand-outs. How times have changed for the American Indian. Perhaps this was inevitable—yes, but still it must be recognized as yet another bitter fruit of what Native Americans understand as the "process."

The present "process" is flawed and unrealistic. By now, Native Americans must see our government as a big monster that keeps growing a new head every year. Says John Rivers, counsel for the Mowa tribe, "[I]f you could meet the criteria set by the B.I.A., then you probably weren't Indian, because that means you've stayed in one spot, could read and write, kept a journal of everything you've done for the past few hundred years, and were economically stable. If we had all that, we would be middle-class white people".[10] I would challenge my colleagues to come up with the detailed two-hundred-year history and genealogy required of these tribes to prove the identity of their own families!

Furthermore, it is not as though these tribes have all the money in the world to hire the needed anthropologists and historians to verify their identity over the last two hundred years. Costs for the Lumbee petition escalated to a half-million dollars dispersed over seven years of having to deal with the Department of the Interior.

Time is also clearly the companion problem to money. It not only takes too long to compile these petitions, it takes just as long, and sometimes more, to process them. Senator MCCAIN of Arizona reported that some petitioners have waited "10 years or more for even a cursory review by the BIA."[11] The petition of the Chinook Tribe of Washington state has sat in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 15 years now without being processed.[12]

This is what Native Americans are looking at when we lecture them to follow today's "process." A few years ago, Congressman George Miller called today's process "an abomination,"[13] and I could not agree more with the Chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources.

As you reflect on the outrageous history of our "process," I ask you to also reflect on the plight of the Lumbee Indians of Robeson County, North Carolina who have given up on the "process," and who have turned to the Congress again for help.

The Lumbee have had their share of processing. They have fought for recognition since 1888. Their first effort was a petition to Congress for Federal educational aid. We note first that the Department of Interior's negative response does not deny the existence of the Lumbee as a tribe. The Department denied the petition because of insufficient funds. In fact, the language of their report sounds like they recognize the Croatans, or Lumbee, as a civilized tribe. Their report said, "I do not see how I can consistently render any assistance to the Croatans or any other civilized tribe".[14]

Then between 1899 and 1911, three bills were introduced in Congress recognizing the tribe as "the Croatan Indians of Robeson County". The Department's response was again negative, but Charles Pierce, who wrote the report to the Department of Interior recognized their legitimate Indian ancestry. But it was the "process" that prevented a positive response. The tribe's identity was not in question. Pierce gave a negative recommendation because aid in education was legally supposed to be delegated to state governments, not the Federal government. The policy was that "states having an Indian population" should "assume the burden and responsibility for their education as soon as possible."[15]

In 1914, the Department of the Interior sent Special Indian agent O.M. McPherson to investigate the tribal rights question in response to another bill: Senate Resolution 344. His report said that the Lumbee are "in part, of undoubted Indian origin", but he seems to question their qualifications as a historically distinct and autonomous community or tribe.[16]

Here I would like to address the larger issue of conflicts of opinion between the government and the academic community. The greater community of anthropologists do not challenge the

Lumbee past. Dr. Jack Campisi of Wellesley College testified before the House and Senate subcommittees in this field a few years ago that of the eighteen other Indian petitions he has worked on, "[n]one has exceeded the Lumbee petition in documentation and no group has exhibited more evidence of community cohesion and political continuity than the Lumbee tribe".[17] The Lumbee are also recognized by Dr. John Reed Swanton, a long-time anthropologist with the Bureau of American Ethnology and a leading authority on Southeastern Indians. And Dr. William Sturtevant of our own Smithsonian Institution, another leading scholar in this field, acknowledges that anthropologists unanimously recognize the Lumbee. So why is it that the experts have no trouble recognizing the Lumbee, but the government has found grounds to resist recognizing them for over 100 years?

Well, life inside the Beltway is very different from that of inside our nation's academic halls. Frankly, I believe this is a funding issue. Simply put, the problem is money. If recognition were costless, the Lumbee would have been recognized a long time ago.

For those of you who are looking at the Lumbee from an "economic man" perspective and are concerned over resource allocation or investment return, I will speak openly about the Lumbee as an investment return.

Nowhere is the return on this people more apparent than in the Lumbee record of military service. I am informed that over 400 Lumbee have served our country in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. The last Lumbee World War I veteran passed away this year. This call to serve came from a government that challenged their heritage and refused to recognize them. Nevertheless, like many other Native Americans, they went. Bitter stories are still told about Lumbee men being sent to Vietnam by non-Indian draft boards. Still, they answered the call. The membership records of the Veterans of Foreign War organization in Pembroke, North Carolina, which is a 90 percent Lumbee town, show 420 members, only one of which is non-Indian.

So how would you calculate the investment return on a Lumbee like the highly decorated Henry T. Locklear, the recipient of two Silver Star awards—or for that matter, on Mr. Adolph Dial, a World War II vet and also an author, former state legislator, and energetic leader in several Pembroke community service organizations? How do you calculate the larger return on this people who in 1958 collectively confronted the morally-bankrupt Ku Klux Klan and ran them out the state? How do you calculate the return of social good done in that effort?

The Lumbee must wonder why they can be recognized on the battlefield, in academic halls, or newspapers and radio, but not in our nation's capital.

Truly, we cannot be afraid to make a positive and fair investment in these people. The Lumbee must be puzzled why they hear about the United States giving $5 billion economic/military aid to Iraq during the 1980s, or to Jordan, who turned around and gave military intelligence to Mr. Hussein, or to a host of politically-strange dealings with authoritarian governments down south, but are then told that we cannot afford to invest in them. Should this cast of bizarre dictators and other undesirables be getting financial backing before our own American people? What do we tell the Lumbee? Yes?

So the 1915 McPherson report was submitted with its doubts of Lumbee eligibility. But even so, seeing the great need there, Mr. McPherson recommended that the Department grant agricultural and other technical aid to them. But the Department again opposed these actions—probably not wanting to stretch their already limited appropriation.

Between 1914 and 1934, four more bills were introduced to recognize the tribe. Again, a specialist, George Swanton, was sent to investigate. This time, the Lumbee Indian ancestry was endorsed. His report identified the Lumbee as descendants from the Cheraw and other Siouan speaking Indian tribes.[18] But the Department again resisted recognizing the tribe.[19]

The Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934 and the recommendations made to them from the Department of the Interior prompted the Lumbee to try to establish themselves as one-half or more Indian blood, and thereby be entitled under the act to draft up their own constitution, i.e., become Federally-recognized. This "blood" test is representative of the greater parade of demeaning "processes" suffered so long by Native Americans. Who but the most condescending of governments, after all they had already done to the American Indian, would actually make them go through tests to see how "Indian" they are!

These tests though, shed some interesting light on the nature of the relationship between the government and the American Indian. Remember that the government's policy was once (and would be again) an assimilation policy. So if you historically were a "good savage", and abided by the government's assimilation process, then you would actually have less of a chance of being eligible for government services now. On the other hand, the more effectively you had fought the government on integrating with whites, the better your chances would be now of being declared half or more Indian, and thus being recognized. So this "process" says, you would have been better off fighting against the government policy. These are the illogical results of the "process."

These tests subjected the Lumbee to all kinds of demeaning things, including measurement of head size and tooth and nail shape. Who decided these criteria anyway? This fiasco showed results listing one person qualifying as a "half-blood or greater" but some of his own brothers and sisters as "less than half-blood"![20] To this day, all these so-called tests have not helped the Lumbees. Their attempts to acquire a land base for organization, which was also a requisite under the act, were a failure, as bureaucracy and non-Indian opposition prevented government action in procuring land.

After this failure, the Lumbee again went back to Congress. They are in a like position right now. It had been over 70 years since the North Carolina state government had recognized them. What was wrong with the Federal government? A recognition bill was adopted that passed the House but received a critical wound in the Senate. One clause in a 1956 Senate amendment has been the cause of almost 40 years of misunderstanding and controversy. The Lumbee believed the bill gave them Federal recognition, but without services. The government apparently held that all the bill did was change the name of the tribe from "the Cherokee Indians of Robeson County" to "the Lumbee Indians of Robeson County." The controversy was brought to light in the early 1970's, when the Lumbee were denied exemption from a school desegregation order because they were not Federally recognized.

Thus when the 1978 recognition "process" was introduced, the Lumbee were found to be technically ineligible because of the Senate amendment in the 1956 Lumbee Act.

Other attempts were made at recognition which also failed in the mid-1970's, as bills were introduced arguing for the eligibility of the Lumbee to receive non-Federally recognized services. But the Department of the Interior would not move from their position and recognize the Lumbee.

This brings us to the 1980's and to where the Lumbee are today. In spite of the preventive language of the 1956 Lumbee Act, the tribe informally asked the Department whether they should try to petition through this latest recognition process. They were told informally that they do qualify and to proceed with the preparation of their petition.

The Lumbee began assembling their petition in earnest in 1980 and finished 7 years and $500,000 later. After 2 years of waiting and three broken deadlines for beginning work on their petition, the Department of the Interior had the gall to reverse its position and tell the Lumbee that they actually do not qualify to petition the government for Federal recognition.

Can you believe this?

After a decade of diligent work and patient waiting, the Department of the

Interior reversed their position. That is why we say that this is not a partisan issue. This issue is not about dividing lines between political parties. This is an issue of right and wrong. You cannot sit here and listen to these people plead the same cause that they have been pleading for over 100 years and assert that this is not a fundamentally moral issue.

I have said before that there comes a time when the "process" has to be sacrificed to correct an injustice. As my colleagues from Maine, California and other states will also attest, the "process" for these peoples means more waiting, more frustration, and possibly tribal break-up and collapse. The media has written about the "shrinking" or "disappearing Red man". Well, we have tried to "process" him out of existence, and it is time to recognize that the "process" has been and is, like Chairman MILLER says, "an abomination".

When my colleagues vote "yes" for Lumbee recognition, we are voting to help repair one of the larger broken bones in a greater sick and suffering body that is our relationship with today's Native Americans. And given that the Lumbee tribe is four times larger than the next biggest petitioner, this would be a significant repair. We may never see the day when the American Indian has an understanding and fair relationship with the Federal Government. But our duty demands that we try. Having the wisdom to see that the "process" is not working for the Lumbee and other tribes is a step in the right direction. I plead with my colleagues in the Congress to make this present Congressional "process" the last process the Lumbee will ever have to suffer again. Let us support H.R. 334 and let's answer the Lumbee Tribe's plea for recognition.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Taken from Crown's Book of Political Quotations, compiled by Michael Jackman. New York, Crown Publishers, [1990]. p. 205.

[2] Same source as 1, p. 147.

[3] This has reference to the 1890 Wounded Knee Massacre.

[4] Taken from "Dangerous Memories: Invasion and Resistance Since 1492." Chicago Religious Task Force on C.A., [1991]. p. 122.

[5] Same source as 4, p. 123.

[6] Testimony for S. 1036 and H.R. 1426, Lumbee Bills Joint Hearing. Senate select committee on Indian Affairs. House Interior and Insular Affairs. p. 7.

[7] Fisher, Marshall. "Bones of contention: Can Native Americans and Archaeologists find common ground?" Earthwatch, August, 1990. p. 6.

[8] Same source as 6, p. 7.

[9] The four legal avenues available to Indian groups seeking Federal Recognition are: A presidential decree, a judicial ruling, a Congressional act, or since 1978, the formal petition process through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Although there is a "process" in place (the latter BIA process), there are still the three former legal avenues available to Indian groups.

[10] See "New ways to recognize tribes split Indians", August 4, 1991. Special to The New York Times. 1:1, p. 1, c. 1.

[11] Same article source as note 8. Entire article is on one page.

[12] Bock, Paula. "Girl Stumps Clinton with Tribal Question." The Seattle Times, February 21, 1993.

[13] Taken from CO Weekly Report 1991, p. 3389.

[14] CRS Report from Roger Walke to Del. Faleomavaega. October 18, 1991. It contains a correctional commentary on the said Congressman's own staff records of Lumbee efforts to obtain Federal recognition and CRS's own chronological table of these efforts. Also included is an attachment narrating the history of Lumbee related legislation. This quote is taken from page 1 of the narrative attachment.

[15] Same source as 14. p. 1. (Italics added).

[16] The McPherson Report concluded, in substance, that "the Lumbee are "in part, of undoubted Indian origin" but with no Indian names, language, or customs; to be an "amalgamation" of Hatteras Indians, the Lost Colony, early white settlers, and other races; and to have no treaty relations with the U.S., no tribal rights with other Indian tribes, and no lands or money due them ("Report on Condition . . . ", p. 16–17)." (Preceding quotation from CRS Report-Roger Walke, same source as 14). This is very strange when you contrast his report with Dr. Campisi's or Dr. Swanton's. McPherson seems to see the Lumbee as a kind of loose coalition of Indians with no real historical identity. Dr. Campisi and the greater body of anthropologists seem to have always recognized the Lumbee as a historically legitimate tribe.

[17] This statement is taken from Dr. Campisi's testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of S. 1036 and H.R. 1436; August 1, 1991, p. 1.

[18] The Swanton Report was a Smithsonian opinion published at the request of the Department of Interior in 1933. In response to S. 1632, 73d Cong., 1st Sess., the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs asked the Department of Interior for comment. The memorandum identified the Lumbee as predominantly descendants of earlier "Siouan Tribes of which the most prominent were the Cheraw and Keyauwee" with other minor strains of perhaps Algonquians or Iroquians. He proposed the name "Siouan Indians of Lumber River" (H. Rept. [73–] 1752, p. 6). Same memorandum as 14. Roger Walke, CRS Report to Congressman Eni F.H. Faleomavaega.

[19] H.R. 5365 and S. 1632 were designed to accomplish three things. 1) Recognize the Indians of Robeson County as Cheraw. 2) Deny them rights in other tribes' lands or money. 3) Allow access to Bureau of Indian Affairs schools for Lumbee children. "The Department of Interior opposed the bill because it would entitle Robeson Indians to BIA services" (Walke 1991, 13). This is taken from an abstract by Roger Walke of CRS pertaining to the Interior's response on H.R. 5365 and S. 1632. Same memorandum as 14.

[20] A narrative chart of the events of Lumbee efforts to gain Federal recognition written up by Roger Walke at CRS give commentary on the strange nature of these tests. "These tests were so arbitrary that Selzer listed different blood quantums for full brothers and sisters" (Walke 1991, (Brief section) 2). Same source as note 14.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to give special recognition to Mr. Brian Nantos for the outstanding job that he provided to my office while he served as a summer intern two months ago. In fact, a substantial portion of the research in preparation of this special order was due to Mr. Nantos' hard work and diligence, and I commend him for his thoroughness and scholarly work on this important matter. I also want to thank Mrs. Nancy Leong, Ms. Kawen Young, Ms. Pela Enesi, Mr. Vili Le'i, Mr. Marty Yerick, and Mr. Ali'imau J.R. Scanlan of my staff for their assistance.

---

□ 2110

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NADLER) laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, DC, October 27, 1993.*

The HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR GENTLEMEN: The "Health Security Act of 1993" holds the promise of a new era of security for every American—an era in which our nation finally guarantees its citizens comprehensive health care benefits that can never be taken away.

Today, America boasts the world's best health care professionals, the finest medical schools and hospitals, the most advanced research and the most sophisticated technology. No other health care system in the world exceeds ours in the level of scientific knowledge, skill and technical resources.

And yet the American health care system is badly broken. Its hallmarks are insecurity and dangerously rising costs.

For most Americans the fear of losing health benefits at some time has become very real. Our current health insurance system offers no protection for people who lose their jobs, move, decide to change jobs, get sick, or have a family member with an illness. One out of four Americans is expected to lose insurance coverage in the next two years, many never to be protected again. Altogether, more than 37 million Americans have no insurance and another 25 million have inadequate health coverage.

Rising health care costs are threatening our standard of living. The average American worker would be making $1,000 a year more today if health care accounted for the same proportion of wages and benefits as in 1975. Unless we act, health care costs will lower real wages by almost $600 per year by the end of the decade and nearly one in every five dollars Americans spend will go to health care.

Small businesses create most of the new jobs in America and while most want to cover their employees, more and more cannot. Under the current health care system, cost pressures are forcing a growing number of small business owners to scale back or drop health insurance for their employees. Small businesses spend 40 cents of every health insurance dollar for administration—eight times as much as large companies. And only one in every three companies with fewer than 500 workers today offers its employees a choice of health plan.

Our health care system frustrates those who deliver care. Doctors and nurses are drowning in paperwork, and hospitals are hiring administrators at four times the rate of health care professionals. The system places decisions that doctors should be making in the hands of distant bureaucrats. Its incentives are upside down; it focuses on treating people only after they get sick, and does not reward prevention.

Clearly, our challenges are great. This legislation is sweeping in its ambition and simple in its intent: to preserve and strengthen what is right about our health care system, and fix what is wrong.

Our needs are now urgent. A nation blessed with so much should not leave so many without health security.

This legislation draws upon history. It reflects the best ideas distilled from decades of debate and experience.

It reflects the sense of responsibility that President Franklin Roosevelt called for when he launched the Social Security program in 1933 and recommended that health care be included.

It reflects the vision of President Harry Truman, who in 1946 became the first President to introduce a plan for national health reform.

It reflects the pragmatism of President Richard Nixon, who in 1972 asked all American employers to take responsibility and contribute to their workers' health care.

And it reflects the ideas and commitment of generations of Congressional leaders who have fought to build a health care system that honors our nation's commitments to all its citizens.

Today America stands ready for reform. For the first time, members of both parties have agreed that every American must be guaranteed health care. An opportunity has been placed before us. We must not let it pass us by.

This legislation builds on what's best about the American health care system. It maintains and strengthens America's private health care. It extends the current system of employer-based coverage that works so well for so many. It protects our cherished right to choose how we are cared for and who provides that care. It invests in improving the quality of our care.

This legislation recognizes that America cannot, and need not, adopt one model of health care reform. It allows each state to tailor health reform to its unique needs and characteristics, as long as it meets national guarantees for comprehensive benefits, affordability and quality standards. It establishes a national framework for reform, but leaves the decisions about care where they belong—between patients and the health care professionals they trust.

Under this legislation, every citizen and legal resident will receive a Health Security card that guarantees the comprehensive benefits package. People will be able to follow their doctor into a traditional fee-for-service plan, join a network of doctors and hospitals, or become members of a Health Maintenance Organization. Like today, almost everyone will be able to sign up for a health plan where they work. Unlike today, changes in employment or family status will not necessarily force a change in health coverage.

The self-employed and the unemployed will receive their health coverage through the regional health alliance, a group run by consumers and business leaders, that will contract with and pay health plans, provide information to help consumers choose plans, and collect premiums. The largest corporations—those employing 5,000 workers or more—will have the option of continuing to self-insure their employees or joining a regional alliance.

The legislation is financed by three sources: requiring every employer and individual to contribute to paying the cost of health care; raising excise taxes on tobacco and requiring small contributions from large corporations which form their own health alliance; and slowing the growth in spending on federal health care programs. Enormous efforts have been made to ensure that the financing is sound and responsible.

The Health Security Act is based upon six principles: security, simplicity, savings, quality, choice and responsibility.

Security. First and foremost, this legislation guarantees security by providing every American and legal resident with a comprehensive package of health care benefits that can never be taken away. That package of benefits, defined by law, includes a new emphasis on preventive care and offers all Americans prescription drug benefits.

Under this legislation, insurers will no longer be able to deny anyone coverage, impose lifetime limits, or charge people based on their health status or age. The legislation also limits annual increases in health care premiums, and sets maximum amounts that families will spend out-of-pocket each year, regardless of how much or how often they receive medical care.

The legislation will preserve and strengthen Medicare, adding new coverage for prescription drugs. To meet the growing needs of older Americans and people with disabilities, a new long-term care initiative will expand coverage of home and community-based care.

The legislation also provides residents of underserved rural and urban areas with better access to quality care. It also offers incentives for health professionals to practice in these areas, builds urban-rural health care networks, and protects those doctors, hospitals, clinics and others who care for people in underserved areas.

Simplicity. To relieve consumers, businesses and health professionals of the burdens of excess paperwork and bureaucracy, this legislation simplifies our health care system. It requires all health plans to adopt a standard claim form; creates a uniform, comprehensive benefits package; and standardizes billing and coding procedures.

Savings. The legislation promotes true competition in the health care marketplace. It increases the buying power of consumers and businesses by bringing them together in health alliances. Health plans will no longer succeed by trying to pick only healthy people to insure; they will have to compete on price and quality. This competition will be backed up by enforceable premium caps.

This legislation also criminalizes health fraud, imposing stiff penalties on those who cheat the system. And it takes steps to reduce "defensive medicine" and discourage frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits by requiring patients and doctors to try to settle disputes before they end up in court, and by limiting lawyers' fees.

Quality. The legislation empowers consumers and health care professionals by providing information on quality standards and treatment results. It calls for new investments in medical research, including heart disease, bone and joint disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, AIDS, birth defects, mental disorders, substance abuse and nutrition. To help keep people healthy, rather than only treating them after they get sick, the legislation pays fully for a wide range of preventive services and offers new incentives to educate primary care doctors, nurses and other family practitioners.

Choice. Through comprehensive reform, the legislation gives Americans a new level of control over their health care choices. It ensures that people can follow their doctor and his or her team into any plan they choose to join. It transfers the choice of health plan from the employer to the individual, and guarantees a choice of health plans, including at least one traditional fee-for-service plan. Doctors and health professionals may participate in multiple health plans if they wish.

Responsibility. Under this legislation, every employer and individual will be required to pay for health coverage, even if that contribution is small. It extends the current employer-based system for financing health coverage—a system that now serves nine of every ten Americans who now have health insurance. To ensure affordability, small businesses, low-wage employers and low-income individuals and families will get substantial discounts.

This legislation will strengthen our economy. Our current system is so much more costly than any other system in the world, and the American people should not be asked to pay huge new taxes in order to afford health care reform. This plan raises no new broad-based taxes, but spends our health care dollars more wisely. It levels the playing field for small businesses, making it possible for them to insure their families and employees. It eases the tremendous burden of rising health costs on big business, helping them to compete for global markets. And by bringing the explosive growth in health costs under control, it sets us in the right direction of reducing our national debt.

The legislation restores common sense to American health care. It borrows from what works today, letting us phase in change at a reasonable pace and adjust our course in needed. It builds on what works best—and makes it work for everyone. Our task now is to work together, to leave behind decades of false starts and agree on health care reform that guarantees true security. The time for action is now. I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for Tuesday, October 26, on account of illness.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and October 28, on account of personal business.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), after 3 p.m. today, on account of family illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 60 minutes, on October 28 and 29 and November 1 and 3.

Mr. KOLBE, for 60 minutes, on November 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15, and 16.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NADLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABO, for 5 minutes, on October 28.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, on October 28.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. FINGERHUT, for 60 minutes, on October 28.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) to revise and

extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH, 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. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. GOODLING in three instances.
Mr. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. PACKARD in two instances.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. DORNAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NADLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. LAROCCO.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. HAMILTON, in two instances.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. MANN, in two instances.
Mr. MINGE.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mrs. THURMAN.
Mr. STRICKLAND.
Mr. HUGHES.
Mr. DOOLEY.
Mr. BARLOW.
Mr. TANNER.
Mr. DEFAZIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POMEROY.
Mr. PARKER.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. KYL.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Ms. LONG.
Mr. HENCHEY.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. COPPERSMITH.
Mr. SANTORUM.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. BUYER.
Mr. SPENCE.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1534. An Act 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.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2403. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS 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 joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res 228. Joint resolution to approve the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of Romania.

H.R. 2491. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 328 An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, NM.

H.R. 2750. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2519. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 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:

2061. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priority—Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Rehabilitation in the Pacific Basin, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2062. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a final audit report entitled "Accounting for Fiscal Year 1992 Reimbursable Expenditures of Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Money, Bureau of Reclamation," Report No. 93-I-1599, dated September 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2063. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Protection Board, transmitting the fiscal year 1993 annual report as required by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 286. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 334) to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of Cheraw Indians of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-309). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-310). Referred to the House Calendar.

## 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. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 3375. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow grants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance to such agencies most directly affected by crime and violence; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 3376. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 3377. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to parental kidnapping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 3379. A bill to amend section 156 of title 35, United States Code, to provide for the interim extension of patents subject to that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ARMEY,

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 3380. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for consideration of the ability of an applicant for a stormwater permit to pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 3381. A bill to provide for the continued sale of power by Federal power marketing agencies to preference entities using power at military installations selected for closure; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 3382. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent an institution from participating in the Pell grant program if such institution has a high default rate under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 3383. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a program to place members of the Armed Forces who are separated from the Armed Forces in employment positions with law enforcement agencies to relieve shortages of law enforcement officers and to provide employment for displaced military personnel; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL (for himself and Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona):

H.R. 3384. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to trading with Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama):

H.R. 3385. A bill to protect the integrity of the Nation's financial system from international counterfeiting and economic terrorism, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCRERY (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. COMBEST):

H.R. 3386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the effective date for the change in the point of imposition of the tax on diesel fuel, to provide that vendors of diesel fuel used for any nontaxable use may claim refunds on behalf of the ultimate users, and to provide a similar rule for vendors of gasoline used by State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3387. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Neurolite (complete dosage kits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3388. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cardiolite (complete dosage kits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require insured depository institutions to provide notify customers who purchase mutual funds on the premise of the institution that such mutual funds are not insured deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3390. A bill to provide assistance to local elementary schools through its local educational agency for the prevention and reduction of conflict and violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER:

H.R. 3391. A bill to restore eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to unremarried surviving spouses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SWETT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 3392. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to assure the safety of public water systems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the franking privilege for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and House Administration.

By Mr. KLUG (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require disclosure of information by the Congress; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Government Operations.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 3395. A bill to require the preparation of risk assessments in connection with Federal health and safety or environmental regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution making further, continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. HAMBURG):

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Rules.

By Mr. DEUTSCH:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution concerning the heroic rescue of Danish Jews in World War II by the Danish people; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PARKER, Mr. COX, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. GRAMS):

H. Res. 288. Resolution requiring the committees of the House of Representatives to report legislation to include the Congress under certain employment and civil rights laws; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Government Operations, and the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 44: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LONG, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 115: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. REED.

H.R. 144: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 145: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 324: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 417: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 431: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 647: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 649: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 786: Mr. GOSS and Mr. REED.

H.R. 789: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1048: Ms. BYRNE and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1120: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1168: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1181: Mr. FIELDS of Texas and Mr. DEAL.

H.R. 1239: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 1240: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 1295: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. MCMILLAN, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1314: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1391: Mr. STARK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1453: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ORTON, and Ms. SHEPHARD.

H.R. 1455: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1504: Mr. MCMILLAN.

H.R. 1551: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1687: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 1900: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Ms. LAMBERT.

H.R. 1928: Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1981: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1986: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2043: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2076: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2157: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 2231: Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 2232: Mr. TUCKER and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 2357: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2396: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2457: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 2499: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2556: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 2592: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2613: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2623: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WISE, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2641: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2676: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2708: Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 2709: Mr. DICKS, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 2758: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2788: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2872: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2886: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 2896: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2929: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2936: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2938: Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 2951: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 3006: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 3025: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3026: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3065: Mr. FISH, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 3086: Mr. TALENT and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 3087: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHENK, and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 3088: Mr. KING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.
H.R. 3098: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3101: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 3121: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 3125: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 3206: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3208: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3238: Mr. JACOBS.
H.R. 3265: Mr. HOUGHTON.
H.R. 3272: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 3341: Mr. GILMAN.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. SANDERS.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. DEAL.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. CLAY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MILLER of California.
H.J. Res. 95: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. DEAL and Mrs. FOWLER.
H.J. Res. 131: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.J. Res. 188: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WISE, Mr. CARR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.J. Res. 191: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.J. Res. 209: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.J. Res. 237: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.J. Res. 242: Mr. EVANS.
H.J. Res. 254: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. GALLO.
H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Con. Res. 147: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H. Res. 38. Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 247: Mr. KOLBE.
H. Res. 270: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GRAMS.