HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, November 23, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

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

At all the moments that span our days during all the times of opportunity and disappointment, whenever we wonder or worry, our hearts are grateful, O loving God, that Your spirit is ever with us. May each person, whatever the task or duty, be worthy of the high calling to which we have been called, to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You.

Now may the Lord bless us and keep us.
The Lord make His face shine on us and be gracious to us.
The Lord look upon us with favor and give us peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. WALKER 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.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY IS PEOPLE'S POLL CHAMPION

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, pretty soon the coaches poll and sportswriters poll will declare their choices for America's 1993 national champion in college football. This is the people's House, so today, on behalf of the people's poll, I am declaring Auburn University, which has completed its season with an unbeaten, untied 11 and 0 record, America's 1993 national champion. Warrrrrr Eagle.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF TWO MEMBERS TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT THAT THE HOUSE HAS COMPLETED ITS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 324) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 324

Resolved, That a committee of two Members of the House be appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the House of Representatives has completed its business of the session and is ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members of the House to the committee to notify the President, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 3600, THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT, TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill, H.R. 3600, the Health Security Act, is re-referred to include among the titles referred to the Committee on Education and Labor part 1 of subtitle C of title V.

There was no objection.

LAYING ON THE TABLE HOUSE RESOLUTION 317 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 321

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 317 and House Resolution 321 are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

NEED FOR REAUTHORIZATION OF NEW YORK STATE'S CHILD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to my colleagues' attention the urgent need to extend the authorization of New York State's historic welfare reform demonstration known as the Child Assistance Program [CAP]. The House approved a reauthorization of CAP as part of the OBRA 93 bill, but the measure was deleted by the other body on procedural grounds.

In the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, Congress authorized CAP to enable New York State to test groundbreaking strategies in the area of welfare reform. Since that time, the New York Department of Social Services has conducted a highly successful and nationally significant demonstration project in seven New York counties, testing strategies for encouraging work and self-sufficiency among welfare recipients.

Earlier this month, Gov. Mario Cuomo released the results of a 2-year independent assessment of CAP that reported impressive successes in increasing the average earnings and work hours of CAP participants. CAP also succeeded in significantly increasing the rate of participants who obtained child support orders. All this was achieved while the average amount of cash assistance to CAP participants declined.

These results indicate that there are real and effective alternatives to the present welfare system, and that government can supplement rather than supplant the efforts of single parents trying to improve their children's lives.

Early in the next session I plan to introduce welfare reform legislation which draws on some of the lessons of CAP. However, in order for this program to continue to provide important information about welfare reform, it is essential that Congress move to reauthorize this demonstration effort before it expires at the end of March 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the executive summary of the 2-year assessment of CAP.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New York State Child Assistance Program (CAP) is a demonstration program operating in seven New York counties. The program was conceived and developed by the New York State Department of Social Services (SDSS), and approved by the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services under provisions of Section 9122 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, Section 1115 of the Social Security Act, and Section 17(b)(1) of the Food Stamp Act.

CAP was designed as an alternative to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program (AFDC), the nation's primary public assistance program for poor families with children. CAP intends to promote both the immediate and long-term prospects of children in AFDC single-parent families while requiring that their parents—both custodial and noncustodial—take responsibility for supporting their children to the best of their ability. CAP offers single-parent AFDC families a unique financial aid and social service package that includes: incentives for parents to work and assist with child support enforcement efforts; individualized case management services; less burdensome administrative requirements; and financial assistance supplementing parental contributions.

CAP's incentives and services are intended to alter the behaviors and circumstances of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

AFDC recipients. If the program is successful, it will: Motivate and help clients to increase their earnings; motivate and help clients to obtain complete child support orders; allow clients to raise their income above the poverty level even before becoming independent of assistance; and allow clients to attain enough income from earnings and child support and accumulate enough resources to move into sustained self-sufficiency.

Based on two years of clients' exposure to CAP, the evaluation finds that CAP had significant positive impacts on clients' earnings, support orders, and total income. CAP had no positive or negative impact on clients' receipt of public assistance during the first two years, and the program's long-term effect on self-sufficiency cannot yet be determined. CAP generated clear net financial benefits to clients over the two years at no cost to the government; in fact, net government expenditures declined slightly.

The following pages summarize the rationale, design, and results of the CAP demonstration. The full report presents more detail and discussion on all of these points.

CAP RATIONALE: AFDC HAS BEEN LARGELY INEFFECTIVE IN HELPING SINGLE-PARENT FAMILIES EXIT FROM POVERTY

Much of the basic rationale and program concept for CAP stems from an investigation of the relationship between poverty and economic dependence conducted by the New York State Task Force on Poverty and Welfare. One of the Task Force's findings was that poverty is heavily concentrated in children, particularly children in single-parent households. A second major finding was that the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program (AFDC), which was originally established to provide temporary income support for single mothers with children, has been largely ineffective in helping single-parent families become self-supporting or exit from poverty.

The Task Force found several features of AFDC to limit its effectiveness as an antipoverty program. First, combined AFDC and food stamp benefits do not normally raise a family above the poverty line. Second, AFDC regulations provide no meaningful incentives for earnings. Third, because the labor market for entry-level or part-time workers with minimal skills typically offers low wages, job instability, and limited or no employee benefits, single parents with children may be financially better off receiving AFDC than working.

In the view of the Task Force, the problems of the AFDC program are compounded by a trend in the administration of welfare programs which has increasingly separated eligibility determination from social service. AFDC line staff are generally responsible for determining the eligibility and benefits of recipients, rather than providing the supportive services, job search assistance, and skills training which could promote economic independence.

CAP WAS DESIGNED TO OVERCOME THE OBSTACLES TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY SEEN IN THE AFDC SYSTEM

CAP is a voluntary program. Only single-parent families that are currently receiving AFDC may enroll. To qualify for CAP, the AFDC case must include a custodial parent and at least one child of an absent parent.

To motivate clients to increase their work hours and earnings, CAP offers a dramatically different treatment of earnings than AFDC. AFDC benefits are reduced by nearly a dollar for each dollar of earnings, once the client has worked more than four months. CAP benefits are reduced by only 10 cents for each dollar of earnings below the poverty level, and by 67 cents per dollar when their income surpasses the poverty line. CAP families may achieve incomes as high as 150 percent of the poverty level before losing program eligibility.

Grant levels are based on the number of children in the family who are members of the AFDC case and are covered by a court-issued order of child support. Children who are not eligible for CAP cannot receive AFDC while the family participates in CAP. The custodial parent therefore has a direct financial incentive to try to establish orders for every child in the family. CAP participants receive program assistance in obtaining child support orders and upgrading their current support orders.

Employment is not a prerequisite to participation in CAP, but the CAP grant will exceed the AFDC grant only when the family has substantial earnings. If all of the children in the family are covered by support orders, and therefore can be included in the CAP grant, monthly earnings of about $350 are needed for CAP to be financially advantageous. If one or more children in the AFDC case are not covered by support orders CAP may still be advantageous but at a higher level of earnings.

To further assist participants' efforts to become self-supporting, CAP eliminates the AFDC resource rule that prohibits clients from accumulating more than $1,000 in assets (including any equity value of a car exceeding $1,500). To encourage self-reliance and remove stigma, CAP provides food stamp benefits by check (commonly referred to as cashout) rather than coupons. CAP also eliminates the restricted shelter and energy vendor payment system commonly used in AFDC in New York State, so that CAP participants must be more actively involved in managing their own household budgets.

Finally, CAP features intensive case management. CAP workers are expected to handle caseloads of about 50 cases, on average, compared to caseloads several times as high for AFDC caseworkers. CAP case managers provide advice and assistance to help clients qualify for CAP and move toward self-sufficiency.

THE CAP DEMONSTRATION IS AUTHORIZED TO OPERATE IN SEVEN COUNTIES THROUGH MARCH 1994

The Child Assistance Program is authorized to run in seven local Department of Social Service districts from October 1988, through March 1994.[1] A mixed evaluation design includes non-experimental sites, to study CAP operations under normal operating conditions, as well as experimental sites that rigorously test the program for its impacts on participants.

In four counties—Albany, Allegany, Chautauqua and Ulster—enrollment is open to all eligible single-parent AFDC families, and for this reason they are referred to as saturation counties. The three remaining counties—Monroe, Niagara, and Suffolk—are participating in an experiment designed to measure CAP's effects on participations, and its costs and benefits. In these experimental counties, AFDC cases were randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. Members of the treatment group were informed of CAP, and invited to participate if they met the program's eligibility requirements. Control group members were not permitted to enroll in CAP for the duration of the demonstration.

THE IMPACT EVALUATION FOCUSES ON THE THREE EXPERIMENTAL COUNTIES, IN WHICH AFDC RECIPIENTS WERE RANDOMLY ASSIGNED TO TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUPS AND CLOSELY TRACKED

The SDSS has contracted with Abt Associates, a research firm based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to conduct the evaluation of the demonstration. The evaluation comprises four major studies: an impact study, a cost-benefit study, an implementation/process study, and a food stamp cashout study. This report presents the findings of the impact and cost-benefit studies. It is based on data covering the first two years of recipients' exposure to CAP.

One cannot determine whether CAP has its desired effects simply by measuring outcomes for CAP participant. Client outcomes under CAP must be compared to the outcomes that would have occurred in the absence of CAP. The most scientifically accepted way to make this comparison is to assign clients randomly to treatment and control groups and to compare the two groups' outcomes. This is the procedure used for the CAP evaluation. All members of the treatment group were offered the opportunity to enroll in CAP at any time they qualified and wishes to participate. Members of the control group had no such opportunity.

CAP impacts are measured by comparing the full treatment group with the full control group, including clients participating in CAP (in the treatment group only), those participating in AFDC, and those no longer receiving any form of assistance. We cannot measure separately the impact on those people who participate in CAP. In effect, the treatment-control comparison averages CAP's impact on participants with its (presumably much smaller) impact on non-participants (weighting the two impacts according to the number of participants and non-participants.

The three experimental counties (Monroe, Niagara, and Suffolk) had a combined total of about 18,000 AFDC cases that would be potentially eligible for CAP—that is, cases consisting of a custodial parent and one or more children of an absent parent. From these, the SDSS randomly selected about 4,300 cases, assigning half to the treatment group and half to the control group. The selected clients were approximately equally divided among four key subgroups: Those who already had some earnings and at least one support order when they were selected; those who had earnings but no support orders; those with at least one support order but no earnings; and those who had neither earnings nor support orders.

Three kinds of data were collected for each case. As the selected cases entered the demonstration, caseworkers administered a Background Information Form to record characteristics of the clients and their households. For each month thereafter, SDSS automated files provided information on assistance benefits and child support status. Finally, in follow-up surveys conducted one year and two years after selection, clients reported on their employment and earnings for the previous twelve months.

The two-year study period does not allow us to observe all of CAP's impacts. At any point after the demonstration's first few months, we would expect to find the treatment group clients divided into three types: those who have not yet enrolled (including those who will never enroll); those currently

[1] At this writing, the possibility of extending this authorization for another five years is under discussion.

participating in CAP; and those who have completed a spell of CAP participation and either left welfare or returned to AFDC. Relatively few people completed the full cycle of CAP enrollment and participation with the two years. Thus the findings mainly reflect the experiences of clients who have not yet enrolled in CAP or who are currently participating.

THE DEMONSTRATION POPULATION IS REASONABLY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SINGLE-PARENT AFDC CASELOAD IN THE NATION

Virtually all of the AFDC recipients in the experimental sample are women. Most have one or two children, and half have at least one child less than three years old. Half of the clients had received AFDC continuously for two years or more when they entered the sample, and almost all were receiving food stamps as well as AFDC. Just over half had graduated from high school. About 40 percent are white, about the same number are black, and most of the remainder are Hispanic.

Very few clients (less than 3 percent) entered the experiment with enough earnings and child support orders for CAP to be immediately advantageous over AFDC. Although most had some work experience, only one in ten was employed in the month they entered the sample, and just one in twenty earned $350 or more that month. Half had at least one support order, but a third had orders for all of their children. Most of those without orders were never married to the absent parent, most had no contact with the absent parent, and most had an absent parent who lived out of state or whose location was unknown.

The three counties' caseloads differed in some potentially important ways. Monroe's clients appeared to face the greatest obstacles to participation in CAP. They had the youngest children and were the least likely to have ever married, obtained any support orders, finished high school, or ever worked for pay. Niagara's clients, in contrast, seemed the most likely to meet CAP's entry criteria. Niagara had the highest proportion who were employed as they entered the study and the highest proportion who had ever married, obtained support orders, or graduated from high school. Suffolk's caseload was more comparable to Monroe's than Niagara's

To the extent that comparable figures are available, the profile of the experimental sample appears quite similar to that of the national AFDC caseload. The sample also resembles in most respects the caseload in upstate New York (i.e., excluding New York City). The exceptions include higher percentages in the experimental sample of black and Hispanic clients, never-married clients, and clients with a child under age three, than in New York's upstate AFDC population as a whole. These differences reflect the generally urban nature of the experimental counties, while much of upstate New York is more rural.

TEN PERCENT OF TREATMENT GROUP MEMBERS PARTICIPATED IN CAP, ALTHOUGH MORE WOULD BE EXPECTED IN A NON-EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

CAP participation not only is voluntary, but requires most clients to take substantial steps to obtain earnings or child support order before they enroll. Thus it is to be expected that many AFDC recipients would never enroll in CAP. The 10 percent enrollment rate observed in the experimental counties is almost certainly lower than it would be in a non-experimental program, however, because the research design constrained CAP recruitment efforts.

Although CAP participants were limited in number, their characteristics were diverse. The need to obtain earnings and support orders did not exclude any major segments of the AFDC population (apart from those excluded by definition, such as two-parent families). Clients whose situation might make it difficult to obtain complete support orders, such as having an out-of-state absent parent, did have lower than average participation rates.

Clients who had some earnings and at least one support order when they entered the experiment were, not surprisingly, the quickest to enroll and had by far the highest participation rate. Only about 6 percent of clients already had earnings and orders, however, so they did not dominate the enrollee group. The majority of CAP enrollees (55 percent) had at least one child support order but no earnings when they entered the experiment.

LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION WAS CRITICAL TO CAP PARTICIPATION

Only 4 percent of the treatment group enrolled in CAP in Suffolk County, while the Monroe and Niagara had enrollments of 12 and 16 percent, respectively. Moreover, nearly half of the enrollees in Suffolk were clients who already had some earnings and support orders when they entered the experiment.

Effective recruitment is usually critical in voluntary programs. One might have expected it to be less important CAP, a program that offers immediate, automatic, and clearly defined financial benefits. However, CAP participation clearly depended heavily on CAP workers convincing clients that it was worth responding to the program's incentives. In Monroe and Niagara, CAP had a clear priority in the county Department of Social Services, workers implemented systematic and relatively intensive follow-up contacts with prospective clients, and the program was effectively presented to clients as being an attractive alternative to AFDC. These factor proved very important in motivating clients to take steps to qualify for CAP.

CAP RAISED CLIENTS' AVERAGE TOTAL EARNINGS FOR THE TWO YEARS BY 27 PERCENT

Members of the control group had average monthly earnings of $133 over the two years, with the average climbing throughout the period. More people worked in the treatment group and they worked more hours, on average. Thus treatment group members earned $37 more per month, on average, an increase of 27 percent.

CAP's impact grew over time, from 21 percent in the first in the year to 30 percent in the second. The gap between the treatment and control narrowed somewhat and seemed to level off toward the end of the period, but the future course of CAP impacts cannot be determined.

CAP had its greatest impact in Monroe, raising the two-year average income by 53 percent. Apparently because Niagara already offered an extensive array of employment and training services to AFDC recipients, average earnings in the control group almost kept pace with treatment group earnings. No significant impact was seen in Suffolk, probably reflecting the low CAP participation rate and the high proportion of CAP enrollees who already had earnings when the experiment began.

CAP did not induce people to sacrifice job quality in a quest for immediate earnings. On average, treatment group member's jobs provided equal or higher wages and health benefits than control group jobs. There is evidence, however, that some treatment group members were forgoing education and training activities, presumably to seek earnings quickly.

CAP LED TO 25 PERCENT INCREASE IN THE CHANCE THAT A FAMILY WOULD OBTAIN SUPPORT ORDERS FOR ALL CHILDREN WHO LACKED THEM

When they entered the experiment, nearly two-thirds of all clients had at least one child not covered by a support order. Control group members got new orders at a steady but quite slow pace. On average over the two years, 14 percent of the control members who initially had a gap in orders had filled the gap.

Treatment group members filled in their missing orders in greater numbers and at a faster pace. Over the two years, the proportion of families that had gained complete orders averaged about four percentage points higher than the proportion in the control group—a 25 percent improvement. Some of this increase appears to represent additional orders, orders that the custodial parent would not have sought in the absence of CAP. Some of the increase probably stems from client and CAP worker pressure to speed up orders that the clients would have obtained ultimately even without CAP.

The CAP effect was very large in Monroe (55 percent), but not statistically significant in either Niagara or Suffolk. The Monroe CAP hired a former Child Support Enforcement program worker, who worked aggressively with prospective participants to pursue orders that would help them qualify for CAP. In Niagara, where nearly twice as many clients started out with complete support orders, obtaining new orders had a somewhat lower priority. Suffolk's generally less effective implementation again led to no significant impact.

THE INCREASE IN SUPPORT ORDERS DID NOT LEAD TO A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN SUPPORT PAYMENTS DURING THE STUDY PERIOD

There is some evidence that the impact on orders can translate into increased child support income: statistically significant impacts on support payments were found in both Monroe and Niagara for clients who began the experiment with some earnings and at least one support order. Average support payments for the full treatment group were not significantly different from the average for the control group.

It seems likely that some of the "extra" support orders generated by CAP would not otherwise have been pursued because they would call for relatively low payments. These orders have potential future value if, for example, the absent parent's income rises and the award amount is adjusted upwards. This process did not generate statistically significant gains during the study period, however.

CAP CAUSED NO SIGNIFICANT INCREASE OR DECREASE IN THE AMOUNT PAID IN ASSISTANCE BENEFITS DURING THE TWO YEARS

Average assistance payments declined over the two years as clients slowly left AFDC and CAP. The decline for treatment group members followed almost exactly the same path as that for the control group, producing no statistically significant difference in average payments for the population as a whole.

The absence of an increase in assistance payments is somewhat surprising, because

some planners assumed that CAP's more favorable treatment of earnings would lead to higher expenditures. Apparently CAP induced enough increases in earnings to counterbalance this aspect of the benefit formula.

When various assistance programs are considered singly, no significant differences are found for cash assistance (CAP, AFDC, and Home Relief), for Medicaid eligibility, for Emergency Assistance, or for Services.[2] CAP reduced average monthly food stamp benefits by $4 or 3 percent over the two years, because average earnings increased while cash assistance payments remained level. When benefit payments for these programs[3] are combined, CAP showed no significant effect on average payments.

CAP INCREASED TOTAL TWO-YEAR FAMILY INCOME BY 4 PERCENT AND SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED A FAMILY'S CHANCE OF HAVING AN ABOVE-POVERTY INCOME

Total monthly discretionary income in the control group averaged $977 over the two years. This includes the client's earnings, other family members' earnings, cash assistance benefits, food stamps, child support payments, and income from other government sources (such as Social Security). Because the treatment group had higher average earnings, total monthly income for treatment group families averaged $41 or 4 percent higher than the control group average, a statistically significant difference.

The positive effect was concentrated in Monroe and Niagara counties. In Suffolk, where CAP participation was low and CAP did not affect earnings or child support orders, total income was likewise unaffected.

In addition to raising average incomes, CAP helped some families achieve incomes substantially above the poverty level. Families in the treatment group were 18 percent more likely than those in the control group to have incomes exceeding 125 percent of the poverty line.

THE NET RESULT OF ALL CAP'S COSTS AND BENEFITS WAS AN AVERAGE CLIENT INCOME GAIN OF $36 PER MONTH AND AN AVERAGE GOVERNMENT SAVINGS OF $2 PER MONTH FOR EACH FAMILY IN THE TREATMENT GROUP

CAP's principal effect on families' economic circumstances was to bring about a $37 increase in the average monthly earnings of clients in the treatment group. A series of small impacts on assistance benefits and other sources of income essentially cancelled each other out, leaving a net gain of $36 per family per month.

CAP's net effect on government expenditures was very close to no effect at all. The largest single impact was an increase in administrative costs amounting to about $7 per month for each family in the treatment group. This was offset by small reductions in cash assistance and food stamp payments and a small increase in child support collections for cases on assistance. The net result was a reduction in total government expenditures of about $2 per family per month.

The net cost-benefit result differed across the three counties. Clients' income gains were larger than the overall average in Monroe and Niagara but near zero in Suffolk. Government costs were reduced by several dollars in Monroe and Suffolk, but increased in Niagara. In Niagara, where much of the gain in client income stemmed from higher assistance payments, the clients' income gain was still larger than the government's extra cost.

CAP'S POSITIVE IMPACTS FOR CLIENTS AND THE GOVERNMENT ARGUE FOR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THIS APPROACH TO WELFARE REFORM

CAP's impacts compare favorably in many respects with the impacts that have been documented for other welfare reform approaches. In particular, the gain in client earnings with CAP equals or surpasses the gains documented with employment and training programs, the most widely tested approach of the past decade. Because CAP's goal is to boost client incomes before they leave public assistance as well as afterward, CAP did not generate reductions in assistance payments as quickly as most employment and training demonstrations. Yet because its administrative costs were relatively low, CAP apparently paid for itself more quickly, while providing clients with more immediate income gains.

Such findings do not suggest that CAP is a "silver bullet" solution to the welfare dilemma; however, they indicate that CAP offers meaningful improvements relative to the current system, and that elements of this approach may merit more widespread consideration in forming welfare policy.

[2] This refers to a set of five social service programs available to welfare recipients: Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, Adoption Services, Title XX Child Care, and Domestic Violence.

[3] Medicaid and Services payments are not included because they reflect events that are highly variable from case to case and month to month. CAP had no impact on the percentage of months in which clients were eligible for Medicaid or the percentage of months in which they received Services.

WAR CRIMES AND GENOCIDE IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. I rise today to discuss the prospects for bringing to justice those who have planned, perpetuated, and taken part in war crimes, crimes against humanity, and even genocide in the former Yugoslavia.

As my colleagues here know, for more than a year and a half I have been calling for the establishment of an international tribunal empowered to bring individual wrongdoers to justice.

Many in this body have called for the same. If we are in a new world order, it will be a world in which international crimes are not committed without justice being applied.

Last week, we were brought one step closer to this goal. Eleven judges were sworn in, who pledged to impose legal sanctions on those who have shocked the conscience of humanity with the atrocities they have committed in this conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, if in the 1930's, when genocide began, we had had the oversight of the international community and the commitment to call to account those who would treat their fellow human beings so savagely, perhaps, just perhaps, millions of lives might have been saved.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, that the obstacles this tribunal faces are daunting. So daunting, in fact, that its inaugural meeting has been met with doubt in many quarters as to whether it will be able to meet the goals set for it in its statute. In fact, I must confess that I share some of those concerns.

The tremendous delays experienced during the election of judges and the appointment of the chief prosecutor are indicative of the barriers erected by those at the U.N.—both within the U.N. bureaucracy and among the U.N. member states—who did not want this tribunal established at all and, frankly, I think do not want it to succeed now.

Although the Security Council had pledged to reflect the diversity of "the world's legal systems" in the election of judges, the final panel confirmed by the General Assembly includes only two women and, inexplicably, not one single Moslem. Efforts to select a chief prosecutor were equally disheartening: The Security Council deadlocked twice before it could reach agreement on a third nominee, reflecting the lack of a common sense of purpose in that body. Even today, the tribunal still has insufficient resources, insufficient staffing, and insufficient support from the members of the Security Council itself.

In spite of all this, I am not and I hope others are not—prepared to say that this tribunal cannot succeed, because I believe that many of the problems it faces can be addressed, in part if not totally. The United States must continue to lead the way, both in terms of the information we make available to the tribunal as we have to the Commission of Experts and in terms of financial resources, material, and expert staffing. In this regard, I know of no other country that has provided as much support for this effort as has the United States.

But even we can do more. The United States should undertake an interagency review of its classified materials in order to determine if critical information on war crimes has been unnecessarily withheld.

We know for a fact that this had occurred in the post-World War II history of this country.

This information should be made publicly available to the United Nations, as have previous reports on war crimes prepared by the United States. In addition, the United States should seek to make available to the court and to the chief prosecutor experts of the highest caliber, drawing not only from within its own ranks, but from the nongovernmental community as well.

□ 1210

In this way, the United States can set a positive example for other countries whose proclaimed support for prosecuting war crimes has not yet been translated into positive deeds.

But perhaps the most consequential undertaking that awaits the United States and the other Members of the Security Council is the adoption of provisions for the apprehension of alleged war criminals. Cooperation with the tribunal, established under chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, is required by all countries; but we know from experience that not all countries will, in fact, cooperate.

It is imperative, therefore, that consideration be given today—not next week or next month or year—for the establishment of a specific regime to which recourse can be made by the Security Council to implement the warrants for arrest, detention, surrender, or transfer of persons sought for trial by this tribunal. No country must be permitted to become a safe haven for those indicted for war crimes.

Let it be true of international law that those who harbor, protect, and further the criminal enterprise of those who commit genocide against the peoples of this world, let them, too, be branded equally guilty of such heinous crimes.

An undertaking of this scope is unprecedented, of course, and will require innovative approaches to be successful. Indeed, innovative approaches will be essential if a new world order is to be realized. It is conceivable that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe could play a significant role in this process, possibly contributing to the formulation of such a regime or its ultimate implementation.

Some have suggested that this kind of planning will, in the end, be unnecessary. They imply that the perpetrators of these crimes have not left a documentary paper trail that would enable any court to convict them. Of course, few murderers do. I do not believe, however, that without a written confession we can never bring people to justice. In many of the cases arising from this war, I believe there will be ample evidence to issue indictments and arrest warrants; and in many of those cases, I believe convictions can and will be sustained.

For starters, we have the graves of thousands of noncombatants—civilians, neighbors like ours, children like ours, mothers like ours, fathers like ours, sisters like ours, brothers like ours—who were purposely, willfully, and criminally killed in the war in the former Yugoslavia.

The U.N. Commission of Experts, working with Physicians for Human Rights, has been engaged in the arduous process of gathering forensic evidence on graves such as these, evidence that may ultimately link silenced victims with their living killers.

We also, of course, Mr. Speaker, have survivors, eyewitnesses, and a significant body of intelligence about what troops were where, and when—placing the suspects, if you will, at the scene of the crime.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I believe the chief prosecutor of the tribunal can and should immediately launch investigations into those figures about whom the most information has already been gathered.

Mr. Speaker, anonymity for war criminals is an important aspect for their success.

I would like to name briefly here some of those figures, whose role in this war has been documented by Helsinki Watch reports, by the New York Times and other newspapers, by the recent book of Pulitzer Prize winning Newsday correspondent, Roy Gutman, entitled "A Witness to Genocide."

Let me say parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, that in today's world we have all been witnesses to genocide. There is no excuse to say, "If we had only known, if we had only seen, if we had only heard of the deaths of children, the starving of peoples, the commission of crimes."

Finally, documentation comes from an April 1993 video report entitled "A Town Called Kozarac" produced for the British television program, Dispatches. The following people, Mr. Speaker, are among the most notorious.

Zeljko Raznjatovic, also known as Arkan, stands here, He is well-dressed, has a fancy uniform, a shaven face, a close haircut. Perhaps he is someone who we would otherwise think is just another person. He has already been branded an international criminal, He robbed banks in Belgium and the Netherlands for which he was imprisoned, and committed several burglaries in Sweden and Germany.

In early 1992, his group was responsible for a major massacre of moslems in the town of Bijeljina and elsewhere in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Arkan is a perpetrator of war crimes, a person who has furthered genocide in the best tradition of Adolph Hitler.

Vojislav Seselj is head of the fascist Serbian Radical Party and its paramilitary wing, known as the Serbian Chetnik Movement. His people have operated throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina during the course of the war, committing atrocities, not against military personnel, but against the civilian population. Seselj is a war criminal in the best tradition of Adolph Hitler.

Mladjo Krkan is an Omarska camp guard—like other guards at other prison camps about whom we have talked. He was known to be particularly brutal and is implicated in the murder of two prisoners.

But one thing we always know when it comes to war crimes is that unfortunately most are secret, done out of the light of witnesses or other observers.

Surviving prisoners in one British documentary said that most of the atrocities at the Omarska camp occurred during Krkan's shift. Krkan is a war criminal in the best tradition of Adolph Hitler.

Gen. Ratko Mladic is the head of the Bosnian Serb military. According to the New York Times, he is often called the ethnic cleanser in chief. "Ethnic cleansing," what an interesting phrase. Cleansing is a word that most of us feel makes things better. But what it has meant here is the genocide of a people, the expelling of a people, through death and injury, from the homelands in which they and their ancestors had lived for centuries.

Why? Because of their ethnicity, because they were a different kind of people and because an invading force wanted to sanitize a geographic region for their own people.

□ 1220

Before moving to the Bosnian front, Mladic was commander of the Yugoslav army in the Serb-controlled region of Krajina in Croatia, where he earned the additional title of "Butcher of Knin." The troops under his control are responsible for many of the atrocities we hear about in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and, as I said, that we witness on CNN, on NBC, on CBS, on ABC, on BBC and other countless television programs, brought into our very homes, brought to this Nation and nations around the world.

Radovan Karadzic is the Bosnian Serb political leader. He is cold, calculating and, at best, amoral, savaging others through puppets for political ends. He is a familiar face from his presence at the negotiations in Geneva. Trained as a psychiatrist, he is perhaps the person most responsible for ordering the atrocities that have been committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Karadzic is from the Serb population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but he is the agent, clearly, of the next person: Slobodan Milosevic, with whom I have met.

Mr. Speaker, Slobodan Milosevic is more than the President of Serbia. He is the Hitler of Yugoslavia, the mastermind of the plan for a Greater Serbia. Milosevic has been the single most culpable figure in orchestrating this war.

Make no mistake, America. Make no mistake, my colleagues. If he had wanted to do so, he could have brought an end to the conflict. Not all the killing is organized, nor are all the atrocities. But he could have brought to an end the ethnic cleansing and the organized massacre of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of people. He could have stopped the largest migration of peoples in Europe since the Second World War, over 2½ million refugees, homeless, displaced, children, old people, families. Slobodan Milosevic is a name of infamy in the international community.

Some of these people, Mr. Speaker, were named as suspected war criminals by then-Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger almost a year ago, but they are still free and, in some instances, we negotiate with them.

I only assert the guilt of these individuals, because the new world order demands that we have a system of laws and not of men, a system in which even Milosevic has a right to defend his innocence. The international community, however, needs to have him at the dock, in the court, responding to the charges, as we did at Nuremberg. It is time to move forward with concrete indictment of specific individuals, establish a framework for apprehending them, and, ultimately, trials for war crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a lasting resolution of the war in the Balkans requires breaking the cycle of violence and vengeance that has racked this region, not just in this century, but in centuries past. That goal can only be achieved through the administration of justice, by an impartial and, in this case, international tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a new world order, it will be because, as we become witnesses, we then act. As we become witnesses, we become enraged and determined to hold accountable those who for no other reason than ethnic differences would commit acts of savagery on their fellow human beings.

Mr. Speaker, inaction in the face of genocide is both immoral and illegal, but here we are, witnesses to yet another attempt in this century to annihilate a people.

While I do not believe we have done all we can to prevent genocide in Bosnia, neither do I believe that it is too late to act.

As I have said many times on this very floor and in letters to the administration, the United States must take the lead. In particular the United States should put the U.N. Security Council on notice that unless it acts within a specified period of time to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, the United States will undertake unliteral action, if necessary, to uphold that country's right to self-defense, a right theoretically guaranteed to Bosnia by the United Nations Charter, but denied to it in practice.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we, and the rest of the world have done is to say, "We will neither defend you, nor will we allow you to get the arms to defend yourselves."

How many of us, Mr. Speaker, would say to our neighbor, under attack by those who would throw them from their home, that we have arms available for them to repell the criminal element at their door, but we will neither come to their aid, nor will we allow them to purchase an arm to protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a moral policy. That is not a policy that is defensible. That is not a policy that allows any one of us to look at our neighbor the next morning and say, "We believed it was in the best interest of law and order in our community."

Mr. Speaker, some time ago, in the city of New York, in a built-up neighborhood, a cry was heard by many people. It was a cry of rape by a woman named Kitty Genovese, and she cried again asking for help from her neighbors and, perhaps, her friends. But no one took a risk to open the door, to open the door and go down the stairs, to where Kitty Genovese was being attacked. At least 50 people stayed in their homes, later to admit hearing the cries for help and the cries of pain.

□ 1230

We hear of a genocide. We hear of a genocide, and we say to ourselves it is dangerous to go outside the door.

Mr. Speaker, I do not advocate at this point in time the sending of American boys, American men, American personnel and material. But at the very minimum, Mr. Speaker, I believe it a moral imperative that we give to those under attack the right, the ability, and the means to defend themselves. For if we do not, their blood is not only on the hands of Slobodan Milosevic and those criminal elements with whom he conspires.

If the international community rewards aggression and permits criminals to retain their gains, with zero accountability, then we shall have forged the contours of a new world order far worse than the old. If we permit war criminals to prevail by sheer force, the post-cold war era will be shaped by the voices of violence and vengeance. If democracies are unwilling to back up their own principles with effective action, then we betray, Mr. Speaker, not only the innocent victims of this war, we betray ourselves and generations yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, this, we must not let happen.

DESIGNATION OF HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOR REMAINDER OF FIRST SESSION OF 103D CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDREWS of Maine) laid before the House the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 23, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions for the remainder of the First Session of the One Hundred Third Congress.

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

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 960

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 960.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1534

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, November 26, 1993.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman just enlighten us as to what is happening and why we are recessing until then?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Senate is still considering, it is my understanding, the Brady bill. They have not cleared the adjournment resolution as well. That is tied up in that issue, so we have to meet until that issue is resolved.

Mr. SOLOMON. I did not hear exactly what the gentleman's unanimous consent request was.

Mr. BONIOR. Well, the first unanimous consent request that I made was that when we adjourn, we adjourn until 10 a.m. this coming Friday, the day after Thanksgiving.

Then I will ask unanimous consent, once this is given, that when we adjourn on Friday, we meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday next.

Mr. SOLOMON. So the intention on Friday would be, provided the business had been completed on the Brady bill, that we would just go in and out until the 25th?

Mr. BONIOR. It would be pro forma, of course. If there is some resolution, which we do not expect, I guess, at that particular point, but it would just be pro forma, yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. And we will go in and out on Friday, and if it was not settled by that time, and if the Senate so chose, we would come back in on Tuesday?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct, Tuesday, and hopefully that issue will be resolved and we can adjourn sine die.

Mr. SOLOMON. With no other business in-between?

Mr. BONIOR. That is my understanding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1993, TO TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, November 26, 1993, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 30, 1993.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOLIDAY WISHES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish you all a happy Thanksgiving, and all the staff that has been inconvenienced here as well, have a good one.

Mr. BONIOR. And the same to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The good wishes are reciprocated.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 698. An act to protect Lechuguilla Cave and other resources and values in and adjacent to Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

H.R. 2632. An act to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3167. An act to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 5, 1993:

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

On November 17, 1993:

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 21, 1993, and November 20, 1994, as "National Family Week."

On November 19, 1993:

H.R. 3341. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to persons who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

H.R. 2677. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the West Court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

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

On November 20, 1993:

H.R. 3161. An act to make technical amendments necessitated by the enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1992, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2650. An act to designate portions of the Maurice River and its tributaries in the State of New Jersey as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems.

H.R. 914. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Red River in Kentucky as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems, and for other purposes.

On November 22, 1993:

H.R. 3225. An act to support the transition to nonracial democracy in South Africa.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 26, 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:

2180. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an updated compilation of historical information and statistics regarding rescissions proposed by the executive branch and rescissions enacted by Congress (H. Doc. No. 103-175); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2181. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Federative Republic of Brazil, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2182. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of final funding priorities—Research in education of individuals with disabilities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2183. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Howard University Endowment Amendments of 1993"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2184. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2185. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs [CCNAA] for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-12), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2186. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-14), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2187. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2188. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by John Bundy Ritch III, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2189. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report concerning the accuracy, difficulties, benefits, and costs associated with the Federal agencies' audited financial statements; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2190. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a letter from the Secretaries of Commerce, Energy, NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy with respect to the Penny-Kasich proposal to H.R. 3400; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2191. A letter from the Director, U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2192. A letter from the National Adjutant, the Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the organization's 72d National Convention, including their annual audit report of receipts and expenditures as of December 31, 1992, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 901; 44 U.S.C. 1332 (H. Doc. No. 103-176); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2193. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the review of the interest rate charged to borrowers, referred to as the cost of money rate, as determined by the Governor of the Rural Telephone Bank for the preceding fiscal year; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

2194. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on high-speed ground transportation research and development, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1036(c)(1) (105 Stat. 1983); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.

2195. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "John F. Kennedy Center Act Amendments of 1993"; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Natural Resources.

2196. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Reauthorization Act"; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Post Office and Civil Service, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

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. LEWIS of California:

H.R. 3719. A bill to establish a wellness program for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3720. A bill to regulate the manufacture, importation, and sale of jacketed hollow point ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. HUNTER):

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government should require that all tax benefits or other subsidies afforded to businesses operating in the United States as part of health care reform should be used for investment and job creation within the borders of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASHINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that United States assistance to Algeria should be terminated unless its military backed government proceeds towards democratization; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 324. Resolution providing for the committee to notify the President of completion of business; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

267. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Norton Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

268. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to war atrocities in the former Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

269. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to native American burial grounds; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

270. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to expenditure of surplus airport revenues; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 50: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 70: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 214: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 301: Mr. COX.

H.R. 306: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 391: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 392: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 657: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 790: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 886: Mr. WALSH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 894: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 957: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 999: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1009: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1120: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1146: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1161: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1168: Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 1231: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 1277: Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 1493: Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1523: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 1552: Mr. FINGERHUT, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1604: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1621: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 1720: Mr. EDWARDS of California and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1778: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1900: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1999: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 2365: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2393: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 2396: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2443: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DEAL, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2488: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 2554: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 2826: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 2879: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2890: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2958: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 3017: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 3064: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3080: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3097: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3128: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.R. 3179: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 3183: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3195: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3222: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3234: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3309: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 3328: Ms. DUNN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3334: Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 3367: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3386: Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3430: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KING, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 3434: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 3480: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3527: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 3589: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. KIM and Ms. FURSE.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TEJEDA, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 257: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SANDERS.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Con. Res. 167: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 33: Mr. NADLER and Ms. FURSE.

H. Res. 234: Mr. WYNN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Ms. SCHENK.

H. Res. 242: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 243: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 244: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 281: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H. Res. 291: Mr. ARMEY.