

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the Third District of Georgia as well as voters across this great country are sick and tired of business as usual. One hundred and ten freshmen were sent to Washington to reform Congress, to reform its spending habits and to get our fiscal house in order.

My fellow freshmen and I rise to urge our colleagues to cut the Federal budget, not the family budget.

Both sides of the aisle can agree that there is too much Government inefficiency and waste. President Clinton recognized this when he cut his staff at the White House by 25 percent. Mr. Speaker, we can answer the President's challenge for specific budget cuts this week. We should begin immediately to streamline our operation in these great Halls of Congress.

I ask each and every one of my colleagues to support the freshman initiative to cut committee staff by 25 percent.

This one act will save \$13 million. While it will not solve the deficit problem in one fell swoop, it will show the American people that we are committed to cutting the Federal budget and not the family budget.

AMERICA SUPPORTS THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, about 1 month ago, we saw President Clinton address the American people and lay out an economic plan to revitalize the economy and put people back to work. He was straight with us, courageously saying that the days of something for nothing were gone.

The American people overwhelmingly supported the President then and, today, they still stand with the President and his plan.

This weekend in the Wall Street Journal, a poll showed, 62 to 30 percent, the American public prefers President Clinton's plan to the Republican plan. By a 2-to-1 margin voters think the Democrats are doing a better job on the economy and the deficit than Republicans.

By 75 percent, the American people agree with the concept of taxing the wealthy and funding the Head Start Program.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, this week we will have a chance to back the President. The American public backs him; the Congress should back him, too.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, let us take some advice from history—we need a balanced-budget amendment. Just passing statutes has not worked.

In 1978, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1981. Then in 1985, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1991. In 1987, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1994. Finally, in 1990, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1995. If this body is ever going to face fiscal responsibility, balancing the budget must be a requirement made by the supreme law of the land. Laws control men, but only the Constitution can control Government.

Voting for the budget resolution is a vote to increase the debt ceiling. The administration wants Congress to increase the debt ceiling by a huge \$325 billion. What we really need to do is pass a balanced-budget amendment.

It has been said that Governments sometimes do the right thing—but only after they have exhausted all the alternatives. Well, we've about exhausted the alternatives. It is time for a balanced-budget amendment.

GRIDLOCK GOES SNAP, CRACKLE, AND POP

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, since we have just had a very frigid weekend along the east coast and back home in Kentucky, I will use the analogy of the ice breaking in the river to indicate what will happen later in the week when this House passes the budget resolution and the President's package of economic stimulation measures, because the ice will break, the ice jam, the gridlock, will snap, crackle, and pop apart later this week. An end to the gridlock is something that the American people have desired for a long time indicating such last November during the course of the elections.

This week we will see both the passage of a budget resolution, which will reduce Federal spending by \$510 billion over the next 5 years. This will reduce Federal spending leaving a total deficit at a manageable level in that outyear.

The economic stimulus has in it both human capital, Head Start, immunization programs, and physical capital, our infrastructure, bridges, and highways.

Mr. Speaker, once again the American people want gridlock to break. It breaks this week.

CUT COMMITTEE FUNDING

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

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the call for a reduction in committee funding.

The people are demanding that we reduce the bureaucratic burden on American taxpayers.

And they are demanding we begin here in the House of Representatives.

Today, before the House Administration Committee's Subcommittee on Accounts, Ms. DUNN, my colleague from Washington, is offering an amendment to cut committee funding by 25 percent this year.

It is a good proposal.

It would be unconscionable for this body to demand more sacrifices from the American people while wasting the people's money on already bloated committee staffs.

Worse still, last month a number of requests were made for substantial increases in certain committee budgets.

Shame on this House if it agrees to make such unwarranted increases.

American businesses and families alike have had to make painful cuts in their budgets for years.

Why should Congress spend more when the people have less?

The people of my district in central Florida do not want larger committee staffs.

They want their Government to behave responsibly.

Let us answer that call.

Let us behave responsibly.

And let us cut committee funding.

GREAT PRESIDENTS WITH NO PRIOR MILITARY EXPERIENCE

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I have heard in the last couple of weeks comments about the President not having prior military experience as a requisite to being the Commander in Chief, but if my colleagues would look at the second edition of "The Complete Book of U.S. Presidents" by William A. DeGregorio, of the 41 Presidents to precede President William Jefferson Clinton, 12 of them had no military experience. That means that prior to becoming Commander in Chief of this great Nation nearly 30 percent of our Presidents were civilians their entire lives.

But who were these men? Were they some of our lesser known and historically notable Presidents? Hardly. The list begins with two of our most famous Founding Fathers; John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. It also includes John Quincy Adams, Woodrow Wilson, and even Franklin Delano Roosevelt. These men were all great Presidents,

and great Americans, both in times of peace as well as war. Despite the fact that none of these men had any previous military experience, they all still managed to perform their duties as Commander in Chief with the utmost honor and distinction. Why? Because serving in the military is not a prerequisite for patriotism and leadership—and I say this as a marine.

In addition, Presidents with no previous political experience have been members of both political parties. In fact, of the seven Presidents with no prior military experience since the founding of our present two-party system, four of them have been Republicans.

The citizens of this United States of America, the greatest democracy in the history of the world, have elected Bill Clinton both President and Commander in Chief, and no one in this Chamber should be arrogant enough to second guess their wisdom.

The full list of Presidents with no military experience reads as follows in chronological order:

- John Adams, Federalist.
- Thomas Jefferson, Democratic-Republican.
- John Quincy Adams, Democratic-Republican.
- Martin Van Buren, Democratic.
- Millard Fillmore, Whig.
- Grover Cleveland, Democrat.
- William H. Taft, Republican.
- Woodrow Wilson, Democrat.
- Warren Harding, Republican.
- Calvin Coolidge, Republican.
- Herbert Hoover, Republican.
- Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Democrat.
- William Jefferson Clinton, Democrat.

A LIMERICK FOR THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, since St. Patrick's Day is so near, here is a limerick for Bill Clinton regarding his economic package.

There once was a President named Bill
Who wished to spend more than his fill
He called it investment
Which caused much resentment
It proved him an old Democrat still.
The spending bill we will consider
T'will make the taxpayer bitter
Brandishing more tax
With no spending axe
It will cause the economy to quiver.
I send this message from the Hill
To our Dear Leader, Bill
His investment is spending,
His taxes are offending,
This package is too painful a pill.

NATIONAL INTEREST SERVED BY A VOTE FOR THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PACKAGE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, former Speaker "Tip" O'Neill described the best and worst of our American government when he said, "All politics is local."

In the past, the American people have blamed individual Members of Congress for focusing only on the needs of their districts while ignoring our national interest.

This week, the Congress will have an opportunity to do what is right for the entire Nation. Our children's future literally is in the House's hands to win or lose.

The passage of the Clinton economic package will end the gridlock that has divided the legislative and executive branches for 12 years.

Less than 2 months ago, President Clinton called on all Americans to join him in forging a "government of our tomorrows, not our yesterdays."

The Congress must weave the President's words into the fabric of governance. The tattered rhetoric of yesterday will not reduce the deficit and create new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of Clinton economic plan will ensure that the national interest comes ahead of any special interest or pet program.

Vote for the Clinton economic package.

THE ENERGIZER BUNNY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us cut Government spending, not raise taxes.

All the new spending in President Clinton's economic program is kind of like the Energizer bunny. It just keeps growing and growing and growing.

The American people are being led to believe that the Clinton economic plan actually cuts spending. Not true. This year Washington spends \$1.5 trillion. After 4 years of Clintonomics the total is \$1.7 trillion. It just keeps growing and growing and growing.

And then there's the national debt. Today it is \$4 trillion; 4 years under Clintonomics and it'll be \$5 trillion. Any plan that adds a trillion dollars to the national debt is not a good plan. Under Clintonomics, the debt keeps growing and growing and growing.

Americans do not want an Energizer bunny government. They want a government that works.

Let us cut Government spending, not raise taxes.

FRAUD IN OUR HOSPITALS

(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, a Medicare investigation of 15 hospitals uncovered 24 million dollars' worth of downright stinking fraud. Here are some of the things the hospital got:

Thousands of dollars worth of Superbowl tickets, a Chinese silk antique pillow worth a thousand dollars, 4,000 dollars' worth of symphony tickets, no less, thousands and thousands of dollars worth of candy, golf clubs, \$16,000 for limousines.

But do not worry, Members. The Government says of the \$42 million in fraud the taxpayers will only have to pay about 4 million dollars' worth.

Mr. Speaker, I say, "The taxpayers shouldn't spend one dime. I recommend hospital administrators be handcuffed to a chain link fence and flogged before they go to jail."

□ 1220

HONG KONG'S EXPANSION IN DEMOCRACY FOSTERS NERVOUSNESS IN COMMUNIST CHINA

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the tyrants of Beijing have taken dead aim at Gov. Chris Patten of Hong Kong. His crime: attempting to expand democracy in Hong Kong prior to the scheduled mainland takeover in 1997.

At the equivalent of a Red China state-of-the-union address yesterday, China's Premier, Li Peng, criticized Patten for extending popular elections and other democratic reforms.

One can hardly blame the old men for worrying. Greater economic freedom is causing China to have growth rates in double digits and giving the lie to the good life promised but never delivered by the 1949 revolution. In Communist China, communism is becoming irrelevant.

And now, greater democracy on China's doorstep is causing even greater nervousness in Beijing: Someday the old men might have to face the judgment of the Chinese people.

I say hurrah for Chris Patten and Martin Lee and all the people of Hong Kong who believe in human freedom. They may not only free the 6 million people of Hong Kong, they may ultimately free all 1 billion of the Chinese people. Clearly, this is the real worry of the tyrants.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRUSADE TO REDUCE THE BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate our President on his historic efforts to reduce the budg-

et deficit. His call to the American people and Congress to join in this crusade has not gone unheeded and has brought Americans together in a common cause.

Many of my New Hampshire constituents have answered the President's call and have contacted me with suggestions for further spending cuts. From their suggestions, and other sources, I have compiled a list of some \$300 billion in additional spending cuts that could be made over the next 5 years. Making these cuts will not be easy. It will require sacrifice, but I am convinced that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, as well as the administration, are committed to bringing about the change we need. We know that future generations will thank us for rising to this challenge.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S NO DETAILS, NO SPECIFICS ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, we knew the details would eventually work to the level where we all could see what was really contained in the Clinton economic stimulus package, and now it is becoming more evident. We know that the only real cuts in this program are in defense, and they amount to approximately \$127 billion over 5 years. But what will these cuts mean to us?

If we look at what the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Technology Assessment are saying, between 1.5 million and 3 million Americans will lose their jobs. Out of a total defense work force of 5.5 million people, this could mean that 1 of every 2 defense workers will lose their jobs over the next 5 years.

Where will these cuts occur, Mr. Speaker? We have no idea because we have not been given any specifics. The Committee on Armed Services of the House as of today, March 16, has given no details and no specifics as to where these cuts will occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all Americans who have jobs today and who will lose their defense-related jobs, they should remember that they have been stimulated by the no-details, no-specifics Clinton economic stimulus package.

EQUAL TREATMENT IN HEALTH CARE SERVICES DENIED TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, let me ask this of my distinguished colleagues: Did you know that there

are 3,600,000 American citizens that are not covered by our Nation's health care plan, better known as Medicaid?

Those 3,600,000 citizens are all my constituents. They live in Puerto Rico.

As the administration and this Congress begins to contemplate health care reform, I will, on their behalf, seek your help so that we may redress this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, aliens residing in the 50 States are covered by Medicaid, but American citizens who live in Puerto Rico are not. Is this fair? Is this happening in America?

Among my constituents there are many thousands of veterans and the widows and orphans of those who fell in the fields of battle defending our country. And they are not covered. Is this fair?

On their behalf, Mr. Speaker, today and in the days and weeks ahead I will not rest in seeking your support and my colleagues' support for equal treatment in health care services for those 3,600,000 deprived and disenfranchised American citizens.

IMMIGRATION LAWS IN DESPERATE NEED OF REPAIR: KEEP THE FOREIGN TERRORISTS OUT OF OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who watched last Sunday night's broadcast of "60 Minutes," there can be no doubt that U.S. immigration and political asylum law is in desperate need of repair. This is a problem this Member has been attempting to actively address for nearly a year. There are serious loopholes that tens of thousands of illegal aliens continue to exploit.

As incredible as it seems, any foreign national who reaches U.S. soil and asks for political asylum—regardless of the fact that requests are often transparently fraudulent—must be given a full asylum review. Consequently, our international airports are being inundated with would-be asylum claimants. They come to the United States with forged documents, or even without documents, and then ask for political asylum. Lacking facilities to hold the tens of thousands of individuals who come in this manner, the Immigration and Naturalization Service is compelled to release these individuals on their own recognizance until the date for their hearing. Not surprisingly, few ever return for their hearing. They can be and have been terrorists, they can be drug smugglers, they can be criminals, but they are released into American society.

The numbers are simply astonishing. Each and every month an estimated 1,800 inadmissible aliens are coming to

New York's JFK airport alone. There are over 50,000 adjudicated alien asylum petitions pending in New York City alone, and delay of 18 months or more are commonplace. By the time of the INS review, the vast majority fail to appear, simply disappearing into the fabric of American society.

Yesterday, at a hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee, the head of the Consular Affairs Division of the State Department urged the Congress to pass legislation granting authority for summary exclusion of transparently fraudulent political asylum cases. Many of these ineligible asylum-seekers have been involved in terrorism attempts, narcotics trafficking and other criminal acts, are abusing our taxpayer-financed social safety-net programs. If we are to do our duty, this body must respond quickly and favorably.

Mr. Speaker, this Member has been coming to the well of this body to denounce this practice for over a year. Last year this Member joined with an initiative by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] in an effort to close this noxious, dangerous, and expensive loophole. Today, we are once again introducing legislation that would provide summary exclusion for the tens of thousands of illegal aliens who continue to manipulate the law in this manner.

This Member would urge his colleagues to join in this effort to preserve the integrity of our U.S. borders.

OUR NATIONAL REFUGE SYSTEM: SEA LION ROCK

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, we have just celebrated the 90th birthday of this Nation's Wildlife Refuge System. As we rejoice in the foresightedness of those who came before us in establishing the system, we should also speak out about the problems on the horizon.

One of those problems is within the Copalis National Wildlife Refuge, off the coast of my State of Washington. At various times of the year, bald eagles, Stellar sea lions, gray whales, pelicans, falcons, and several other endangered or threatened species call this refuge home. Yet within these pristine borders, on an island known as Sea Lion Rock, the Navy is continuing the senseless practice of conducting bombing runs that jeopardize the very future of these endangered birds and marine mammals.

Mr. Speaker, this has to stop. There is no compelling need of the Navy to bomb this refuge and the marine life living there. It is time for the Navy to change.

A TRIBUTE TO FIVE MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD AVIATORS

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, all Minnesotans join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy and deepest respect to the families of the five members of the Minnesota Army National Guard, who perished in the crash of two helicopters this past weekend at Camp Ripley.

All five—CWO4c James Nichols, Sgt. Larry Roalstad, CWO2c Dale Schmidt, Sgt. James Teel, and CWO2c Mark Nelson—were dedicated and patriotic National Guardsmen who collectively had served as Army aviators for 53 years and had flown over 4,300 hours in training to serve our State and Nation.

Our thoughts and prayers also go out to the two seriously injured survivors of the crash—Lt. John Millen and Sgt. Roy Fhurong.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Members to please join me in a moment of silent tribute to honor these five deceased Minnesota National Guard aviators, for they were true American patriots who represented the best of our great Nation.

□ 1230

STRAIGHT SHOOTERS IN WASHINGTON

(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, hope is breaking out all over America, and some of my Republican friends hate it. Why is hope breaking out? Well, for the first time they are seeing a President like we haven't seen in a long time, one that listens, one that is energetic, and one that is basing his plan on facts, not smoke and mirrors.

The American people understand that this may be a painful package dealing with the threat of the debt, but they also understand we had better deal with the threat of the debt. They understand there are some good parts in it, there are some investment parts in it, there is some tax stimulus in it, and they also look at his long-term plan for defense conversion. It is a message. We either adopt it or die in this global economy. That is a tough message, but it is the right message.

Mr. Speaker, I think this week we are going to see these people here in this Congress stand up for the President and continue to spread this hope, because it has been a long time since we have had such straight shooters come out of Washington.

CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING, HEED CBO'S ADVICE ON ENERGY R&D

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, let us cut Government spending, not raise taxes. In the President's State of the Union Message, he proclaimed that the Congressional Budget Office is an impartial and fair source of information concerning the budget.

Well, here is what CBO said about the effectiveness of the Department of Energy:

After two decades of spending, few successful energy technologies have emerged from these research and development programs. Given this lack of success, DOE could cut back on programs for near-term development.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget does not reflect this advice. Why does the President ignore the advice of CBO to reduce needless spending?

We need to cut Government spending, not raise taxes.

TRUTH COMES OUT ABOUT EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United Nations Truth Commission issued its report. Through the smoke and horror of war, it allowed us to see events in El Salvador throughout the last decade, and it was a frightening sight. Seventy-five thousand deaths. Men, women, and children led to their senseless slaughter. An archbishop, labor leaders, political leaders, killed by death squads and the military.

Unwritten, but not unseen between the lines, was another victim—truth, credibility. For all during those years Ronald Reagan and his administration certified to this Congress that there was progress, human rights were being respected, our country was identifying with people of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what Ronald Reagan is thinking today, or where George Shultz might be, or Elliott Abrams or Dean Hinton. But I do know this: They cannot feel good about themselves or what they did to the credibility of this country. Our people, who believed in peace and wanted a settlement in El Salvador, Ronald Reagan, I do not know what you are thinking, but I do not know how you and those who served with you feel about yourselves today or how indeed you can live with this terrible truth.

NATIONAL SECURITY IS NO PLACE FOR WISHFUL THINKING

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to consider President Clinton's budget resolution for fiscal year 1994, we should look carefully at his proposed defense budget cuts.

Last week, we watched news reports of President Boris Yeltsin fighting to maintain his authority in the face of increasing demands by the Communist-dominated Russian Parliament. I consider Boris Yeltsin a great man, but we can no longer ignore the possibility that he will be unable to remain in power in Russia.

I have supported reasonable reductions in defense spending in the past, but we should not cut too much or too deep. The return of a hostile, or even uncooperative, government in Moscow would contribute to instability throughout the world. This would radically increase the threat to our national security and overturn the assumption that President Clinton has made in his budget.

Most of the real spending cuts in President Clinton's budget were on national defense. I strongly urge my colleagues to look soberly at the instability throughout the world, and especially in the former Soviet Union, before supporting the administration's drastic cuts in defense.

PUT AMERICA FIRST

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

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, at long last America has a President who has guts. He has told the Japanese and he has told the Europeans that we are not going to take it anymore and we are mad as hell. He is saying to them to get your trade policies in line with fairness or we are going to do something about it.

They are cheating the United States, and they know it. They are stealing jobs from our Americans. American past Presidents and Congress have not had the backbone to do anything about it. Bill Clinton has said to the Japanese this year, he says don't come to the White House unless you got something to put on the table. He said to the Europeans, stop freezing out American products or we are going to retaliate.

Tomorrow they start negotiations on the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I am saying that you do not put the cart before the horse. I hope the President goes down there and negotiates first on the environment, health, safety, pay equity, and benefits. I think it is time to put America first.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOUR PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, CBS radio's Charles Osgood said something pretty clever this morning. Of course, that is not unusual. Charles Osgood is a pretty clever guy.

But what he said, if I may paraphrase, was this: President Clinton would have all America's problems solved if it were not for four small things. Just four small things stand between the President and history. Those four small things are: Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. His budget numbers do not add up. If they did, you would have to subtract more money from taxpayers than they can afford to pay. If you multiplied the number of taxpayers by the amount of tax Clintonomics asks them to pay, there are not enough people among which you can divide the burden.

Four small things. Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Because the President in his budget has failed to master these four small things, these four small things will master him.

HOME HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, each weekday morning on a popular television show, one of the personalities recognizes individuals who have reached or passed their 100th birthday. Many of these honorees, though of an advanced age, have the option of staying in their own home through utilization of a most important program—home health care. This program permits them to maintain not only their dignity, but their independence, as well, while receiving necessary care.

Such assistance is important not only to those to whom care must be given, but also to the care givers themselves; the families. As our population ages and medical technology advances, more and more families face the responsibility of providing care for their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, long-term care must be made a critical part of health care reform. I urge my colleagues to support the inclusion of home health care as a cornerstone of any basic benefits health package. Only with the enactment of such a program will we insure reliable access and competent delivery of this most-needed service.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BUDGET

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, Ross Perot said recently the devil is in the details. He could have added the devil you know is better than the devil that you don't know.

Last week Republicans here in the House offered up a package to cut the budget deficit by \$430 billion over the next 5 years in a specific plan that does not raise taxes.

□ 1240

This week, the President is asking us to consider a budget resolution that is just more generalizations, promises and no details. As a matter of fact, the details are not expected to get here until April 5, but yet we have to vote on this package this week.

One of the previous speakers said the President has guts. Well, if the President has guts, he ought to have the guts to give us the specifics about his plan.

The American people expect to know the details, the specifics. Frankly, the American people, in my opinion, deserve to know the truth about this budget.

THE BIG SNOW JOB

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if you were anywhere along the east coast during the last few days, you were surely snowed under by several feet of snow. Luckily, the Sun is now shining, the snow is beginning to melt and people are starting to move and to get back to business again.

Well, if you were anywhere in America during the last 12 years, you were also snowed in. Unfortunately, the Reagan and Bush administration did a real snow job on the American people. Their borrow-and-spend mentality left us so snowed in that we could not even dig ourselves out. Those of us on this side of the aisle are glad that January 5 heralded in a new springtime in America, and all of us have a chance for a new beginning with President Clinton's economic plan, which encompasses a long-term vision that will reduce the Federal deficit, invest in our future, reinvigorate the economy, create jobs and cut spending.

As everyone knows, after a winter of the 12-year Reagan-Bush economic hibernation, fiscal reality has to set in, and it is now time to get on to the business of restoring our country to its former economic prominence.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle have been working hard to trim down the budget and have gone beyond the President's plan by cutting even more, \$63 million more, in discretionary spending. That is the true angel, not the devil.

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, we surely have short memories around these Halls. Last year, amidst the House bank and post office scandals, the cries for reform were unprecedented.

In a triumph of symbolism over substance, a mislabeled reform package was adopted, including a powerless inspector general. This inspector general was not independent of the House of Representatives, was not autonomous like those found in the executive branch, and was not designed to respond to individual Members or staff.

This inspector general was designed to serve as the lap dog of the Committee on House Administration. Hardly reassuring since it was the Committee on House Administration that was originally responsible for overseeing the House bank and the post office in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, since we did not get it right the first time, let us try it again. Today, I am introducing legislation that repeals this impotent and yet unfilled position with an IG that is true to its function as an independent watchdog.

It is about time we were answerable to the public rather than just ourselves. I would encourage all Members, particularly the new 110 freshmen who came here with an idea of reforming this institution, those interested in restoring its credibility, to consider co-sponsorship.

AN AMERICAN NEIGHBORHOOD

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, I visited a neighborhood in my district that area industry has treated absolutely criminally. I would like to thank Dr. Frank Rumph, chairman of the Georgia Governor's Task Force, for conducting this tour.

The Hyde Park and Virginia subdivisions in the city of Augusta have been the targets of numerous studies conducted by the local, State, regional, and now national health and environmental agencies to try to explain the suffering. I conducted my own study this weekend by using my five senses:

I looked at the ditches that used to flow from one of the suspected industries—a wood-processing plant. I saw the rainbow colors in the water that is the trademark of creosote.

My hands felt the skin lesions on the palms of Rev. Alvin Gilcrest, a longtime resident of the area.

I heard the testimonials of residents like Miles Roberts, whose mother's house was tested for arsenic levels, and

the results showed that the level was 10 times that necessary for cleanup.

My nose was irritated by the stench of the same wood-processing plant whose machines stopped running over 6 years ago.

Oh, yes—finally taste. Well, let us just say that every time I think of the children who grow up in this area and attend Clara Jenkins Elementary School, I wonder if I will ever taste the meal I last ate.

If America truly is the land of the free, then these neighborhoods certainly are the home of the brave.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the President gave us the outline of his budget proposal, he and the Democrats in this House have been baiting Republicans to come forward with a budget plan that attacks the deficit. "Show us your specifics," they told us. "Tell us where you would make cuts."

Well, budget Republicans have done just that. We have a plan, and it is a better alternative. Why? Because it involves more deficit reduction and no tax increases for the American people.

There is no tinkering with the Social Security trust fund, as the Democrats would do. There are no spending increases for a bogus stimulus. There is no smoke and mirrors; nothing in our proposal is a tax increase but labeled a spending cut. And the Republican alternative would mean less Government.

It is real spending cuts, cuts that the Americans want before we have tax increases.

This alternative illustrates the fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans want less Government, no new taxes, and less spending. Democrats want more taxes and more spending.

We have a budget alternative, and it has the specifics. Our proposal deserves a good faith debate and consideration of this body.

Mr. President, where are your cuts? Is it now time you showed them to us?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would remind the gentleman that the rules of the House require Members to address the Chair, not the President or other persons.

PROTECTING THE LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a shipyard that is very near my district, and that is the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in California—Long Beach, CA.

This institution is a unique and very valuable asset, not only to that district but also to southern California and to California as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I was very shocked to learn about the number of bases that were on the base closure list in California, particularly in northern California, and the impact, of course, in California could be tremendously devastating.

Of course, we know the State of California right now is experiencing an inordinately high unemployment level. However, I must say, I was very surprised and pleasantly surprised that the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was not on that base closure list.

However, I would like to encourage colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with me and to work with our Senators to make sure that not only Long Beach Naval Shipyard but other shipyards and other bases in California stay off the list because of the economic downturn in California, with the aerospace industry downturn. We need the help of all parties concerned.

A BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all have heard the expression, "Just do it."

If the Democrats and Republicans agree that overspending is not good, then let us stop overspending.

Today I am presenting a proposal to the Committee on Rules to ask for permission to substitute a budget resolution that calls for a balanced budget in 5 years.

It limits the growth in some programs, such as Social Security, to 6.5 percent. Others it limits to 1 percent a year. But it does resolve the problem of overspending in 5 years.

It seems to me that if we are watching somebody sink in the cold river out there and we decide to save them, then we just do it.

Well, we are starting to sink in this economy because we insist on overspending with a credit-card mentality. What it is doing is taking money that could be used in the private sector to help the economy, to borrow money for a new car, a new home, or to go to college.

I say, let us just do it. Let us decide that we are going to do it and make the cuts that are necessary.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESCUE OF DANISH JEWRY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that tonight in 2105 Rayburn from 6 to 8 p.m., there will be a reception commemorating the 50th anniversary of the rescue of Danish Jewry. I invite and encourage my colleagues to attend.

The magnificent and courageous acts of the Danes, who collectively as a nation sheltered and rescued virtually its entire Jewish population during World War II are testament to what peoples are capable of doing.

The saving of its Jewish population, indeed not just the Jews of Denmark but those of any nation who were in Denmark at that time, was a gesture rare for the times in which it took place. In a world totally eclipsed by one of the darkest moments of human anguish, the people of Denmark offered light and hope to all who were destined to die by virtue of their religion or ethnicity.

It was on Danish soil, Mr. Speaker, that the Nazi action against Jews failed miserably.

It is often said of Denmark, Mr. Speaker, that it is a small nation. This is true, but it is enlarged by its greatness of spirit and commitment to humanity.

And so, while we mourn the loss of so many victims and are reminded of the malevolence of world history, we are also here to celebrate life and the courage and the beneficence of man.

□ 1250

AUTHORIZING SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at the appropriate time, after the other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to suggest that if we start asking for special orders, with all due respect to my colleague, during the course of 1-minute as opposed to doing it in the list, I do not have any objection, obviously, to the gentleman's request, but I just am wondering if we get into that during 1 minute, we will all be, I think, perhaps more on guard than we need to be.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Would the gentleman yield for a question, through the Chair?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is it his un-

derstanding, speaking for the leadership, that there is not going to be a problem with doing the special orders?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, I have not talked to the leadership, but I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we will object to a special order on the gentleman's side of the aisle, any more than we would expect the gentleman to object to one on our side.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I only raised the point because it has happened recently, last week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a Member objected to a request for a special order?

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

NO MORE BLARNEY: CUT SPENDING, DON'T RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to cut spending, not raise taxes. Tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day. It has become evident that President Clinton has kissed the Blarney Stone. He convinced the American people that his budget was specific, but compared to the Republican budget it was clear as the Irish mist.

He wants to make us believe that his economic stimulus package will help move the economy, but the economy is already moving in many parts of the country. Ever since the Druids were in Ireland we have known that raising taxes will stall an economy, not stimulate it.

He wants to convince us that his emergency spending program is a desperately important investment that will create jobs, but at \$93,000 a job he must think we have all imbibed too much, if he wants us to believe this jobs bill is cost-effective.

Mr. Speaker, I must ask the President to stop the blarney. It is time to cut spending, not raise taxes.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE BENEFITS SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the President's economic package offers more targeted assistance to small business than we have seen from the White House for a long time. In the prior administration we saw unaddressed issues push this country into a painful and prolonged recession that literally

closed the doors of millions of small businesses all across the country.

In contrast, the stimulus package before this body offers meaningful relief and real growth opportunities geared specifically for small business. The relief includes a capital gains tax cut tailored to attract long-term investment in small business. This measure will make it easier to obtain the capital required to start and grow these small businesses.

The opportunity to grow is provided by an investment tax credit. This tax credit starts at 7 percent and becomes permanent at 5 percent after 2 years. These proposals have been welcome news to the small business men and women in my State. This is precisely the recession-buster many individual businesses are looking for.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for recognizing the crucial role of small business in getting our economy going again and giving them substantial assistance in our stimulus package.

ARKANSAS BILL WILLIES

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, gonna tell you a story 'bout President Bill who wrote a big budget and sent it to the Hill. Then the taxpayers started lookin' at the pages finding tax and spending that was just outrageous.

The sum of \$300 billion in new taxes? So the people start writing letters to the President, "In all that new spending, you gotta make a dent." But for Congressmen, the spending is what they wanna see, an economic stimulus package yes-sir-ee!

Golf courses. White water rafting. Sooo-eeee!

These make-work jobs just create more debt. And our kids' kids' kids will have to pay us out of it. But to Hillary and Bill what's \$16 billion or a trillion among friends? It seems the tax and tax and spending just never ends.

I got the Arkansas Bill Willies.

NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, violence and brutality are not solutions to the tragedy of Northern Ireland. For years, I have followed with a profound sense of sadness, the violence, and hate which festers there.

President Clinton's promise to commit the United States to playing a more proactive role in Northern Ireland and to end the human rights abuses in that beleaguered region should be applauded by all of us. Am-

nesty International, Helsinki Watch, and our own State Department have all documented cases of civil liberties abuse in Northern Ireland.

As some of our colleagues in the other body indicated in a letter to President Clinton:

The discussion on human rights in Ulster must not be removed from the political dialogue. British human rights abuses may not be the sole cause of the violence in Northern Ireland. But reform of those abuses, in our view, must be an integral part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States must continue to promote bicomunal endeavors such as Project Children, which has long been supported by my good friends, TOM MANTON, BEN GILMAN, and JOE KENNEDY. By bringing Protestant and Catholic children together for a summer in the United States, the seeds of hate are slowly being replaced with the roots of friendship.

Let us all work for the furtherance of Human Rights in Northern Ireland. The children, all of our children, deserve no less.

URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT CUTS IN COMMITTEE STAFFS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal offered by the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] to cut committee staffs by 25 percent. The proposal is a good one, a solid, straightforward, no-nonsense way to save millions of dollars from our budget.

It is very simple. It is just like what we do in our households, our businesses, companies, or organizations; just a plain 25-percent reduction in staff, pure, and simple. Unfortunately, it has not gotten much publicity. The gentlewoman from Washington does not use Clintonesque words such as "investment" and "contribution" and other media buzz terms.

Nonetheless, the President asks for specifics, and the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] has given him one. The proposal has three advantages. No. 1, it saves money, over \$10 million. No. 2, it cuts out the insulation of Representatives because of the many staff members that are surrounding them. Constituents will not have to go through staff if they want to talk to their Congressmen, they can go straight to their Representatives.

No. 3, it is simple, perhaps too simple for Washington. It does not need a conference committee, legislation, and it does not need a lot of support groups. All it takes is an act of Congress. Maybe that is the problem.

MERCHANT SEAMEN REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT OF 1993

(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 in support of H.R. 1109, the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993.

This bill is designed to provide reemployment rights and other benefits for any member of a reserve component. These rights and benefits shall be equivalent to those that are provided by chapter 43 of title 38 under the United States Code, which allows seamen to be rehired at their civilian jobs after they have served in active duty.

During Operation Desert Shield there were seamen who were ready and willing to serve on Ready Reserve vessels, but could not because their jobs were not protected. This reemployment legislation is needed so that seamen's jobs will be guaranteed after war, a national emergency, activated training, or during alertness exercises.

This bill does not in any way, shape, or form, demand that a mariner volunteer for service. Nor will labor-management agreements be changed or affected. This reemployment right does not cost the Government anything and it allows them to utilize these dedicated individuals for military needs.

These dedicated mariners are there to protect the United States in time of national crisis. If these individuals are ready and willing to risk their lives and protect us, then we need to make sure their jobs are guaranteed and protected.

NEGOTIATIONS TOWARD A UNITED STATES-JAPAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, listening to administration trade officials in recent weeks, I am reminded of the Gatorade commercial with Chicago Bulls star Michael Jordan. In the commercial, children sing "I want to be like Mike!" In the case of the Clinton administration's emerging trade policy, the refrain should be "I want to be like Japan."

In the name of strategic trade, the Clinton team wants to create a cadre of Government managers to identify, nurture, and subsidize certain sectors of the economy. This form of managed trade or industrial policy plays right into Japan's hands, and will most certainly lead to a trade war that we cannot win.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we should play to the strengths of America's competitive advantage, and convince Japan to open up its markets and become more

like the United States, where consumers, not Government bureaucrats and corporate interests, determine what is bought and sold, and at what price. How do we accomplish this objective? By negotiations leading to a United States-Japan free-trade agreement.

□ 1300

ENDING GRIDLOCK

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that I believe that the worst that we could do for our economy and the deficit is to do nothing.

The budget and stimulus package we will consider later this week can begin to end gridlock here in the Nation's Capitol, and the combination of spending cuts and tax increases and investments contained in those two bills will reduce the deficit and start to put our country back to work again.

Taken together, the budget and stimulus package will provide jobs for America's workers, improve our Nation's infrastructure, and target critical resources to the education and training needs of our Nation's children, youth, and adults.

Mr. Speaker, former President Harry Truman said in his book "Where the Buck Stops," as he reflected on the Presidency, "There are not good or bad Presidents, there are just those who decide to do nothing." Our own President, Bill Clinton, has shown that he is willing to take the steps to do something. I think that Congress should take the lead and help him to lead us down the road.

A TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIAN DREW BARRY, GEORGIA TECH'S FRESHMAN GUARD

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, in this U.S. Congress, I am a freshman from Danville, CA. Today, I want to talk about another freshman from Danville, CA.

Drew Barry, freshman guard for the Georgia Tech basketball team, led his teammates in an amazing weekend of upsets.

Seeded sixth in the Atlantic Coast Conference tournament, Drew and the Yellow Jackets had the tough task of facing Duke in the first round. Georgia Tech ignored the experts and upset the defending national champion Blue Devils.

After defeating Clemson in the second round, the Yellow Jackets were to face the No. 1-ranked team in the country—the North Carolina Tar Heels who were on an 11-game winning streak.

Against the odds, Tech went on to upset North Carolina to win the ACC championship in a nail-biter that went down to the wire.

What is more, Drew Barry was named to the all-ACC tournament team and broke the ACC tournament record for total assists with 27.

I am proud of Drew Barry, freshman from Danville, CA.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WAR IN EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the truth about El Salvador's bloody civil war is finally starting to be confirmed. After 75,000 deaths and some of the worst human rights violations ever seen in this hemisphere, the U.N. Truth Commission has revealed that the lion's share of the war's atrocities were committed by the Salvadoran Government, a government that received over \$6 billion in aid from the United States taxpayers in the 1980's, and whose military officers were trained in the United States.

The Commission should be commended for its work, and also identifying the atrocities committed by the leftwing forces. The Commission verifies facts that many of us have known for a long time, that Robert D'Aubuisson is behind the cold-blooded assassination of Archbishop Romero in the 1980's, that high military commanders participated in the coverup of the murder of the American nuns in El Salvador, and that high ranking army officers plotted the murder of six Jesuit priests in 1989.

Sadly, the Reagan-Bush administrations sought to protect their allies from these facts and to mislead the American people and the Congress. This report raises serious questions, and we should ask for a full investigation of the State Department about its activities in El Salvador during the 1980's.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S REVERSAL OF POSITION

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

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it has not taken long for us to realize the contradictions, changes, and reversals of position made by our President.

On the domestic side, a middle-class tax cut has turned into a tax increase for many Americans.

An energy consumption tax, once off limits during the campaign, is now an integral part of the economic stimulus plan.

And, our senior citizens are now being asked to contribute more toward

the years of rampant Government spending.

Yes, as President Bush said last October, elect Bill Clinton and hold on to your wallet. So true.

On foreign affairs, the Haiti immigration problem which outraged many in Congress when Mr. Bush introduced the policy—a policy that candidate Bill Clinton expressed his grave concern and objection—is now an immigration policy that President Clinton has also embraced.

I guess the positive aspect about taking both sides on an issue is that it is very difficult not to be right.

DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-57)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling \$46.1 million.

This deferral affects the Department of Agriculture. The details of this deferral are contained in the attached report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 16, 1993.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

CHILD SAFETY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 965) to provide for toy safety and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Safety Protection Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR LABELING AND BANNING.

(a) TOYS OR GAMES FOR CHILDREN WHO ARE AT LEAST 3.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The packaging of any toy or game intended for use by children who are at least 3 years old but not older than 6 years or such other upper age limit as the Commission may determine which may not be less than 5 years old, any descriptive materials which accompany such toy or game, and the bin, container for retail display, or vending machine from which it is dispensed shall bear or contain the cautionary label described in paragraph (2) if the toy or game—

(A) is manufactured for sale, offered for sale, or distributed in commerce in the United States, and

(B) includes a small part, as defined by the Commission.

In the case of such a toy or game dispensed from a vending machine, the packaging of such toy or game shall not be required to bear the cautionary label described in paragraph (2).

(2) LABEL.—The cautionary label required paragraph (1) for a toy or game shall be as follows:

Insert folio 1A here.

(b) BALLOONS, SMALL BALLS, AND MARBLES AND TOYS AND GAMES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—In the case of any balloon, small ball intended for children 3 years of age or older, marble intended for children 3 years of age or older, or any toy or game which contains such a balloon, small ball, or marble, which is manufactured for sale, offered for sale, or distributed in commerce in the United States—

(A) the packaging of such balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game,

(B) any descriptive materials which accompany such balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game, and

(C) the bin or container for retail display of a balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game or the vending machine from which the balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game is dispensed, shall contain the cautionary label described in paragraph (2). In the case of such a balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game dispensed from a vending machine, the packaging of such a balloon, small ball, or marble or toy or game shall not be required to bear the cautionary label described in paragraph (2).

(2) LABEL.—The cautionary label required under paragraph (1) for a balloon, small ball, marble, or toy or game shall be as follows:

(A) BALLOONS.—

Insert folio 2A here.

(B) SMALL BALLS.—

Insert folio 3A here.

(C) MARBLES, TOYS, AND GAMES.—

Insert folio 4A here.

(3) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, a small ball is a ball with a diameter of 1.75 inches or less.

(c) GENERAL LABELING REQUIREMENTS.—All labeling required under subsection (a) or (b) for a toy or game or balloon, small ball, or marble shall—

(1) be prominently and conspicuously displayed on the packaging of the toy or game or balloon, small ball, or marble, on any descriptive materials which accompany the toy or game or balloon, small ball, or marble, and on the bin or container for retail display of the toy or game or balloon, small ball, or marble or the vending machine from which the toy or game or balloon, small ball, or marble is dispensed, and

(2) be visible and noticeable.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall be considered to be a regulation issued by the Consumer Product Safety Commission under section 3(b) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1262(b)).

(e) OTHER SMALL BALLS.—A small ball—

(1) intended for children under the age of 3, and

(2) with a diameter of 1.75 inches or less, shall be considered a banned hazardous substance under section 2(q) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Consumer Product Safety Commission shall promulgate regulations, under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, for the implementation of section 2 by January 1, 1994. Subsections (f) through (i) of section 3 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1262) shall not apply with respect to the issuance of regulations under this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2 shall take effect February 1, 1994, with respect to products entered into commerce on or after that date.

SEC. 4. BICYCLE HELMETS.

(a) INITIAL STANDARD.—Within 9 months of the date of the enactment of this Act, all bicycle helmets manufactured after the expiration of such 9 months shall conform to—

(1) the ANSI standard designated Z90.4-1984,

(2) the 1990 Snell Memorial Foundation Standard for Protective Headgear for Use in Bicycling, B-90, or

(3) such other standard as the Commission determines is appropriate,

until a standard under subsection (b) takes effect. A helmet which does not conform to a standard identified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall, until the standard takes effect under subsection (b), be considered in violation of a consumer product safety standard issued under the Consumer Product Safety Act.

(b) *PROCEEDING.*—Within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall begin a proceeding under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to—

(1) harmonize the requirements of the ANSI standard, the Snell standard, and other appropriate standards into a standard of the Commission,

(2) include in the standard of the Commission provisions to protect against helmets rolling off the heads of riders,

(3) include in the standard of the Commission standards which address risk of injury to children, and

(4) include additional provisions as appropriate.

The standard developed under paragraphs (1) through (4) shall be considered a consumer product safety standard issued under the Consumer Product Safety Act and shall take effect 1 year after the date it is issued. Sections 7, 9, and 30(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056, 2058, 2079(d)) shall not apply to any proceeding under this subsection and section 11 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2060) shall not apply with respect to any standard issued as a result of such proceeding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider, H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act. This legislation requires warning labels for toys that pose a choking hazard to small children, the bill also establishes minimum size requirements for balls made for children under age 3, and requires the development of a mandatory safety standard for bicycle helmets.

This bill received bipartisan support in our committee and is deserving of the support of the entire House. On March 2, 1993, the Committee on Energy and Commerce favorably reported the bill by voice vote with support from both sides of the aisle. In the last Congress, essentially the same toy safety and bicycle helmet provisions were approved by the House when it passed H.R. 4706, the Child Safety Protection and Consumer Product Safety Commission Improvement Act, by voice vote with bipartisan support.

There is broad-based support for having national toy safety requirements and a mandatory bicycle helmet standard. Health and safety experts think toy labeling and minimum size requirements, as well as mandatory requirements, for bicycle helmets are a good idea. Consumer advocates think so. Even the toy manufacturers now think having a national toy labeling law is a good thing and they support minimum size requirements. The bicycle helmet manufacturers want a mandatory bicycle helmet standard.

As author of the bill, and chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Com-

merce, Consumer Protection, Competitiveness, which considered it, I would like to take this time to discuss the importance of the bill.

There are three important provisions in this bill. The first provision deals with labels for toys with small parts.

Every year, too many young children choke to death on small toys and small parts of toys. The CPSC has made us aware that between January 1980 and July 1991, 186 children choked to death on balloons, marbles, small balls, and other children's products. Countless more children are injured by such toys each year.

While the State of Connecticut recently enacted labeling legislation, there are no nationally required warning labels to alert parents to the choking hazards of small toys and balloons, marbles, and small balls.

Some toy companies voluntarily use labels, but since there is no nationally required language, the label can say virtually anything. Many of these labels do not warn of the choking hazards associated with the toys. They simply say "for ages 3 and up" or "Not recommended for children under 3." In these cases, a parent could easily think the age levels have to do with the intelligence of the child, instead of the hazards posed by the toy. H.R. 965 rectifies the labeling problem by requiring the cautionary labels on applicable toys to warn of the choking hazard.

As revealed at a hearing on the bill, some of these labels do warn of the choking hazards. However, some toy packages are so cluttered with design details that it is hard to see the warning language even if you are looking for it. H.R. 965 provides for the warning to be enclosed in a rectangular box and has other similar requirements to ensure that the label does not get lost in a sea of package clutter.

Mr. Speaker, the second important provision will prevent the marketing of small balls to children under 3. Children under the age of 3 routinely explore their world by putting objects in their mouths. Right now, it is legal to market small balls to children under the age of 3. H.R. 965 alleviates the small ball hazard by requiring minimum choke-proof-size requirements for balls intended for children under age 3. It does not require toy makers to stop making balls of certain sizes; it only tells them that they cannot market the small ones to children under age 3.

The third portion of the bill establishes a safety standard for bicycle helmets. According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission [CPSC], each year there are approximately 1,200 bicycle-related deaths. Head trauma is responsible for 70 percent of the deaths. In addition, each year, over half a million injuries related to bicycles are treated in hospital emergency rooms. Approximately 30 percent of these inju-

ries involve the face or head. Children under age 15 represent about two-thirds of the bicycle-related injuries and one-third of the bicycle-related deaths. There are no legal requirements to ensure compliance with these standards.

For most kids, their bike is their most prized possession and bicycling has long been an American family pastime. These days, many parents are buying helmets for themselves and their children to protect against head injuries.

Helmets currently sold in the United States meet voluntary standards that conform to either the American National Standards Institute or the Snell Memorial Foundation. Neither standard addresses rolloff resistance, which is designed to determine whether or not a helmet will rolloff during a collision. Further, neither standard includes specific requirements for children's helmets.

This bill will make sure that all helmets are designed to protect kids and their families from bicycle-related head injuries. The CPSC must develop a new Federal standard based on the existing voluntary standards. The standards must protect against the risk of helmets rolling off of the heads of riders. While the CPSC is working on the new standard, the bill requires all helmets made after a certain date to meet at least one of the voluntary standards.

Since we have a Consumer Product Safety Commission, which was created by Congress over 20 years ago to "protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products," one might wonder, why does Congress have to enact product safety legislation to protect consumers?

The answer is that the CPSC is not living up to its mission to protect American consumers from hazardous products.

The CPSC's work on the toy safety issue seems to make the case. For instance, the CPSC had been looking at labeling issues for a few years. Then in 1992, even after the CPSC's expert staff recommended that there be warning labels on toys and minimum size requirements for toy balls intended for children under 3, the Commission terminated the rulemaking.

Like my colleague and ranking member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], I would prefer not to deal with product specific legislation. It is my hope that in the future, the CPSC can take the initiative on these matters, so that we in Congress will not be required to enact more product specific legislation.

But, until then, we can protect our children by passing the Child Safety Protection Act.

Before concluding, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], the ranking member of the

subcommittee, and his staff for their work on this legislation.

I urge the support of my colleagues.

□ 1310

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act, is a bill which has the primary objective of saving the lives of children. It addresses the potential hazards posed by such commonplace items as toys with small parts, small balls, marbles, and balloons, as well as the lack of standards for bicycle helmets.

The distinguished Chairwoman has long been known for her efforts on behalf of young children. Her concern for this all too often underrepresented group is plainly evident in the objectives of this legislation. She should be commended for her dedication to the interests of young children.

While I support H.R. 965, I have reservations about the manner in which the bill tries to achieve its objectives. H.R. 965 consists of two product-specific provisions, one relating to toys, small balls, and balloons, and the other relating to mandatory standards for bicycle helmets.

In response to petitions by interested parties and proposals by the CPSC staff, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has already ruled on the need for substantially similar regulations. In both cases the CPSC found the burden of proof as required under the authorizing statutes insufficient to merit action. In the case of toys with small parts, they found that they were unable to make the necessary findings under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to justify issuing the regulation codified in H.R. 965. In the case of bicycle helmets, the CPSC found it unnecessary to create a mandatory standard because there was not one, but two, voluntary standards which bicycle helmet manufacturers used.

This bill represents Congress' willingness to interfere in a rulemaking process which we designed. I strongly believe that if we do not like the outcome of an administrative procedure, it is incumbent on the Congress to change the process, and not try to address serious problems only on a product-by-product basis.

However, this bill does address serious dangers to children and substantially improves toy labeling. The labels required by the legislation clearly warn parents of the choking hazards posed by toys with small parts, small balls, marbles, and balloons. Too often parents may assume that age labeling refers to a child's innate ability. This bill makes that distinction clear. Also, there will be benefits associated with the improved standard for bicycle helmets developed under this legislation.

This bill harmonizes the existing voluntary standards into a single, mandatory standard that must be met by both domestic producers and foreign suppliers. Because of the importance of these provisions to the safety of children, I will support passage of H.R. 965. In the future, however, I hope the Congress will choose not to interfere with rulemaking processes of its own design.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act. As a mother I am proud to support this important legislation.

H.R. 965 is a thoughtful and critical piece of legislation that will help protect our children from senseless injury and harm caused by the inappropriate use of toys. In addition to the valuable safety measures provided for by this worthwhile legislation, it will also save lives and may reduce health care costs by helping to avoid some common childhood accidents.

As good as this piece of legislation is, it cannot and will not replace the action of a responsible parent. No warning label, no matter how well drafted or visible, will save the life of a child if the purchaser does not read it, understand it, and act upon it.

Let us, therefore, pass this legislation not as an end unto itself, but as one step in the process of educating parents to our responsibilities in ensuring child safety protection.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Child Safety Protection Act.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act. H.R. 965 will help prevent small children from choking on small toys, and it will also help safeguard them from the often deadly head injuries that occur in bicycle accidents.

Healthy American children live at risk of unintentional, unexpected injury every day. According to Children Now, the California-based children's advocacy group, almost half of all childhood deaths are due to accidents that could have been prevented. The National Commission on Children confirms that accidents are one of the leading threats to our children's health, and the leading cause of death in all children over a year old. In 1989, accidents caused nearly 40 percent of the deaths among those aged 1 to 4, and 46 percent of the deaths among those aged 5 to 14. In most cases, children who live in rural areas are at a higher risk of accidental death than their counterparts who live in or near cities.

Since 1979, there has been a ban on the sale of certain toys that are intended for children under 3 if these toys present a choking, aspiration or ingestion hazard because of small parts. Yet, 14 years later, choking remains one of the most common causes of accidental deaths among babies under the age of 1. According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission [CPSC], from 1980 to 1991, 186 children choked to death on balloons, marbles, small balls, and other children's products. In addition, it is estimated that every year, over 3,000 children under 6 are treated in hospital emergency rooms because they swallowed or inhaled a small toy or part.

Choking continues to remain a threat for several reasons. For example, balloons were not included in the 1979 ban. Additionally, toddlers often accidentally gain access to toys

that are bought for older children. Parents also sometimes intentionally allow children under 3 to play with toys that are intended for older children, even when the packaging bears a warning for toddlers. They mistakenly believe that the warning has to do with the child's developmental age and consequently do not realize that it has been placed on the package for the express purpose of preventing a small child from choking on the toy. Therefore, even though some dangerous toys cannot be sold for use by children under 3, there is no law that says that parents must be warned about the danger of choking on small toys, and their parts, that are intended for children over 3, even if these toys are unsafe.

In response, the Child Safety Protection Act requires that warning labels be placed on any toy if there is a possibility that a small child might choke on that toy, or on any of its parts. This warning must be in place even if the toy is not intended for a child under 3. The act gives buyers more guidance when it comes to selecting such toys. If this bill becomes law, purchasers will be better informed and alerted as to the possible choking hazards of balloons, marbles, small toys, and games—even if these purchases are intended for use by older children.

The act also establishes a uniform mandatory safety performance standard for bicycle helmets, including standards which specifically address the risk of injury to children. This is because head trauma accounts for 70 percent of the 1,200 bicycle-related deaths that occur each year, and injuries to the face or head are at the root of just under a third of the 500,000 annual injuries related to bicycles. Children are the victims of about two-thirds of the bicycle-related injuries and one-third of bicycle-related deaths.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support final passage of the Child Safety Protection Act. It is no secret that many American children suffer from abuse and neglect. Far too many live in unsafe homes, in unsafe neighborhoods and attend unsafe schools. As we attempt to tackle some of these greater problems, we cannot afford to ignore those that are so readily solvable, especially when the safety of our children is at stake. There is no reason to place any of our children at additional, needless risk, when the means to protect them is close at hand. Safe toys are a necessary, obvious investment that we can make, and we can make it now.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act.

The intent of H.R. 965 is brilliant in its simplicity, to require warning labels for toys that pose a choking hazard to small children and to develop standards for the manufacture of bicycle helmets.

It is astonishing to realize that there are no national mandatory warning labels to warn parents and nonparent toy purchasers about the choking hazards of small toys and toys with small parts, including marbles, small balls, and balloons. Requiring that warning labels be placed on products with small parts that pose a potential choking hazard and are marketed to children over three, but which still pose a hazard to younger children would help steer toy purchasers toward age appropriate toys.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce notes in its committee report that in the June 1991 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, a study entitled "The Impact of Specific Toy Warning Labels," found that, "the current voluntary labels used by manufacturers may not be sufficiently explicit to alert buyers of toys with small parts to the potential choking hazards to children under 3 years of age." The study further concluded that "an explicit label that warns of the hazards, might substantially reduce inappropriate toy purchases without imposing any substantial cost on the consumer, the government, or the manufacturer."

This bill seeks to arm consumers with information before a potentially fatal purchase is made. Between January 1980 and April 1989, the Consumer Product Safety Commission was informed of 146 choking-related deaths of children, under 10 years of age as the result of toys and other children's products. Toys as nonthreatening in appearance as balloons were implicated in 40 percent of those deaths. If a warning label could have prevented even one of those deaths, would it not have been worthwhile? To a grieving parent, there can be only one answer.

H.R. 965 also requires the Consumer Product Safety Commission to develop a mandatory performance standard for bicycle helmets. Currently, there are voluntary performance standards. Each year, 1,200 bicycle-related deaths occur and 70 percent of those deaths are attributable to head trauma. Although the committee report submitted by the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not specify the number of deaths that occurred in spite of helmet usage, those bicycle riders that do rely on helmets should be assured that the helmets they wear will protect them against severe head trauma. This is why we must require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to develop and ensure compliance with mandatory performance standards for bicycle helmets.

If there is an old adage that may be quoted to describe this bill it is "an ounce of prevention, is worth a pound of cure."

Mr. Speaker, let us do everything possible to prevent our children from dying wholly preventable deaths. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 965 and to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 965, the Child Safety Protection Act, because it seeks to increase parents' awareness of the choking hazards presented by some toys and to protect children from potentially hazardous products.

H.R. 965 seeks to remedy the dangers posed by toys with small parts, small balls, and balloons by mandating that specific labels appear on the packaging of those items. The warning labels mandated by this legislation are in plain English and are required to be visible and noticeable, a considerable improvement over the present situation. The portion of the bill requiring the development of a mandatory bicycle helmet standard is also useful because it will harmonize several existing voluntary standards into a single, improved mandatory standard.

However, I do have a reservation about this bill because of the message that it sends to

the Consumer Product Safety Commission. About a year ago, the Commission rejected a staff proposal to label toys that closely tracks this bill because they did not think the proposal would solve the problem. The Commission also rejected a petition by the National Safe Kids Campaign to develop mandatory standards for bicycle helmets because they determined that they did not have the evidence that the voluntary standards were inadequate. The obvious intent of this bill is to overrule the commission's decisions in both cases.

In the long run, if we do not trust the rule-making process, then we should change the process, and not intervene with piecemeal, product specific legislation.

However, because H.R. 965 will improve toy labels and bicycle helmets, I will vote for this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 965. I want to express my most sincere thanks to Committee Chairman JOHN DINGELL and my special thanks to Subcommittee Chairwoman CARLIS COLLINS. Undaunted when others counseled inaction, Mrs. COLLINS has moved aggressively to protect the Nation's children.

My children are well past the age when they could swallow small parts of toys or are likely to get on a bicycle without a helmet. But I can surely remember the times when my children played with small toys and I had bought them in ignorance of their potential dangers. Neither my education nor my experience informed me that I might be risking their lives. Nor, sad to say, did the U.S. Government.

Most tragically, there was no warning to the parents of the 186 children who choked to death on small toys and the more than 3,000 children who were treated or saved each year in hospital emergency rooms during the last decade. Many of these parents were just like me—educated but ignorant, careful but unwarned. Worse must be the anguish of the parents whose children died or were injured in bicycle accidents because the helmets they wore were deceptively ineffective.

For 17 years Americans for Democratic Action [ADA] in the District of Columbia took on the task the U.S. Government should have been undertaking to warn parents about unsafe toys. Indeed, consumers from other parts of the country depended on the thoroughly professional annual toy quality and safety reports of the ADA Consumer Affairs Commission. Ironically, even the Federal Consumer Product Safety Commission referred many complaints to this city's ADA.

In their last report in 1988 the ADA wrote: Some of the dangerous toys we found came from reading the Consumer Product Safety Commission's own statistics. And in those documents, trends can be discerned and danger anticipated. We don't need overwhelming injury data or grotesque body counts in order to act. The time for action is before a child is injured or dies.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission did not get the message. In the face of bone chilling evidence a year ago, the CPSC decided to go no further to prevent choking deaths for children under the age of 3 years old. Children under 15 continue to be at an exorbitant risk of heavy injury from ineffective bicycle helmets. The Congress has no choice

but to move forward to protect children from these entirely preventable injuries.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 965, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. 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 H.R. 965.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1320

MERCHANT SEAMEN REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1109) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 to establish reemployment rights for certain merchant seamen.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1109

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR CERTAIN MERCHANT SEAMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1131) is amended by inserting after section 301 the following new section:

"SEC. 302. (a) An individual who is certified by the Secretary of Transportation under subsection (c) shall be entitled to reemployment rights and other benefits substantially equivalent to the rights and benefits provided for by chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, for any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States who is ordered to active duty.

"(b) An individual may submit an application for certification under subsection (c) to the Secretary of Transportation not later than 45 days after the date the individual completes a period of employment described

in subsection (c)(1)(A) with respect to which the application is submitted.

"(c) Not later than 20 days after the date the Secretary of Transportation receives from an individual an application for certification under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

"(1) determine whether or not the individual—

"(A) was employed in the activation or operation of a vessel—

"(i) in the National Defense Reserve Fleet maintained under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, in a period in which that vessel was in use or being activated for use under subsection (b) of that section;

"(ii) that is requisitioned or purchased under section 902 of this Act; or

"(iii) that is owned, chartered, or controlled by the United States and used by the United States for a war, armed conflict, national emergency, or maritime mobilization need (including for training purposes or testing for readiness and suitability for mission performance); and

"(B) during the period of that employment, possessed a valid license, certificate of registry, or merchant mariner's document issued under chapter 71 or chapter 73 (as applicable) of title 46, United States Code; and

"(2) if the Secretary makes affirmative determinations under paragraph (1)(A) and (B), certify that individual under this subsection.

"(d) For purposes of reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section, a certification under subsection (c) shall be considered to be the equivalent of a certificate referred to in clause (1) of section 4301(a) of title 38, United States Code."

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to employment described in section 302(c)(1)(A) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by subsection (a), occurring after August 2, 1990.

(c) EMPLOYMENT ENDING BEFORE ENACTMENT.—Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 302 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this Act, an individual who, in the period beginning August 2, 1990, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, completed a period of employment described in subsection (c)(1)(A) of that section may submit an application for certification under subsection (c) of that section with respect to that employment not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue regulations implementing this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, when our Nation deploys its military forces overseas, we depend on sealift to deliver the vast majority of equipment, supplies, and fuel to our troops. During the Persian Gulf war, ships carried over 95 percent of these cargoes. Many of these ships were in the Ready Reserve Force, a Government standby fleet which had to be activated quickly and crewed from

scratch—relying in large part on American merchant mariners who left their everyday activities to serve.

During the Persian Gulf war, we discovered a problem that bedevils a merchant mariner who is considering giving up regular employment to volunteer to serve on a sealift ship: there is no guarantee, statutory or otherwise, that the regular job will be waiting when the seafarer returns.

Last Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries heard testimony that there were merchant mariners who hesitated to volunteer for the sealift effort during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm for fear of losing regular civilian jobs.

Citizens who are called from regular employment into active military service do not face the same dilemma. Congress protected them by enacting a statute creating reemployment rights; however, merchant mariners currently do not have similar statutory protection.

The Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993 will address this problem. Under the bill, civilian merchant mariners who serve on sealift vessels in times of national emergency will receive reemployment rights that are substantially similar to rights now available to military reservists. To qualify, seafarers must serve on a Government-owned or controlled vessel in a war, armed conflict, national emergency, or maritime mobilization need. The Secretary of Transportation will certify eligible seafarers.

H.R. 1109 is virtually identical to section 3 of H.R. 4484 from the 102d Congress. That provision was approved by the House on September 9, 1992, with no controversy whatsoever. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that provision prior to adjournment.

The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine approved H.R. 1109 on March 4, 1993. Because of the prior approval of these provisions by this body just 6 months ago, we are presenting the bill directly to the House. Since no report has been prepared, I wish to further discuss the bill in some detail to establish a legislative history for it.

Testimony received at a sealift readiness hearing on April 23, 1991, by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine confirmed the need to provide reemployment rights to merchant mariners. Air Force Gen. Hansford T. Johnson, then the commander in chief of the U.S. Transportation Command, specifically stated that, during Desert Shield/Desert Storm, trained mariners were ready to go to sea but, because they had no "rehire rights," they elected not to take a chance on losing their civilian jobs. Because of the lack of reemployment rights, the United States had to use, in some cases, volunteer pensioners who were in their sixties, seventies, and even eighties. While we do not denigrate the efforts of these

older volunteers, our national policy should be such that we have available to us the most physically capable mariners. Civilian job protections would greatly enhance the ability of the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration to crew the Ready Reserve Force and other Government-owned sealift vessels.

While H.R. 1109 seeks to provide reemployment rights which are substantially equivalent to those granted in chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, for a member of a reserve component, it will be administered by the Secretary of Transportation. Procedurally, an individual who meets certain specific criteria simply applies to the Secretary of Transportation for a certification within 45 days after completion of service on a qualifying vessel. The Secretary has 20 days to make a determination that the merchant mariner was employed on a vessel during a period of activation.

Because activation of Ready Reserve Force and other Government-owned sealift vessels can occur at times other than an actual war or a national emergency, provision has been made to provide reemployment rights when vessels are activated for training or during readiness exercises. The inclusion of this provision is critical to the success of the Maritime Administration's increased emphasis on vessel readiness.

We recognize that the time constraints placed on the merchant mariner and the Secretary are compressed; however, it is contemplated that proof-of-service requirements which exist under current law make the determination by the Secretary largely a ministerial review.

The bill creates a free-standing statute to provide reemployment rights for merchant mariners; however, by use of the term "substantially equivalent," we intend to allow the retention of the large body of case law which has developed under title 38 of the United States Code since reemployment rights were first granted to returning service personnel over 50 years ago. Even though the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993 and the veterans' reemployment rights provisions of Federal law will be administered by different agencies, enforcement and the appropriate interpretations of the legislative text will be handled by the Attorney General and the Federal judiciary, respectively, thus ensuring consistent treatment for merchant mariners.

Throughout our history, America's merchant mariners have repeatedly demonstrated their patriotism by volunteering in time of national need. Our national policy is deficient because it provides no reemployment rights to this group of citizens. Let us correct this omission by passing H.R. 1109 today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to express my strong support for passage of H.R. 1109. I thank Chairman LIPINSKI, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, for his prompt movement of this bill. I will not repeat the fine explanation provided by Chairman STUDDS except to clarify some misperceptions concerning this legislation and its intended purpose.

First, H.R. 1109 does not create a costly Merchant Marine Reserve nor does it confer veteran's status on merchant mariners. As such, we have not, nor do we intend, to interfere in any way with the jurisdiction of the other committees of this Congress. Second, it does not set salary levels, it does not require that a mariner volunteer for service and it does not alter or affect labor/management relations.

Mr. Speaker, in simple terms, we are accomplishing just what needs to be accomplished—allowing a merchant mariner the opportunity to serve his country in time of mobilization and at the same time return to his civilian job when hostilities are over. H.R. 1109 solves the problems facing our war planners without the attendant cost of a large expensive and bureaucratic Merchant Marine Reserve.

This bill has the overwhelming support of the maritime industry because it is a measured and appropriate response to a problem that cropped up during the Desert Storm crisis. This amendment to the Merchant Marine Act will, in conjunction with the enhanced operating status on the Ready Reserve vessels, provide a significant increase in the sealift capacity of the United States.

As Chairman STUDDS indicated, it is the Secretary of Transportation that will administer the law. It was felt because the Coast Guard, an agency within DOT, licenses and documents these mariners and because the Maritime Administration, also within DOT, handles the mobilization and crewing of the reserve fleet, that the Secretary of Transportation could manage this program at no additional cost to the Treasury. In other words all the documentation needed to handle a mariner's reemployment request resides in one agency.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1109 is drafted in such a way that DOT and the judiciary will have the benefit of the various interpretations that have been rendered by the courts under the reemployment laws applicable to returning reservists. As a result, I would envision that decisions on technical points regarding promotions, status, and seniority rights will be relatively simple, largely ministerial in nature, and that any disputes should be quickly resolved.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has clearly explained to this body why the men and women of the U.S. merchant marine should be legally guaranteed their previous jobs upon returning from war.

During the Persian Gulf war, U.S. merchant mariners crewed over 80 percent of the vessels that carried the supplies and equipment to the war zone. Many of these mariners left their regular jobs without any guarantee that their jobs would be secure after the war.

Armed Forces reservists who serve in a war have reemployment rights. My bill will grant to merchant seamen reemployment rights substantially equivalent to those granted to reservists.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries unanimously supported reemployment rights for merchant seamen in 1991 and 1992. For reasons unrelated to reemployment rights, the bills which contained the reemployment language were not enacted into law in the 102d Congress. For this reason, I have introduced the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993 as a separate bill.

President Clinton supports H.R. 1109 and there is bipartisan support for the legislation. I urge passage of H.R. 1109 today.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to state that I sincerely appreciate the outstanding cooperation of the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN]. I appreciate that very much and I am looking forward to more cooperation like that in the future.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, first of all, to thank the chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, for introducing this legislation. It is long overdue.

I am privileged to have the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy within my district, at Kings Point, NY. I well know the quality, patriotism, and professionalism of the young men and women who graduate from Kings Point, and from the other merchant marine academies in our country.

These dedicated sailors are only too ready to serve their country in time of national emergency, as they showed during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. Ninety-seven vessels, manned by merchant mariners, carried 95 percent of the supplies for that action. Our victory in the Persian Gulf would not have been possible without the assistance of a viable U.S.-flag merchant fleet, sailing modern vessels and manned by professional American seamen.

For most of these dedicated sailors, it is no choice at all to choose to serve their country. The American merchant mariner has always stood ready to serve his country during time of

war or emergency, even at risk to his own life. This is no less true today than it was when American seamen dodged U-boats in World War I, or faced the horrors of the Murmansk Run in World War II.

Added to whatever other risks may face the merchant seaman the next time he is called to duty should not also be the possibility of losing his or her job. The least we owe them is the guarantee that America will not thank them for their service with an unemployment check.

Twice before this legislation has been brought before Congress, and twice before it has died through no fault of its own. This is a good law which gives justice to a group of people who are vital to our national security and national prosperity. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1109, the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 1109, I rise in strong support of the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993.

This legislation fills a gap in Federal law that has created a major problem in manning America's reserve sealift fleet.

When the United States found itself faced with the need to transport all of the military hardware necessary to function during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, a glaring defect was discovered in the laws providing job protection for American merchant seamen. Numerous merchant seamen indicated their willingness to temporarily leave their civilian employment in order to operate the Ready Reserve Force ships. However, most of the individuals who are currently employed discovered that if they volunteered for maritime service they would not have a job to come back to.

This situation applied not only to individuals currently employed on U.S. merchant ships, but also former engineering officers working in powerplants or other similar facilities. Several seamen were told by their employers that if they decided to man one of these reserve ships they would have to be back to sail their commercial ship when it was scheduled to depart or else they would be replaced.

H.R. 1109 would simply ensure that merchant mariners serving aboard Government-controlled ships during a military emergency would be guaranteed reemployment rights that are substantially equivalent to those currently granted to all other American citizens in military Reserve units that are called to active duty. Under other Federal law these military reservists are guaranteed that the jobs they leave—whether it be a doctor on a hospital staff or a plumber working for a housing contractor—will be available to them upon the conclusion of their active duty service. This legislation would do the same thing for individuals who go to sea serving their Government as merchant mariners.

As a result of the current lack of reemployment rights for merchant seamen, when the crews were being assembled for the Ready Reserve Force vessels during Operation Desert Shield, the Government had to rely on merchant marine pensioners who had gone into retirement and were in their sixties, seventies, and eighties.

This legislation is quite specific in describing who would be eligible for reemployment rights.

It also sets forth very specific procedures for the processing of applications. The bill not only covers times when the United States actually goes to war, but it also includes training purposes. This would assure the readiness of reserve vessels when it is necessary to break out ships to make sure that all of the systems are in working order.

Since this legislation does not create any type of Merchant Marine Reserve program or confer any kind of veterans status for these merchant mariners, there is no cost to our taxpayers. At a time when all of us are concerned about the Federal budget, this is a rare opportunity for Congress to do the right thing for a group of American citizens without costing any money.

Mr. Speaker, because this legislation is without controversy and will serve a critical national defense need, I urge all the Members of this body to join those of us from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by voting to approve this legislation.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise as ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in order to clarify the rights and other benefits which H.R. 1109 would create for certain merchant seamen.

This bill was not referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, though it contains references in it to chapter 43 of title 38 on veterans' reemployment rights. Subsection 302(a) of the bill would provide:

An individual who is certified by the Secretary of Transportation under subsection (e) shall be entitled to reemployment rights and other benefits substantially equivalent to the rights and benefits provided for by chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, for any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States who is ordered to active duty.

Thus, the only interpretation which could be given subsection (a) is that any substantially equivalent rights and other benefits it would create are entirely outside chapter 43 of title 38. For example, chapter 43 of title 38 contains the following requirement:

The Secretary of Labor, through the Office of Veterans' Reemployment Rights shall render aid in the replacement in their former positions or reemployment of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the Armed Forces or the Public Health Service.

Those merchant seamen who would be entitled to reemployment rights under subsection 302(a) of H.R. 1109 clearly could not be persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the Armed Forces or the Public Health Service. The Secretary of Transportation who, under subsection 302(d), would be required to issue implementing regulations, also could not administratively deem entitled merchant seamen to be persons covered by chapter 43 of title 38. But, in my view, the Secretary of Transportation would be impliedly authorized to establish at the Department of Transportation a similar office of reemployment rights for eligible merchant seamen, as well as any other offices at the Department of Transportation needed to carry out the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred that H.R. 1109 be referred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Absent the referral, I trust that my

statement will serve to clarify the references in this legislation to chapter 43 of title 38.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the passage of H.R. 1109, the Merchant Seamen Reemployment Rights Act of 1993.

This bill would correct an injustice confronted by many merchant seamen who served on Ready Reserve fleet vessels during Operation Desert Storm. These seamen who were ready, willing, and able to serve on Ready Reserve vessels found out to their dismay that their normal civilian jobs were not guaranteed after the war. This is simply not fair.

H.R. 1109 would address this matter by guaranteeing merchant seamen the same rights presently enjoyed by members of the U.S. Armed Forces Reserves. Such rights ensure that members of the U.S. Armed Forces Reserves who are called to active duty in times of war or national emergency are entitled to return to their civilian jobs once their active duty ends. The reemployment rights under this bill would apply retroactively to eligible maritime service beginning on August 2, 1990. Such retroactivity would grant merchant seamen who were active in the Persian Gulf conflict eligibility for such civilian job protections.

Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of the supplies and heavy equipment used in Operation Desert Storm were moved by ship. By guaranteeing that merchant mariners are entitled to their civilian jobs upon return from exporting goods on U.S. merchant vessels in time of national crisis we would extend a basic right to American workers and ensure that we have the capability to act quickly and decisively in times of national emergency.

For these reasons, I urge support for the quick enactment of H.R. 1109.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1109.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXTENSION OF BANKRUPTCY PROVISIONS WITH REGARD TO FAMILY FARMS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 416) to extend the period during which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code remains in effect; and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 416

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME PERIOD.

The first sentence of section 302(f) of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-554; 100 Stat. 3124) is amended by striking "1993" and inserting "1998".

SEC. 2. FILING OF PLAN.

Section 1221 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking "an extension is substantially justified" and inserting "the need for an extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT MADE BY SECTION 2.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT MADE BY SECTION 2.—The amendment made by section 2 shall not apply with respect to cases commenced under title 11 of the United States Code before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 416 extends bankruptcy provisions with regard to family farms by extending chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code for an additional 5 years.

Chapter 12—the provision dealing with bankrupt family farms—is scheduled with sunset on October 1 of this year. This chapter allows farmers to reduce the amount of their secured debt to the present value of the collateral while continuing in control of their farms. In exchange, the farmers are required to commit all of their disposable income to repaying their creditors during a debt adjustment period while the farm remains in operation.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] has been the driving force to make sure this important chapter of the bankruptcy laws continues to function as it has in the past, fairly balancing the interests of the debtor farmer, the creditors, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

□ 1330

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 416. This bill extends chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code for 5 years thereby guaranteeing that farmers continue to receive chapter 12's protections for the foreseeable future. Since its inception in 1986, chapter 12's great success is that it has prevented us from callously throwing generations of family farmers off the land without first allowing them the opportunity to reorganize

and reestablish themselves as viable components of our Nation's agricultural community.

When we originally enacted chapter 12, the country was in the midst of a great farm crisis. Family farms were being foreclosed at an alarming rate and farm values plummeted as properties flooded the market. Huge losses were incurred by agricultural lenders as they were forced to sell farm collateral in extraordinarily depressed markets. Worst of all, farmers could find no relief in the Bankruptcy Code. At the time, chapters 11 and 13 were the only possible havens, and both were unavailable to the farmer. Farmers could not meet the adequate protection requirements of chapter 11 and chapter 13's low debt limits were prohibitive. Fortunately, Congress recognized this problem and enacted chapter 12. The new chapter allowed family farmers to keep their farms, reorganize the affairs, and set up a reasonable payment plan for creditors out of future income.

Today, we consider legislation that extends chapter 12 and critics argue that there is no need for chapter 12 because the farm crisis has ended. I disagree. There will always be bad weather, crop disease, harmful pests, wavering prices, and rotten luck to cause farm bankruptcies.

In my home State of Oklahoma, Stanley and Delma Dunegan had their backs against the wall in early 1987 after 6 consecutive years of weather-related disasters. They were also faced with a 10-year low in cattle prices, a 50-percent decline in land values, and a creditor unwilling to renegotiate the terms of their \$600,000 loan. These folks were in danger of losing everything including their 480 acres of land and their 300 cows. Filing for chapter 12 bankruptcy protection allowed this couple to keep their land, their cattle, and most of their equipment. More importantly, they were given a chance to work out a repayment schedule under much more tolerable terms.

The vagaries of farming and the peculiarities of chapters 11 and 13 of the Bankruptcy Code still exist. Consequently, it is critical that we act quickly to extend chapter 12. Without this section, there is no recourse in the code for farmers faced with losing their farm, their work, and their way of life. I urge my colleagues to quickly adopt this bill so we can get on with the business of good governing by saving family farms.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this legislation to extend the sunset on chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code, the family farmer provisions.

In the 99th Congress, I had the opportunity to participate actively in the congressional effort to enact Bankruptcy Code relief for family farmers

facing financial distress. The new chapter 12 was designed to provide a flexible mechanism for family farmers to keep their farms and contribute a portion of future income to the payment of obligations. By making bankruptcy law more responsive to the plight of family farmers, we hoped to help farm communities around the country.

With chapter 12 scheduled to sunset on September 30, we act appropriately by providing continued access for family farmers to Bankruptcy Code provisions tailored to their needs. Without chapter 12, many family farmers facing economic difficulties may be forced to liquidate their farms. Other Bankruptcy Code chapters lack the flexibility family farmers need: The chapter 11 reorganization process is expensive and cumbersome for family farmers, and the restrictive eligibility requirements of chapter 13—the adjustment of debt provisions—often exclude family farmers. Many creditors—as well as farm debtors—are likely to suffer if we fail to retain an effective alternative to liquidation under chapter 7.

The very existence of chapter 12 appears to encourage nonbankruptcy solutions to family farm debt problems. Bankruptcy Judge A. Thomas Small points out in testimony submitted last year to the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law:

[O]ne of the virtues of chapter 12 has been its positive influence, together with State farm credit mediation laws, on resolving disputes outside of court.

Section 2 of H.R. 416 improves chapter 12 by discouraging debtor delay in filing payment plans. Bankruptcy Code section 1221 is amended to permit an extension of a debtor's 90-day period for filing a plan only if "the need for an extension is attributable to circumstances for which the debtor should not justly be held accountable." This tightening of the current requirement that an extension be substantially justified should prove helpful to creditors.

Our experience with chapter 12, in my view, justifies the 5-year extension incorporated in the pending bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of passage.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, agriculture has experienced difficult financial times in the last few years. These desperate times have been caused by a combination of many factors such as: weather disasters, depressed commodity prices, and increased inputs and machinery costs. All of these factors have left many family farmers financially devastated. Farmers found themselves unable to repay these loans because the falling commodity prices did

not offset climbing interest rates and soaring production costs. Their only recourse was to borrow more cash each year to repay the last operating loan; as well as to provide new operating capital. This cycle resulted in farmers becoming dependent upon debt financing. Farmers soon found themselves highly leveraged and confronting cash flow shortages. In 1986, Congress established the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act under chapter 12 of the Federal Bankruptcy Code to specifically meet the need of the debt-burdened farmer. The chapter 12 provision has a sunset date of October 1, 1993.

The bill which Mr. SYNAR and I introduced, H.R. 416, will extend the sunset of the chapter 12 provision until 1998. This will allow time for improvement of the farm economy. It is not just the farmers who benefit from this statutory relief, but the whole farm economy as it establishes a plan for repayment of the farmers' debt to creditors who would otherwise not see any money at all if the farmer was forced to liquidate. The community would also lose a farm family which has been a stabilizing factor of the community.

Chapter 12 is very important to farmers as it provides them with a viable alternative to complete liquidation of the family farm. In many cases these farms are more than a parcel of land, a few buildings and machinery, but it is a way of life; family heritage. It is critical that Congress continue to provide farmers with an opportunity to financially reorganize to better enable the farmer to continue to operate the farm.

Farming is a unique business because it is seasonal and success is virtually dependent on the weather conditions. There is no orderly cash flow, no accounts receivable, and often no dependable income. The other bankruptcy provisions do not adequately address complex issues which arise in agriculture. Creditors should be more satisfied with chapter 12, as opposed to chapter 11, as the time periods for crucial steps such as filing the plan are shortened.

Chapter 12 is a rapid procedure to assist farmers to reorganize the financial condition of their farm enterprises. It is without question that in addition to the many farmers who have sought relief under chapter 12, there are also a large number which have reorganized outside of bankruptcy along the lines determined by the provisions of chapter 12. It is important that the chapter 12 provision continue to assist farmers to work out of these financially troubling times.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support to H.R. 416, a bill to extend the effective date of chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code until October 1, 1998.

In 1985, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 2211, the bill that led to the enactment of chapter 12. At that time, the U.S. agricultural

economy was besieged by a number of problems, including shrinking export markets, high-interest rates, and tumbling land values. The combined effect of these problems forced many family farmers to the brink of bankruptcy.

In response to these problems, the Congress passed a number of bills. In March 1985, the Congress passed the Emergency Farm Credit Assistance Act of 1985. Unfortunately, President Reagan vetoed this bill. Subsequently, the Congress passed the Food Security Act of 1985, commonly known as the 1985 farm bill. The 1985 farm bill redirected Federal farm programs to a more market-oriented focus and beefed up programs to help U.S. farmers to compete in international markets. Next, the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 offered sorely needed assistance to farmers and ranchers besieged by the economic conditions of the 1980's.

In addition, the Congress approved the bankruptcy judges, U.S. trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986. The act amended the Bankruptcy Code to provide, for the first time, bankruptcy procedures specifically tailored to the needs of the Nation's family farmers.

All of these acts helped America's farmers and ranchers to bootstrap themselves out of the agricultural depression of the early 1980's. Chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code is no exception. Chapter 12 extended a helping hand to America's family farmers designed to allow farm families to work with their creditors to resolve financial difficulties fairly, and with compassion and dignity.

The bill before us today will extend chapter 12 for 5 years and make a clarifying amendment to the act to narrow the circumstances in which a court may extend the statutory 90-day period established in chapter 12 for a family farmer to file a debt adjustment plan. The bill represents a reasonable compromise that will allow family farmers to gain the protection of the bankruptcy law under a reasonable plan for debt adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, farmers, ranchers, and lenders who have worked to resolve farm bankruptcies since 1986 would probably agree that chapter 12 is not perfect.

However, it has been proven to be an effective method for resolving the many issues raised by family farmers facing severe financial difficulties. I am confident that the sponsors of the bill will continue to work with parties interested in this important issue toward reauthorizing an improving chapter 12 as the bill proceeds through the legislative process.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 416, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT SETTLEMENT LEASES ACT OF 1993

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1140) to provide for the treatment of certain aircraft equipment settlement leases.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Aircraft Equipment Settlement Leases Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT SETTLEMENT LEASES WITH THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION.

In the case of any settlement of liability under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 entered into by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and one or more other parties, if—

(1) such settlement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act,

(2) at least one party to such settlement was a debtor under title 11 of the United States Code, and

(3) an agreement that is entered into as part of such settlement provides that such agreement is to be treated as a lease,

then such agreement shall be treated as a lease for purposes of section 1110 of such title 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1140 clarifies the treatment of aircraft equipment in bankruptcy, and by so doing, enhances the competitive health of the airline industry. Bankruptcy laws have long provided aircraft equipment lessors special protection in the event of an airline bankruptcy. Thus, section 1110 of the Bankruptcy Code was intended to encourage aircraft financing activity by limiting the bankruptcy risk associated with these leases. Without such financing, Americans would be left with few viable competing airlines in a market already decimated by the effects of deregulation.

Unfortunately, because of several ambiguous court decisions, the coverage of section 1110 has become muddled. The resulting uncertainty now threatens to disrupt the reorganization of Continental Airlines and could affect other airlines that might be forced into bankruptcy.

H.R. 1140 responds to these problems by clarifying the application of section 1110 of the Bankruptcy Code. Under the

simple modification proposed, leasing arrangements which the parties agree to treat as a lease will be treated as such for bankruptcy purposes. This change, which would apply to pending and future bankruptcies, will help struggling air carriers emerge from bankruptcy and thereby protect employees, retirees, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation from dislocation.

I should note that because of the time-sensitive nature of the legislation—in Continental Airlines' case, its petition for release from bankruptcy is being heard this very day—the Senate unanimously passed identical legislation last Friday. I am pleased that following a hearing by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law last week, the subcommittee as well as the full committee have now both approved this legislation, clearing it for consideration by the House this afternoon. If the House adds its approval to this measure, we will be able to forward it to the President without delay. In doing so, we will help ensure that competition in the domestic airline industry will not be further diminished by the loss of another carrier.

I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 1140.

□ 1340

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation addresses a potential bankruptcy-law-related problem that threatens the viability of the Continental Airlines reorganization. Whether the Nation's fifth largest airline continues to fly may depend on whether Congress provides assurances that Bankruptcy Code section 1110 protection will be available in connection with a specific transaction involving 15 planes. Congress can help the reorganization process to succeed—and facilitate a significant potential recovery for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—by clarifying the law applicable to this transaction.

Since strong public policy considerations support section 1110 reform—and this legislation effectuates section 1110 reform albeit in a very limited context—I endorse the pending bill. I am pleased that we can help with the Continental reorganization today but believe we need to address the systemic problems of sections 1110, on aircraft equipment and vessels and 1168, corresponding provisions on railroad equipment expeditiously.

In the Continental Airline bankruptcy, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is a major creditor with claims that include approximately \$700 million relating to the termination of underfunded Eastern Airlines pension plans; Continental's potential liability is predicated on its control group relationship with Eastern. A settlement

agreement between the PBGC and Continental provides for Continental to lease airplanes from a newly created trust. The PBGC, the beneficial owner of the trust, will receive lease payments discounted for amounts paid to lenders with secured interests in the planes. Continental is providing the PBGC a guarantee that the planes will have a certain residual value when the leases expire and the planes are sold.

The secured lenders are concerned that this residual value guarantee may prevent the transaction from being treated as a true lease for purposes of section 1110. Such an outcome is potentially troublesome because section 1110 carves an exception to the automatic stay for entities that lease or finance aircraft and accords them special rights to take possession of aircraft in a bankruptcy case. There is no sound policy justification for differentiating between transactions that include residual value guarantees and those that do not. For that reason, it is appropriate for Congress to clarify that a lease related agreement in a PBGC bankruptcy settlement does not lose section 1110 protection for extraneous reasons. The overriding purpose of section 1110—to facilitate leasing and financing transactions involving aircraft—is unrelated to whether a transaction includes a residual value guarantee. We express our clear intent that this legislative action seeking to facilitate the PBGC's settlement with Continental Airlines does not justify any negative inference about section 1110's application to transactions involving parties other than the PBGC.

During consideration of major bankruptcy legislation in the 102d Congress, I pointed to the fact that the financing and leasing of transportation equipment often is unnecessarily cumbersome as a result of Bankruptcy Code uncertainties. Members of the House and Senate, in an informal conference in October, agreed to include in a compromise bankruptcy reform bill language designed to clarify that the protections of code sections 1110 and 1168 apply to a variety of financing transactions and leasing arrangements. These provisions would have discouraged litigation and reduced risks for businesses engaged in such financing and leasing. The potential savings could have proven beneficial to the traveling public. We must not lose sight of the broader need for section 1110 and 1168 reform as we focus today on legislation designed to address a problem in a specific case.

Congress, in my view, also needs to give attention to the impact of the bankruptcy reorganization process on airlines that have not sought bankruptcy protection. Concerns have been expressed that the financial problems of the airline industry as a whole are exacerbated by the capacity of airlines in reorganization to force healthier

carriers make choices that are not economically viable. We must seek to facilitate the successful rehabilitation of airlines in bankruptcy without compromising the stability of airlines that are not in bankruptcy.

Finally, substantial modifications in sections 1110 and 1168 are part of a much larger bankruptcy agenda that Congress needs to address. My hope is that this body will have the opportunity to consider major bankruptcy reform legislation in the months ahead.

I urge my colleagues to vote today to pass H.R. 1140.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, the Senate-passed bill before us is noncontroversial, and I ask that this bill affecting the PBGC be enacted expeditiously.

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation [PBGC] is a Federal agency dedicated to protecting the interests of hundreds of thousands of retirees whose pensions are endangered. The PBGC helps pensioners obtain the pensions they were promised after many years of service. When companies will not or cannot fulfill those promises, the PBGC steps in.

Recently, the PBGC settled a longstanding dispute over pension liabilities stemming from the demise of Eastern Airlines. Eastern Airlines, formerly a major air carrier, is now gone; with it went the sense of security which retired Eastern employees used to have in their pensions. The PBGC has now settled those claims, but the PBGC and others need assurance and protection for this and any other similar settlements.

As part of the settlement of the Eastern Airlines claims, the PBGC obtained interest in 15 airplanes. Continental Airlines will lease the planes from a trust in which the PBGC has a beneficial interest. The significant restructuring of the existing airplane leases in the PBGC's favor have created uncertainty about the extent to which the interests of the PBGC and others in the airplanes are protected.

The bill will provide the protections that are needed. This is a limited, noncontroversial, technical bill. There is no known opposition to the bill. I ask that the bill now be approved.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1140.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 400) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the treatment of settlement agreements reached with the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Aircraft Equipment Settlement Leases Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT SETTLEMENT LEASES WITH THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION.

In the case of any settlement of liability under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 entered into by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and one or more other parties, if—

(1) such settlement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act,

(2) at least one party to such settlement was a debtor under title 11 of the United States Code, and

(3) an agreement that is entered into as part of such settlement provides that such agreement is to be treated as a lease, then such agreement shall be treated as a lease for purposes of section 1110 of such title 11.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1140) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 965, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 1109, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series of votes.

CHILD SAFETY PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 965, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 965, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 38, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—362

Abercrombie	Deal	Hoke
Ackerman	DeFazio	Holden
Andrews (ME)	DeLauro	Horn
Andrews (NJ)	Dellums	Hoyer
Andrews (TX)	Derrick	Huffington
Applegate	Deutsch	Hughes
Bacchus (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Baesler	Dickey	Hutto
Baker (CA)	Dicks	Hyde
Baker (LA)	Dixon	Inslie
Barcla	Dreier	Jacobs
Barlow	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Durbin	Johnson (GA)
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Bartlett	Edwards (TX)	Johnson, E.B.
Bateman	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Becerra	English (AZ)	Johnston
Beilenson	English (OK)	Kanjorski
Bentley	Eshoo	Kaptur
Bereuter	Evans	Kennedy
Berman	Everett	Kennelly
Bevill	Ewing	Kildee
Bibray	Fawell	Kim
Bishop	Fazio	King
Blackwell	Fields (LA)	Kingsston
Billey	Filner	Klecza
Blute	Fingerhut	Klein
Boehlert	Fish	Klink
Bonilla	Foglietta	Klug
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Knollenberg
Borski	Fowler	Kolbe
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Kopetski
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Kreidler
Brooks	Franks (NJ)	Kyl
Browder	Frost	LaFalce
Brown (CA)	Furse	Lambert
Brown (OH)	Galleghy	Lancaster
Bryant	Gallo	Lantos
Bunning	Gejdenson	LaRocco
Burton	Gephardt	Lazio
Buyer	Geren	Leach
Byrne	Gibbons	Levin
Callahan	Glichrest	Levy
Calvert	Gillmor	Lewis (FL)
Camp	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Canady	Gingrich	Lipinski
Cantwell	Glickman	Long
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lowe
Carr	Goodlatte	Machtley
Castle	Goodling	Maloney
Chapman	Gordon	Mann
Clayton	Goss	Manzullo
Clement	Grams	Margolies-
Clinger	Grandy	Mezvinsky
Clyburn	Green	Markey
Coleman	Greenwood	Martinez
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Matsui
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	Mazzoli
Collins (MI)	Hall (TX)	McCandless
Combust	Hamburg	McCloskey
Condit	Hamilton	McCollum
Conyers	Harman	McCrery
Cooper	Hastert	McCurdy
Coppersmith	Hastings	McDade
Costello	Hayes	McDermott
Cox	Hefner	McHale
Coyne	Hinchey	McHugh
Cramer	Hoagland	McInnis
Danner	Hobson	McKeon
Darden	Hochbrueckner	McKinney
de la Garza	Hoekstra	McMillan

McNulty	Quinn
Meehan	Rahall
Meek	Ramstad
Menendez	Rangel
Meyers	Rangel
Mfume	Ravenel
Michel	Reed
Miller (CA)	Regula
Miller (FL)	Reynolds
Mineta	Richardson
Minge	Ridge
Mink	Roberts
Moakley	Roemer
Mollohan	Rogers
Montgomery	Ros-Lehtinen
Moorhead	Rose
Moran	Rostenkowski
Morella	Roth
Murphy	Rowland
Murtha	Roybal-Allard
Myers	Rush
Nadler	Sabo
Natcher	Sanders
Neal (MA)	Sangmeister
Neal (NC)	Santorum
Nussle	Sarpallus
Oberstar	Sawyer
Obey	Saxton
Olver	Schenk
Ortiz	Schiff
Orton	Schroeder
Owens	Schumer
Oxley	Scott
Pallone	Sensenbrenner
Parker	Serrano
Pastor	Sharp
Paxon	Shaw
Payne (VA)	Shays
Pelosi	Shepherd
Peterson (FL)	Sisisky
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs
Petri	Skeen
Pickett	Skelton
Pickle	Slattery
Pombo	Smith (IA)
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Smith (OR)
Poshard	Smith (TX)
Pricz (NC)	Snowe
Pryce (OH)	Solomon
	Spence

NAYS—38

Allard	Duncan	Packard
Archer	Gekas	Penny
Army	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Bachus (AL)	Hansen	Royce
Ballenger	Hefley	Schaefer
Boehner	Herger	Smith (MI)
Coble	Inglis	Stenholm
Crane	Inhofe	Stump
Crapo	Istook	Talent
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Walker
DeLay	Linder	Zeliff
Dooley	Livingston	Zimmer
Doolittle	Mica	

NOT VOTING—30

Barton	Gutierrez	Lloyd
Billrakis	Henry	Manton
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Molinari
Clay	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Dingell	Hunter	Quillen
Dornan	Jefferson	Roukema
Engel	Kasich	Shuster
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Slaughter
Flake	Lehman	Taylor (NC)
Ford (TN)	Lightfoot	Waters

□ 1405

Messrs. DOOLEY, DUNCAN, ROYCE, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

MERCHANT SEAMEN REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1109.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1109, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Carr	Fazio
Ackerman	Castle	Fields (LA)
Allard	Chapman	Filner
Andrews (ME)	Clay	Fingerhut
Andrews (NJ)	Clayton	Fish
Andrews (TX)	Clement	Foglietta
Applegate	Clinger	Ford (MI)
Archer	Clyburn	Fowler
Army	Coble	Frank (MA)
Bacchus (FL)	Coleman	Franks (CT)
Bachus (AL)	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Frost
Baker (CA)	Collins (MI)	Furse
Baker (LA)	Combust	Galleghy
Ballenger	Condit	Gallo
Barcia	Conyers	Gejdenson
Barlow	Cooper	Gekas
Barrett (NE)	Coppersmith	Gephardt
Barrett (WI)	Costello	Geren
Bartlett	Cox	Gibbons
Bateman	Coyne	Glichrest
Becerra	Cramer	Gillmor
Beilenson	Crane	Gilman
Bentley	Crapo	Gingrich
Bereuter	Cunningham	Glickman
Berman	Danner	Gonzalez
Bevill	Darden	Goodlatte
Bibray	de la Garza	Goodling
Bishop	Deal	Gordon
Blackwell	DeFazio	Goss
Bliley	DeLauro	Grams
Blute	DeLay	Grandy
Boehlert	Dellums	Green
Boehner	Derrick	Greenwood
Bonilla	Deutsch	Gunderson
Bonior	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Borski	Dickey	Hall (TX)
Boucher	Dicks	Hamburg
Brewster	Dixon	Hamilton
Brooks	Dooley	Hancock
Browder	Doolittle	Hansen
Brown (CA)	Dreier	Harman
Brown (OH)	Duncan	Hastert
Bryant	Dunn	Hastings
Bunning	Durbin	Hayes
Burton	Edwards (CA)	Hefley
Buyer	Edwards (TX)	Hefner
Byrne	Emerson	Herger
Callahan	English (AZ)	Hinchey
Calvert	English (OK)	Hoagland
Camp	Eshoo	Hobson
Canady	Evans	Hochbrueckner
Cantwell	Everett	Hoekstra
Cardin	Ewing	Hoke

Holden	Menendez	Schiff
Horn	Meyers	Schroeder
Houghton	Mfume	Schumer
Hoyer	Mica	Scott
Huffington	Michel	Sensenbrenner
Hughes	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Hutchinson	Miller (FL)	Sharp
Hutto	Mineta	Shaw
Hyde	Minge	Shays
Inglis	Mink	Shepherd
Inhfee	Moakley	Sisisky
Insole	Mollohan	Skaggs
Istook	Montgomery	Skeen
Jacobs	Moorhead	Skelton
Jefferson	Moran	Slattery
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Smith (IA)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy	Smith (MI)
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, E. B.	Myers	Smith (OR)
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Johnston	Natcher	Snowe
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Solomon
Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Spence
Kennedy	Nussle	Spratt
Kennelly	Oberstar	Stark
Kildee	Obey	Stearns
Kim	Olver	Stenholm
King	Ortiz	Stokes
Kingston	Orton	Strickland
Klecicka	Owens	Studds
Klein	Oxley	Stump
Klink	Packard	Stupak
Knollenberg	Pallone	Sundquist
Kolbe	Parker	Sweet
Kopetski	Pastor	Swift
Kreidler	Paxon	Synar
Kyl	Payne (VA)	Talent
LaFalce	Pelosi	Tanner
Lambert	Penny	Tauzin
Lancaster	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
LaRocco	Petri	Thomas (CA)
Laughlin	Pickett	Thomas (WY)
Lazio	Pickle	Thornton
Leach	Pombo	Thurman
Levin	Pomeroy	Torkildsen
Levy	Porter	Torres
Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Torricelli
Lewis (FL)	Price (NC)	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Traficant
Linder	Quinn	Tucker
Lipinski	Rahall	Unsoeld
Livingston	Ramstad	Upton
Long	Rangel	Valentine
Lowey	Ravenel	Velazquez
Machtley	Reed	Vento
Maloney	Regula	Visclosky
Mann	Reynolds	Volkmer
Manzullo	Richardson	Vucanovich
Margolies-	Ridge	Walker
Mezvinsky	Roberts	Walsh
Markey	Roemer	Washington
Martinez	Rogers	Waters
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Watt
Mazzoli	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McCandless	Rose	Weldon
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Wheat
McCollum	Roth	Whitten
McCrery	Rowland	Williams
McCurdy	Roybal-Allard	Wilson
McDade	Royce	Wise
McDermott	Rush	Wolf
McHale	Sabo	Woolsey
McHugh	Sanders	Wyden
McInnis	Sangmeister	Wynn
McKeon	Santorum	Yates
McKinney	Sarpalius	Young (AK)
McMillan	Sawyer	Young (FL)
McNulty	Saxton	Zelliff
Meehan	Schaefer	Zimmer
Meek	Schenk	

□ 1432

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to the recent storm and the local airport closing, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 71 and 72. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 71, the Child Safety Protection Act, H.R. 965. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 72, the Merchant Seaman Reemployment Rights Act of 1993, H.R. 1109.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the House vote on H.R. 1109, the Merchant Seaman's Reemployment Rights Act of 1993. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill. I ask that this statement be inserted into the RECORD immediately following the vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes Nos. 71 and 72. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of a flight delay in Charlotte, NC, I missed two recorded votes. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 71 and 72.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO INDIVIDUALS REQUIRED TO LEAVE THEIR JOBS BECAUSE OF MEDICAL OR FAMILY REASONS

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to require that individuals who must leave their jobs for family and/or medical reasons are allowed to receive unemployment compensation once they are ready to reenter the work force and cannot find a job.

Last month, the Family and Medical Leave Act was enacted into law providing workers with 12 weeks of unpaid leave for the birth or adoption of a child, to take care of a sick family member, or for one's own illness. This is a tremendous step forward in assisting workers balance the responsibilities at work and at home.

Unfortunately, in many situations 12 weeks is not enough time to resolve certain family situations. Serious illnesses often last longer than 12 weeks and many parents require more time to be at home with a newborn infant, because of medical reasons, or because mothers often want to stay home while breast feeding.

Workers in these situations are forced to make a decision to leave their jobs or neglect their family responsibilities. Many have no real choice and must leave their jobs.

Once they are ready to return to work and are unable to find a job, the unemployment law does not recognize that they were separated from their job for a good cause, and unemployment benefits are usually denied.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to lead this Nation in setting policies that recognize the importance of caring for our families. And current unemployment law does not set forth this kind of policy. In fact, it penalizes those individuals who have been forced out of their jobs to care for a sick mother or father, to care for a newborn child, or because they cannot recover from their own illness in the requisite 12 weeks.

The bill I am introducing today would allow individuals who are required to leave their employment because of medical or family reasons to be eligible for unemployment compensation when they are ready to reenter the work force. It is a fair bill. It does not provide these individuals with any more benefits than those they would receive if they had lost their jobs for another legitimate reason.

But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it establishes within the unemployment system a policy that acknowledges the importance of caring for our families. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, AND 1998

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-35) on the resolution (H.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Barton	Ford (TN)	Lloyd
Billirakis	Gutierrez	Manton
Brown (FL)	Henry	Molinari
Dingell	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Dornan	Hunter	Quillen
Engel	Kasich	Roukema
Fawell	Klug	Shuster
Fields (TX)	Lehman	Slaughter
Flake	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)

Res. 131) providing for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR H.R. 1335, STIMULUS AND INVESTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-34) on the resolution (H. Res. 130) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES CONCERNING H.R. 670

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify Members regarding the Committee on Rules' plans for further action on H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments of 1993.

The Committee on Rules is planning to meet on H.R. 670 the week of March 22, 1993, to take testimony and to grant a second rule on the bill. In order to assure Members an additional opportunity to submit amendments to the bill, the Committee on Rules is reopening its request for amendments in advance of the hearing.

Members who filed amendments with the Committee on Rules at the time of the February hearing do not need to re-submit their amendments, but any Member who is contemplating an amendment which has not already been filed should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in H-312 of the Capitol no later than 12 noon, Monday, March 22, 1993.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 670.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize. There were some conversations going on around, and we could not hear everything that the gentleman said. In other words, you are saying that on the family planning bill that we had previously issued a rule on, I guess the gentleman was saying that the Committee on Rules was going to meet again on the family planning bill?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. And that we were going to allow amendments to be—

Mr. MOAKLEY. Submitted; we are going to meet on the week of March 22, 1993.

Mr. SOLOMON. Which is what day? Is that a Monday?

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is a Monday.

Mr. SOLOMON. So we have to have amendments filed by—

Mr. MOAKLEY. Monday noon.

Mr. SOLOMON. Monday noon?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Right.

Mr. SOLOMON. Those amendments that had been previously filed with our committee?

Mr. MOAKLEY. They are still on record. Any Member who submitted an amendment in the previous hearing need not submit another one.

Mr. SOLOMON. Need not submit them again; we would still consider those that had been previously filed and any new ones that would be filed as of Monday noontime?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

BUDGET RESOLUTION AND FISCAL YEAR 1993 STIMULUS AND INVESTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, could I ask one additional question concerning tomorrow's schedule? We had previously issued a rule on both the budget resolution and the supplemental, the urgent supplemental, calling for general debate tomorrow on the budget resolution.

What will be the intent? Will we be able to vote on amendments to that resolution tomorrow, to be supplemental?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Does the gentleman mean in the Committee on Rules or on the floor?

Mr. SOLOMON. In the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. In the Committee on Rules, yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. But there are Members on this side of the aisle who would like to have the general debate and then vote on the amendments on the same day. Does the gentleman have any idea of the intent of the schedule?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I do not see how that is possible, because we are going to hear the amendments tomorrow in the Committee on Rules, and they will be on the floor on the following day.

Mr. SOLOMON. So the gentleman is saying we are going to do general debate on both the budget and the supplemental tomorrow with no votes on either one?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Some of the general debate will occur on Thursday as well as Wednesday.

Mr. SOLOMON. Would the gentleman say that again?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Some of the general debate will occur on Thursday.

Mr. SOLOMON. On the supplemental?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. That was the point I was trying to make, and that we would be finishing up general debate on the supplemental?

Mr. MOAKLEY. On Thursday.

Mr. SOLOMON. On Thursday. And then follow through with whatever amendments would be allowed?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. There would be general debate and votes on the supplemental on Thursday?

Mr. MOAKLEY. On Thursday.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is there an anticipation that there will be some amendments permitted on the supplemental to give us some idea in terms of timing?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The Committee on Rules has not decided on that yet.

Mr. WALKER. Do we have any idea how much time is going to be left for debate on the supplemental on Thursday prior to the vote?

Mr. MOAKLEY. At least 30 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. So we would have at least 15 minutes on each side, of debate time for discussion of the supplemental just prior to the vote?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I think it is 30 minutes to the minority.

Mr. WALKER. Thirty minutes to the minority would be reserved for that day? And could we assume then that the majority will also have 30 minutes that day?

Mr. MOAKLEY. We are not sure. We have to consult with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALKER. So we will have at least a half an hour on that day?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will see him upstairs tomorrow.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman very much.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY: A NATIONAL DAY OF CELEBRATION OF GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) designating March 25, 1993, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy," and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1440

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority would like to inform the House that it has no objection to this legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as the principal sponsor of the House companion measure to this bill, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Chairman CLAY and the full committee as well as to Chairman SAWYER of the Census and Population Subcommittee for bringing this measure to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

I would also like to thank TOM PETRI, ranking Republican on the Census Subcommittee, as well as JOHN MYERS, ranking member of the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

March 25 is a very special day to Greek-Americans and those who practice the Greek Orthodox faith—as well as freedom-loving people everywhere. This year, it marks both the 172d anniversary of the independence of Greece and its role as the wellspring of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it is a magnificent thing to see so many people the world over turning to democratic movements in the wake of fallen or overthrown dictatorships and tyrannies. The practice of democratic government, first seen in Athens in 510 B.C., is being sought out and implemented around the world, expanding the frontier of freedom further and broader every day.

We should not forget that the democratic movements of today owe a great debt of gratitude to the ancient Greeks such as Aristotle and Polybius, who were democracy's pioneers. I am never more proud of my own Greek heritage—or of being an American—than on days such as this one.

As the ancient Greeks forged the very notion of democracy, placing the ultimate power to govern in the hands of the people themselves, the spirit of March 25, Greek Independence Day, lives on in its defense. Over the course of history, many of the free world's people have given their lives in the defense of freedom and I believe this commemorative legislation will serve to remind us of their brave sacrifice.

I thank all of my colleagues here today for their assistance in passing this legislation recognizing the democratic heritage that all of us share and which promotes a special bond between the United States and Greece.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 22, legislation which commemorates more than 400 years of Greek independence. I also want to take this opportunity to express my staunch support for House measure, House Joint Resolution 10, sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and add how pleased I am to be a cosponsor of this important measure each year.

Greek civilization has contributed to the world in many significant ways. Much of our modern English vocabulary is derived from the Greek language. Many of our architectural forms copy the beautiful Greek architecture that was created so many thousands of years ago, and which remain to this day as monuments to human creativity and innovation.

Greek culture and heritage has shared so much with the world that we joyously celebrate Greek independence day with all Americans of Greek ancestry as well as with all those resident in Greece today.

March 25 commemorates this important event, and it is one we will continue to celebrate each year, as we also commemorate the bonds of friendship between our two nations and the unequalled and lasting contributions that Greece has made to worldwide civilization and culture over the centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to voice strong support for the adoption of this Greek independence day resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, people of Greek ancestry all around the world are this week celebrating the 172d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. In my district, the Greek Orthodox community of Yonkers and Westchester is holding its annual flag-raising ceremony in honor of this special event at the Prophet Elias Greek Orthodox Church in Yonkers.

The Greek community has many accomplishments of which to be proud. From its place in history as the birthplace of western civilization to its current role as a leading force of democracy, the Greek culture has always been vital and forward thinking. All aspects of our lives—including the arts, science, and politics—have been shaped by the Greek people.

In my role as a Federal official, I am proud to stand by the people of Greece on important policy issues. I am encouraged that the recent controversy over the designation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia may soon be resolved, but I will only support an arrangement that is acceptable to the Greek government. I also believe that the Skopje government must denounce any present or future claims to the territory of surrounding nations. Opposing territorial claims in the region have sparked wars in the past, and we must do all we can to ensure that they do not do so again.

The relationship between the United States and Greece is rooted in our common love of democracy and human rights. If we keep these values at the heart of all our decisions, our friendship will continue to prosper for many years to come—just as the glory of Greek independence has prospered for 172 years.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 22

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States of America drew heavily upon the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas these and other ideals have forged a close bond between our two nations and their peoples;

Whereas March 25, 1993, marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of

the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate with the Greek people, and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which our two great nations were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 25, 1993, is designated as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to proclaim March 20, 1993, as "National Agriculture Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 84.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of passage of Senate Joint Resolution 36, to designate March 20, 1993, as National Agriculture Day.

The nationwide observance of National Agriculture Day has been an annual rite for 20 years now. This day is set aside to promote a better understanding of agriculture's role in the American economy.

National Agriculture Day is more than just a day to honor our Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is really a day to honor the millions of Americans whose livelihood involves the production, processing, distribution, and sale of food and fiber products in our country.

Mr. Speaker, today it seems that many Americans have lost touch with the importance of agriculture in their lives. National Agriculture Day, at least in a small way, serves to remind us how important food and the people involved in the food and fiber sector are to our Nation.

I am pleased to support this resolution which allows our Nation to collec-

tively say "thank you" to all the men and women involved in American agriculture. I appreciate the support and cooperation of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and Chairman CLAY in bringing up the Senate resolution today. And I want to thank all of my colleagues who agreed to be cosponsors of the House companion resolution which is identical to the resolution before us today. I urge adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 36.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, this is National Agriculture Week. It is an important time to remember the contributions of the men and women of this country who produce the food we eat, as well as those who supply farmers with the goods they need to produce our food, and those who make sure the food gets to our dinner table.

Recent hunger crises in Africa and Europe bring home with all-too-graphic clarity the importance a country's farmers are not only to its success, but to its very survival.

Because of our productive agricultural sector, we spend a lower percentage of our incomes on food than any other major industrialized country. We have the safest food supply in the world. We bring money into this country through our enormous surplus in agricultural trade. We are able to help countries in need of food, such as Somalia and Yugoslavia. In short, we are who we are because of the success of American agriculture.

This is a week to remember the American farmers and all those who work in agribusiness. Let us remember them as we sit down to dinner this evening.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member believes it is especially worthwhile to take a moment for National Agricultural Day—March 20, 1993—to recognize the continued importance of agriculture to our Nation's and the world's prosperity.

Farmers, food processors, and agribusinesses combine to create our Nation's most important industry. Together, these people feed our communities, our Nation, and the world. They grow the crops, make the food, and sell it throughout the world, so we can enjoy the most inexpensive and abundant food supply at home while prospering from our agricultural exports abroad.

Today, the U.S. food and fiber system accounts for more than 16 percent of our Nation's gross national product. Last year, the United States posted a dramatic surplus of \$18.3 billion in agricultural exports. Together, agriculture and its related industries provide jobs for 21 million Americans, from producers to processors to scientists. Perhaps most importantly, this industry also provides much of the grain and food, which as humanitarian aid, meets the basic needs of the hundreds of thousands of starving and malnourished people throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, on National Agriculture Day let us honor those individuals and families who make the U.S. agricultural industry the world's most competitive and prosperous. This Member thanks them for their hard work, invest-

ment, and vision and encourages them to further strive to meet the demands of a rapidly growing population.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 36

Whereas agriculture is the Nation's largest and most basic industry, and its associated production, processing, and marketing segments together provide more jobs than any other single industry;

Whereas the United States agricultural sector serves all Americans by providing food, fiber, and other basic necessities of life;

Whereas the performance of the agricultural economy is vital to maintaining the strength of our national economy, the standard of living of our citizens, and our presence in the world trade markets;

Whereas the Nation's heritage of family-owned, family-operated farms and ranches has been the core of the American agricultural system and continues to be the best means for assuring the protection of our natural resources and the production of an adequate and affordable supply of food and fiber for future generations of Americans;

Whereas the American agricultural system provides American consumers with a stable supply of the highest quality food and fiber for the lowest cost per capita in the world;

Whereas American agriculture continually seeks to maintain and improve the high level of product quality and safety expected by the consumer;

Whereas the public should be aware of the contributions of all people—men and women—who are a part of American agriculture and its contributions to American life, health, and prosperity;

Whereas women play a vital role in maintaining the family farm system, both as sole operators and as working partners, and are also attaining important leadership roles throughout the American agricultural system;

Whereas farm workers are an indispensable part of the agricultural system as witnessed by their hard work and dedication;

Whereas scientists and researchers play an integral part in the agricultural system in their search for better and more efficient ways to produce and process safe and nutritious agricultural products;

Whereas farmers and food processors are responding to the desire of health-conscious American consumers by developing more health-oriented food products;

Whereas distributors play an important role in transporting agricultural products to retailers who in turn make the products available to the consumer;

Whereas our youth—the future of our Nation—have become involved through various organizations in increasing their understanding and our understanding of the importance of agriculture in today's society;

Whereas it is important that all Americans should understand the role that agriculture plays in their lives and well-being, whether they live in urban or rural areas;

Whereas since 1973, the first day of spring has been celebrated as National Agriculture Day by farmers and ranchers, commodity and farm organizations, cooperatives, and agribusiness organizations, nonprofit and community organizations, other persons involved in the agricultural system, and Federal, State, and local governments; and

Whereas 1993 marks the twentieth celebration of National Agriculture Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 20, 1993, is proclaimed "National Agriculture Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities during the week of March 14, through March 20.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two Senate joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

NCAA BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT—FOR MEN AND WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many sports fans, Thursday will be the beginning of March Madness, with the first round of the NCAA men's basketball tournament underway. But the real beginning of March Madness is tomorrow when the NCAA women's tournament begins.

Women's basketball has taken tremendous strides over the past several years. Exciting games like the triple overtime contest between Virginia and Maryland have brought added interest to the sport. Women's games are slowly making their way onto national television.

Unfortunately, that progress has not been good enough. Despite the passage of title IX 21 years ago, which promised to end sex discrimination in education, including sports, unequal treatment continues.

For example, a study by the General Accounting Office for the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness found that the average compensation for a division I men's basketball head coach was \$110,000, compared to only \$45,000 for the women's basketball head coach.

The treatment of the two tournaments provides some other interesting examples of the different treatment for the men and the women. Look at the case of Iowa, seeded fourth in the women's tournament. They should be hosting a second round game.

They won't be, though, because the university scheduled a Guns 'N' Roses concert at the arena for the same date. As Iowa women's coach, Vivian Stringer was quoted, "You can bet your last dime this would not have happened if this was the men's team. If this were the men's team, they would have wiped out the whole gol-darned month of March."

Unfortunately, stories of women's sports taking a back seat not just to men's sports, but concerts and other events, are all too common on college campuses.

The current contract between the NCAA and CBS requires CBS to carry the finals of the women's tournament. That should help give some exposure to women's sports. But even that help comes with a dose of bad medicine. Although both the men's and women's semifinal games are played on a Saturday, only the men will get a day off after their game. The women will be required to play the following day, on Sunday, to accommodate television.

Some contend that the men's game and tournament elicit far more interest and attention, so should deserve the lion's share of the spending. However, interest in women's basketball will be hindered for many years, if the networks, local channels, and newspapers continue to provide just passing attention to women's sports.

During the coming days, I want to urge the Nation's media to help end discrimination in sports by devoting greater attention to the women's tournaments. Some papers, such as USA Today, have shown an enlightened approach toward full reporting of the women's game. But unfortunately, too often the networks and local stations either ignore women's sports, or show merely a handful of scores over a few seconds. Too many newspapers do little more than to show women's scores in small type on the back page, if at all.

I also want to urge the Nation's colleges and universities to do their part to promote women's sports. They too must be willing to spend the same kinds of money to promote the women's teams as the men's teams. Recently, with a vigorous promotional campaign, a game between the Brigham Young and Utah women's teams brought a sellout, compared to attendance in the hundreds in the absence of promotion.

Those of us in Congress can also play a role. I have introduced H.R. 921, the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act. The bill requires colleges to disclose their spending on men's and women's programs, and to inform prospective students and the public. The bill will shed light on schools that are failing to comply with the gender equity provisions of title IX. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

I'll have many reasons to be paying attention to the women's tournament,

not the least of which is that it will give me a chance to follow my alma mater of Northwestern, as well as the women of Northern Illinois. And yes, I'll be watching the men's tournament, too, with Illinois and Southern Illinois represented.

As I have said on many occasions, equality for women doesn't mean a taking away from men. Both can prosper in an environment that builds women's sports.

□ 1450

THE BTU TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes this afternoon to talk about one aspect of the President's economic plan; specifically, the Btu tax and its impact on the West and particularly, of course, my home State of Wyoming.

There are some absolute misconceptions about energy and Btu taxes. To implement an enormous tax on a specific industry due to these misconceptions is bad policy and may do irreparable damage to our economic base.

I would like to talk about a couple aspects of it. One, of course, is the whole question of taxes as to whether that leads to where we are going for more jobs, for more economy or whether we need less Government.

Second, of course, the question of whether energy is taxed enough currently.

Finally, the unanticipated consequences of the tax and how it impacts on us.

The question I think that we have to ask before we talk about any taxes is a philosophical one. You ought to ask it on your Main Street at home. Do you want more Government? Do you think we need more Government? Do you think we need more taxes? Do we need more revenues? Or the opposite, of course, do we better accomplish our goals with less Government and less taxes?

Obviously, we have to deal with solving the questions that we have and the problems that we have. What we want to do is have families that are employed. We want to be able to buy homes. We want to be able to send our kids to school, to save for our retirement. We do that best, it seems to me, by encouraging the private sector. That is where wealth is created. That is where jobs are created, not by more taxes and more burdens on the private sector.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gen-

tleman for taking this special order and mentioning in particular the Btu tax. I do not know how many Members have had other groups come to see them in the last week, but I had the airline industry come to see me and they told me it was going to cost them 15 cents a gallon for each new gallon of jet fuel they buy, which would put them into a very precarious position. We have a lot of airlines, like USAir, that just had kind of a merger with British Air so they could keep their heads above water, and you are going to drown them with this kind of a Btu tax.

The trucking industry is going to have to pay about 10 to 15 cents more a gallon for gasoline and fuel. They are going to pass that on to consumers in the form of price increases for clothes, refrigerators, for everything else they transport.

Farmers in their driving and their energy costs are going to be put into real precarious territory.

I had some foundry people come in to see me, who said that we are in a very competitive situation with our foundry counterparts around the world, and they told me that this is the kind of thing that could break their backs and put many of them out of business.

So I would just like to add to my colleague's words here on the floor, my concerns about what this is going to do to the economy of this country.

The Btu tax, in my opinion, is called the big time unemployment tax and that is what we ought to start calling it around here.

Once again I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me talk just for a minute about taxes and energy. I wonder how many people understand that Wyoming coal now, which is very inexpensive as a matter of fact, that the mayor of Gillette told me the other day that you can buy a ton of coal in the spot market for less than six-pack of beer, four bucks for a ton of low-sulfur bituminous coal in Wyoming. Fifty percent of that today is in taxes. With the Btu tax at 25 cents a million, Btu's on this tax would increase the tax by 4 bucks. In other words, you would have \$8 a ton of coal, \$6 of which is taxes.

Now, if that does not cause us some anguish in being competitive in the world, I do not know what would.

Certainly inflation, our ability to compete.

Maybe just as importantly you remember a few years ago we talked a great deal in this country about OPEC and how we were going to be energy responsible and energy independent and we turned to the largest reserve of energy in this country, which was coal.

Then we had a clean-air tax which was very expensive, by the way, but made coal useful as a clean fuel.

Now here is what we do. With low-sulfur coal in Wyoming in the West, which we should encourage because of the environment, we increase the price by 108 percent with the Btu tax.

Too many times we say, oh, it only means a few dollars to a family in New York City; but to farmers and ranchers in Wyoming, miners in Wyoming, it is very important.

So aside from the impact, it seems to me we have a regional problem.

Let me tell you what the American Petroleum Institute indicates. The average household in Wyoming will be hit by \$1,167 a year because of the travel we have to do as compared to an average of \$471. So it hits us very hard. It hits us very hard regionally.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to take a long look at our goals in this country before we raise taxes, because these taxes will not reduce the deficit. These taxes will simply increase Government.

The question is, do you want more Government? Do you want more taxes or do we have less Government and encourage the private sector?

POSTAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Postal Privacy Act of 1993. Every year, 40 million people file change of address order cards with the Postal Service. Few of these people realize that the Postal Service makes their change of address information available to anyone who is willing to pay \$3 for it. Most movers would be even more surprised to learn that as a consequence of filing the change of address card, thousands of direct marketers gain access to their name and address.

Under a program called National Change of Address [NCOA], the Postal Service sells change of address records in computer readable form to 25 licensees. NCOA licensees are some of the largest mailing list companies in the country. The licensees use the NCOA computer file to correct and update their own mailing lists and the mailing lists of their customers.

Some licensees also use NCOA data to create lists of people who have recently moved. Direct mailers use new mover lists to target potential customers for a variety of products and services, ranging from lawn furniture to banking. Because new movers have a high response rate, such lists are of great value to mail marketers. NCOA licensees advertise and sell the new mover lists to other direct marketers, some of whom resell the information. In this way, every mover's change of address information becomes available to thousands of direct mailers. The Postal Service affords people no opportunity to prevent the sale of this material. Once someone files a change of address order form with the Postal Service, the information on that form is quickly and invariably made public.

Last year, the subcommittee I now chair investigated the privacy implications of the NCOA program. It tracked the change of address information given to the Postal Service by an individual who had recently moved. Over the 22-month period following the move, the person's name and address were sold by NCOA licensees 9,900 times. There is no way to tell how many additional times the information was resold. One particularly unpleasant byproduct of NCOA is that a person who files a change of address form for a deceased relative often begins receiving advertising mail addressed to that relative. There is no effective method for turning off the flow of this mail.

For some people, public disclosure of change of address information is not just distressing; it is disastrous. In a report issued last November, the Government Operations Committee detailed how individuals who have fled abusive spouses, jurors in highly sensitive trials, and the elderly are especially vulnerable to harm resulting from the publication of their change of address information. Entitled "Give Consumers a Choice: Privacy Implications of U.S. Postal Service National Change of Address Program," H. Rept. 102-1067, the report also explained that the Postal Service's NCOA program violates two Federal statutes restricting the public dissemination of names and addresses by the Postal Service. Section 412 of the Postal Reorganization Act prohibits the Postal Service from making publicly available any mailing or other list of names or addresses of postal patrons or other persons. Subsection n of the Privacy Act of 1974 prevents agencies, including the Postal Service, from selling or renting an individual's name and address unless the agency has specific legal authority to do so. The purpose of both provisions is to protect the general public from unwarranted invasions of personal privacy.

NCOA does serve a worthwhile purpose. The Postal Service provides NCOA service to mailers primarily to promote efficient mail delivery. Correct addressing saves money for both mailers and the Postal Service by reducing the amount of mail that cannot be delivered as addressed. In its report, however, the Government Operations Committee concluded that the Postal Service has overestimated by several hundred percent its cost savings from NCOA.

Strict adherence to Federal law would require dismantling of the NCOA program; and the resulting savings, whatever the magnitude, would be lost. Rather than to eliminate NCOA, a preferable solution would be to strike a balance between the privacy needs of individuals, on the one hand, and the efficiency needs of the Postal Service and advertising mailers, on the other. The most effective way to achieve this balance is for the Postal Service to provide people with a chance to opt-out of the NCOA program. Each person filing a change of address card would have an opportunity to check off a box to prevent the Postal Service from disclosing his or her name and address information to any members of the public. The Government Operations Committee recommended this solution in its report.

In a January 1993 letter to Representative BOB WISE, the previous chairman of the subcommittee, the Postal Service briefly responded to the Government Operations Com-

mittee report. The Postal Service stated that it was planning to strengthen the notice on change of address order cards regarding NCOA and that it was continuing a dialog with the mailing industry to examine ways to address concerns raised during the subcommittee's hearing. The Postal Service did not respond, however, to committee findings that the NCOA program violates Federal law. The Postal Service was equally silent regarding the committee recommendations for an opt-out.

For these reasons, I am introducing the Postal Privacy Act of 1993. My bill would require the Postal Service to give customers explicit written notice that their change of address information will be disseminated and to whom. More importantly, the legislation would give all movers a choice about whether or not the Postal Service will give out their names and addresses. The act would require the Postal Service to put a checkoff box on change of address order cards that people could use to prevent public access to their records. In that way people could exercise greater control over their personal information, and the contents of their mailboxes.

THE WALSH GOLD MINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to follow the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS]. He speaks well and I agree with him on those points, but I want to talk about another issue, an issue that I think would be of particular interest, especially to our guests, Mr. Speaker, who are watching the floor today.

The Wall Street Journal ran an editorial yesterday which they titled, "A Pardon for Walsh."

I think the Wall Street Journal should have extended its remarks to the extent to say, "A Pardon for Walsh's Gold Mine," or "A Pardon for the Walsh Holdup."

For those people of you who are spectators to this fine House and this fine country, I want you to know that you would face more prosecution for stealing a candy bar down at the local drugstore than Judge Lawrence Walsh will for his misbehavior as a special prosecutor.

Let me just go into a little more detail on what this editorial says. First of all, the General Accounting Office has decided that in spite of Judge Walsh's violations of Federal pay and procurement rules, that they will grant a pardon, not just a pardon for the past misbehavior, but for the first time in my legal career, I have seen a pardon for future behavior.

It was brought to the attention of the GAO that contrary to law, there has been an oversight on the audit of the expenditures of Mr. Walsh's department in his special prosecutions. So they did. The GAO ran an audit, and guess what they found. They discov-

ered that Mr. Walsh's problems were the most severe, that in fact his empire account for an astounding 90 percent of the \$43 million directly spent by all independent counsel since 1978.

Among other things, the GAO found that Mr. Walsh had not paid taxes to the District of Columbia, even though by these rules he was required to do so, and we are talking about millions of dollars and here we have seen hearings in the last couple months with Judge Wood or Zoe Baird where they had a Social Security problem with day care and they face a lot more harsh publicity and negative publicity in that situation than Mr. Walsh faces.

It is the future waiver that is particularly appalling to me and should be appalling to all the citizens of America. Mr. Walsh should be required to live up to the same standards that each and every citizen of this country has to live up to.

Now, this scenario even goes further. In fact, recently a group called Americans For a Balanced Budget filed a request under the Freedom of Information Act. When that was filed it was rejected. The reason it was rejected was because they said that on the Government it would be an unwarranted administrative burden; but that reason is not even one of the exemptions that is allowed under the law. They simply are defying the law in carrying Mr. Walsh's misbehavior even further.

It is interesting that the Department of Justice now, I hope, has an opportunity to look into this. My recommendation would be that the new Attorney General shortly after she dispenses with the Sessions situation over the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that she immediately take a close look at what Judge Walsh is doing with millions, tens of millions of dollars in taxpayers' money.

But do you know what? I do not think any of it is going to occur. So I am going to take this into my own hands, and I will tell you what I intend to do. I intend to write to Ross Perot. He has got a new program called "The Pork Barrel of the Month," and I am going to send this to Mr. Ross Perot, because he seems to be somebody who demands reform in Government, and I will bet you this is one of the projects he would like to take a look at, because it is not only a pork barrel of the month, it is the pork barrel of the decade.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EXCLUSION AND ASYLUM REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to address the House on a bill I have introduced today, a bill

which is entitled "The Exclusion and Asylum Reform Amendments of 1993."

Some of you may have watched the television program "60 Minutes" last Sunday and were as aghast as I was at the ease with which we see aliens coming into this country, at our airports and other ports of entry, who have fraudulent documents or no documents at all, and how they can come in and, if this is the case, simply say, "I claim political asylum. I am in fear of persecution if I am returned to country X, Y, or Z." And immediately the Immigration officers release them into the public domain of the United States. They give them a work permit. They allow them to go get a Social Security card and a driver's license and 90 percent of them are never seen again, not before a hearing officer or anywhere else.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely absurd how this can happen, and I am disappointed that we have not had hearings on this subject before. I introduced a similar bill to the one I am talking about this time in the last Congress, but we have not yet addressed the matter.

What is happening in this country is that we have got a system abroad of people who are smuggling folks into our country, taking advantage of a very big loophole in our law. If somebody comes to this country and he or she has no documents at all, we should not allow that to happen, that they can just walk away into the society and have a work permit and so forth.

The reason why, technically, this is being done is because we are very liberal on giving someone the right to claim asylum when they first set foot in our Nation, either on the sandy shores of the beach or in an airport. We say, "If you profess the right magic word and say that you're afraid that you're going to be persecuted back in your homeland because of some political beliefs or religious beliefs, then we're going to give you the opportunity to go before an immigration judge and have a full hearing on this matter."

Well, the problem is the immigration judges are not sitting at the airports of this Nation waiting to hear these cases. They have backlogs, a hundred thousand cases sitting there in the Nation today waiting to be heard. It takes literally years to hear these cases, and all of that time while people are waiting to be heard they are existing out in the countryside and oftentimes are not even showing up for these hearings.

When somebody goes to JFK, as the "60 Minutes" report showed that they did do on Sunday, and they make this political asylum claim, there is no room to hold them, even overnight, at JFK. They are full at the house, so to speak, at the little bit of detention

center immigration services has. So, they are immediately paroled into the country and given this temporary work permit, and they are told they have a hearing in another couple of months. They are supposed to come to just a preliminary hearing. It does not resolve anything. And then there may be 3 or 4 years, or perhaps a few months, if they are lucky, for coming back for a full-fledged hearing, if they show up.

What my bill does is very simple. It says, "If you come in with a fraudulent document, or no document at all, any port of entry, whether it's an airport or a land port, you are going to be assigned to a specially trained asylum officer." There are already 150 of them in the Immigration Service today, and that specially trained asylum officer is going to ask a series of questions to determine if they have a credible fear of persecution if they return to their homeland. My bill says, "If you don't have a document at all, if you've not made a political asylum claim, or if you do not present a credible fear of persecution to this asylum officer, you'll be put on the very next return plane and shipped back to the country of origin. You are not going to have a day in court here and an immigration judge type court. You're not going to be given a temporary work permit. You're not going to be allowed to get a Social Security card or a driver's license. You're going to be shipped back where you came from." And I think that is very important.

Mr. Speaker, 35,000 came through our airports alone last year in this category, 15,000 of them at Kennedy in New York, and most of those, 90 percent of those, we will never see again before an immigration judge. They are here. As a practical matter, they are here permanently because we do not have a system to round them up.

As my colleagues heard the other night on "60 Minutes," one of those was the fellow who we believe was involved in the shooting at the CIA in Langley, VA, a few weeks ago. He came over here and was given this status because he did not have the right documents, but he claimed political asylum.

I would submit that the bill that I am introducing with a number of co-sponsors today is the only practical way to grant relief to this Nation, to our people, and that we need to get on with the business of screening out those who do not have legitimate claims, and I would hope that we will have hearings shortly on this subject and that this type of legislation will be put in place so that we do not have people coming into this country, getting into our system, buying their way in in many cases. I understand they may pay as much as \$30,000 for these fraudulent documents and for the advice that tells them the magic words to claim the political asylum. If my pro-

posal were to be adopted, I believe that most of this would end and we could go back to a much more reasonable basis for operating.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years alone there has been a 300-percent increase in the number of people coming in through this political asylum claim with fraudulent documents, or a lack of documents, at our airports, a 300-percent increase. It could only be because the people out there in the other world know that this is a way to beat the system, and I would submit to my colleagues that there may be many of those who come in who are not so innocent, who may be terrorists or potential terrorists. The threat to our security, as well as the threat to our orderly immigration system, is at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to look at the Exclusion and Asylum Reform Amendments of 1993, and consider cosponsoring them, and urging hearings and a markup as expeditiously as possible to put in place a system that will stop this kind of nonsense once and for all.

I submit for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the Exclusion and Asylum Reform Amendments of 1993:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—EXCLUSION AND ASYLUM REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Section 1. Short title: "Exclusion and Asylum Reform Amendments of 1993."

Section 2. Subsection (a) adds a new ground of exclusion to section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Any alien who, in seeking entry to the U.S. or boarding a common carrier destined for the U.S., presents fraudulent documents, or who presents a document to board a common carrier and then fails to present the document to an INS inspector at a port of entry, is excludable.

Subsection (b) provides that an alien who is excludable under subsection (a) may not apply for or be granted asylum unless the excludable act was pursuant to a direct departure from a country in which (A) the alien has a credible fear of persecution, or (B) there is significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"Credible fear" means that it is more probable than not that the statements made by the alien in support of an asylum claim are true and that there is a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility as a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A). Relief under section 212(c) (relating to permanent resident aliens who have resided in the U.S. for 7 or more years) is denied to aliens excludable for admissions fraud under the new section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii).

Section 3. Rewrites section 235(b) relating to inspection and exclusion by immigration officers to add new provisions relating to the special exclusion of aliens who are excludable for admissions fraud.

An immigration officer would inspect each alien who is seeking entry to the U.S.

If an alien is excludable for admissions fraud or lack of documentation, does not have a reasonable basis for legal entry into the U.S., and does not indicate an intention to apply for asylum, the alien will be excluded without a hearing. ("Reasonable basis for legal entry" is intended to cover situations where someone is in fact a permanent

resident alien but has lost, misplaced, or packed his or her documentation but can produce an "A" number or otherwise provide information that an INS inspection can use to confirm his or her legal immigration status.)

If an alien indicates an intention to apply for asylum, the INS inspector will refer that alien to an asylum officer.

If the asylum officer determines that the alien is excludable for admissions fraud or lack of documentation and is not arriving from a country in which he or she has a credible fear of persecution or in which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have such a credible fear, the alien will be excluded without further hearing.

Aliens found to have a credible fear of persecution will be allowed to apply for asylum before an immigration judge. They may be detained or paroled in, as is the current practice for all aliens who indicate they wish to apply for asylum. Because of limited detention space, current practice generally is to parole such aliens into the U.S. and give them temporary work authorization.

The Attorney General would establish procedures that ensure that aliens are not excluded pursuant to the new provision on admissions fraud without an inquiry into their reasons for seeking entry into the United States.

This section also specifies that an alien has not entered the U.S. for purposes of immigration law unless and until the alien has been inspected and admitted by an immigration officer as required above. However, an alien who has not been inspected and admitted but who has been living in the U.S. for a continuous period of one year will be considered to have entered the U.S. without inspection and is subject to deportation.

Section 4. Limits judicial review of determinations made with respect to aliens found excludable for admissions fraud and lack of documentation. Review may be only by petition for habeas corpus and such review is limited to the questions of whether the petitioner is an alien and whether the petitioner was ordered specially excluded under the procedures established by this bill for admissions fraud and attempted entry without documentation.

This section also bars judicial review or intervention with respect to the procedures established by the Attorney General for implementing the special exclusion provisions and provides that, except by the specified habeas corpus inquiry, no suit or claim may be heard attacking or seeking to delay the special exclusion of aliens. Judgments of exclusion, special exclusion, or deportation may not be collaterally reviewed in any action for the assessment of penalties for improper entry or re-entry of aliens.

Section 5. Includes two conforming amendments to the deportation procedures in section 237(a).

Section 6. Increases the maximum penalty for smuggling aliens from 5 years to 10. The sentencing commission will use this increase in the underlying penalty to increase penalties for related offenses.

Section 7. The effective date is the date of enactment.

THE IMPORTANCE OF A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from

Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 45 years, I have been a vocal advocate for a strong, viable active U.S. merchant marine. Despite the intent of Congress to preserve a merchant marine both for the benefits it brings to the national economy and the balance of trade, and, importantly, for the national defense of this great Nation of ours, the size of our domestic commercial merchant fleet continues to decline.

According to the latest statistics compiled by the Maritime Administration, the privately owned deep draft, oceangoing fleet of the U.S. merchant marine totaled 386 ships; and the number continues to go downward with each passing year. Cargoes keep merchant ships afloat because cargoes pay the cost. That was the reason, in 1954, that that Congress in its wisdom passed the Cargo Preference Act which requires that all U.S. Government-impelled or financed cargoes shall move on U.S.-flag ships—the percentage of which depending on the role of the Government in that transaction. Some call for 50 percent, others for 100 percent.

Recently, the Merchant Marine Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held a hearing to explore problems the industry continues to have with Federal agencies circumventing domestic cargo preference laws.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BATEMAN, the ranking minority member, for their leadership in convening the cargo preference hearing, which was a continuation of an oversight hearing the subcommittee held at my request on September 30, 1992.

During the course of the September hearing, the committee heard testimony from several of the Federal agencies which allegedly were violating these laws. This time, the committee had the opportunity to hear from the Maritime Administration and the industry, and focus on the problems the industry is encountering with these same agencies.

Because the new administration has not named anyone to head up key offices in both the State and Defense Departments, no testimony was received from these two important agencies. However, Chairman LIPINSKI has assured everyone that he will hold additional hearings in the near future in order that he and his colleagues on the committee have benefit of their input.

The U.S. merchant marine has taken some hard hits lately. These have come from the various Federal agencies which have attempted to evade and circumvent compliance with the cargo preference statutes. I said earlier that the Cargo Preference Act was passed in

1954. It was. However, military cargoes were ordered on U.S.-flag ships at the turn of the century—by the Congress in effect in 1904.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the importance of a viable merchant marine. History has taught all of us that victory by the Allied Forces during World War II—in both the European and Pacific theaters—was due in large part to the merchant marine, which opened a waterborne pipeline that delivered critical ordnance and supplies to the troops.

Mr. Speaker, we won that war because the United States was capable of building 6, oceangoing ships—Liberty, Victory, T-2 tankers, and some C-1 class in 4 short years from 1941 to 1945. That world-shattering record of production was possible because the 1936 Merchant Marine Act had us pointed in the right direction before 1940-41.

We don't have to strain our memories or research the history books for additional documentation. The more recent events in the Persian Gulf again demonstrated the absolute need for a merchant marine.

As I have stated on earlier occasions, the United States was very fortunate in its war against Saddam Hussein. We had the benefit of a coalition of other countries, which contributed to the overall campaign.

Part of those efforts was the availability of deep draft vessels, particularly the roll-on/roll-off type, which were in short supply in both the U.S. active and reserve fleets.

If the United States had to go it alone in the Persian Gulf war, not so much militarily, but with the existing logistical support and transportation systems, our troops would have had serious problems.

During the entire Persian Gulf campaign, including Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, a total of 405 ships was employed, including 91 Government-owned ships, 98 U.S. privately owned ships, and 216 foreign-flag vessels.

As in previous wars, in excess of 95 percent of all of the needed supplies, ordnance, and equipment was carried to the war zone by ships.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the United States does not have a sufficient number of ships or the adequate types of ships to support our military. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is our military and other Federal agencies which continually embark on creative interpretations to circumvent our cargo preference laws.

These laws are designed—in whole and in part—to ensure that we have an adequate active merchant marine in the event of a national emergency or war. And the agency that is supposed to follow through with that adequacy is the Maritime Administration—commonly referred to as MarAd.

Therefore, today, I want to begin by focusing on the Maritime Administra-

tion—the very agency that is responsible for promoting the industry and which the Congress empowered with the oversight responsibilities for cargo preference.

The reason is, Mr. Speaker, that during the fall of 1991, persistent complaints were coming to my office from the industry that MarAd was not exercising its cargo preference enforcement responsibilities properly.

I began corresponding with various Federal agencies—the Defense Security Assistance Agency [DSAA], the Military Sealift Command [MSC], the Agency for International Development [AID], and MarAd—about specific issues brought to my attention.

Through the exchange of correspondence with these agencies, I learned that, in the fall of 1991, MarAd, on its own and without a request from the sponsoring Federal agency, determined that a program, which previously had been determined by MarAd to be subject to cargo preference, now was said to be exempt from the law.

The program involved the southern region amendment transfers [SRA], which had generated millions of dollars in revenue of U.S.-flag operators. MarAd's new determination jeopardizes future U.S.-flag operators. MarAd's new determination jeopardizes future U.S.-flag revenues from this program.

Subsequently, it was learned that MarAd had issued an internal legal opinion which stated that since the law authorizing these donated cargoes contained the language "Notwithstanding any other provision of law," this military program was not subject to cargo preference.

To be frank, Mr. Speaker, this reversal was shocking. However, after reviewing the MarAd cargo preference report, I believe that the "notwithstanding" issue was a minor problem, even though MarAd would not explain to me why it unilaterally decided to render the questionable opinion.

Another cargo preference matter, involving the Agency for International Development, imposed a loading delay assessment penalty on cargo preference shipments. I requested MarAd to inform AID that the imposition of these penalties is not appropriate and to have the agency cease this activity.

The response from MarAd informed me that MarAd is powerless to require AID to remove these objectionable provisions from this program. MarAd claims the cargoes are not subject to cargo preference, as it contains the "notwithstanding" language. Again, I did not expect to receive such a response. However, it clearly exposes several other serious issues.

Since MarAd ruled that these shipments are not subject to cargo preference, under what authority does MarAd finance the incremental differential for this program?

The only authority for such financing is provided in the Merchant Marine

Act of 1936. This authority only applies to programs which are subject to cargo preference. Therefore, MarAd—according to MarAd—appears to lack the authority to finance any freight differential for this program.

Yet it still has provided the financing. I will be extremely interested in MarAd's response on this issue because either MarAd's legal opinion is faulty, as I believe it is, and should be retracted, or MarAd officials have been guilty of misappropriation of funds—a very serious offense. MarAd cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed by this situation. If we cannot rely on MarAd to provide the Congress with reliable information, how can we assist the industry?

At the close of the September 30, 1992, hearing, Mr. Pickett asked then-MarAd Administrator, Captain Leback, what in his opinion might best be done to improve the cargo preference laws so that they would have the policy impact of requiring the carriage on American bottoms the way the committee has intended. No mention was made by Captain Leback of the "notwithstanding" issue. Yet, according to MarAd, this language alone already has excluded approximately 1 million tons of cargo from cargo preference.

During the recent hearing, Edmund T. Sommer, Jr., acting chief counsel at MarAd, testified. He apologized to the committee for any confusion the agency may have created with its explanation of the "notwithstanding" language opinion and he sought to set the record straight.

Despite communications with me, in which MarAd unequivocally states that the "notwithstanding" language exempts the application of cargo preference laws, Mr. Sommer testified, "notwithstanding is not a blanket exemption of this statute or any other statute which contains the notwithstanding language from the application of appropriate laws."

Mr. Sommer continued:

All it does, and in particular in connection with Title II, is provide the administrator of AID with the authority to waive cargo preference or any other statute if in his view it is necessary to do so to provide the timely relief cargoes that are called for under the statute.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that MarAd has not been totally honest with the committee in the past, and is not now. If the Administrator of that agency will not come forth when specifically asked about problems with cargo preference laws, then how can any of us or the industry expect compliance with the statute by the other Federal agencies?

Something doesn't add up at that agency. We must deal with this problem now, in addition to dealing with the violations of the other agencies of our cargo preference statutes.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just one more moment to briefly address legislation which I introduced—H.R. 57, the Merchant Marine Utilization and Preference Act of 1993.

This legislation is intended to replace a 1954 interdepartmental memorandum of agreement known as the Wilson-Weeks agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce.

My legislation would set limits on the number of Government-owned ships to be operated by DOD in peacetime and establishes an order of priority for obtaining additional merchant shipping when required.

In accordance with our national maritime policy, as set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the emphasis is on maximum reliance on privately owned U.S.-flag shipping. Foreign-flag shipping would be allowed only when U.S.-flag ships are not available, and then only to the extent necessary to meet urgent military requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly that modernizing the Wilson-Weeks agreement and codifying it into law will aid greatly the U.S. merchant. It will control the use of Government-owned ships and the employment of foreign-flag vessels as was witnessed during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, our privately owned merchant marine must have cargoes if the stars and stripes is to continue to be seen in the commercial shipping world. Proper enforcement of the 1954 Cargo Preference Act and controlling the use of Government ships will help.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, headed up by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], who are going to salute Women's History Month this month.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order this evening to talk about the budget, the work of the Committee on the Budget, the Democratic plan that we will be considering tomorrow, and the Republican alternative that will also be considered tomorrow. I hope during the course of this hour that I will be joined by some of my other colleagues from the Committee on the Budget to discuss this.

Obviously, tomorrow we begin a long and important debate, a long debate because very rarely in the House, in the course of the year, do we have debates that have as much as 10 hours, as

we will have tomorrow and Thursday, of general debate on the subject of the budget. But I think it is appropriate that we take that kind of time to have this discussion about the budget, about the various alternatives, because I believe that the budget, in a very real way, and also the stimulus package that we will debate the following day establishes the fundamental policy for this Congress and for this country as to where we are going to go.

I believe that the debate tomorrow and the next day will highlight some of the major differences that exist between the plan that the Republicans have put forward in the Committee on the Budget and that which President Clinton and the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget have put forward. But I thought it would be appropriate to spend a little bit of time this evening, as a preview to this date that we will have on the following day, because I think that this issue is of such importance, it is really important to get the fundamentals of this debate down, to understand what the real differences are.

Let me just, if I might, highlight for my colleagues what I think is the fundamental philosophical difference, and then I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget, to discuss this.

But let me just very quickly highlight what I think are the differences.

Leaving aside the numbers, which, after all, the budget resolution is numbers, and tomorrow when our colleagues see this budget resolution, all they will see is a handful of numbers showing budget authority and outlay for fiscal year 1994 by function. But as I tried to point out yesterday or last week in the Committee on the Budget, it is policy which drives the numbers. You have to have some kind of fundamental underlying policy to get to the numbers that are in the budget resolution.

If one was to leave those numbers aside for a moment and talk about what is the policy which drives this budget resolution, and again, I want to say that I am including in this the economic stimulus package and the reconciliation package that we will have later in the year that deals with the tax part of the legislation, the tax increases proposed by the administration. The economic stimulus package, the spending part, the budget resolution, which sets out spending targets for the coming year, and the reconciliation bill, the added taxes are the heart of this, are the three parts that constitute the heart of this overall budget debate.

In one sentence, I think the Democratic plan is one that calls for more spending, that is very clear. The economic stimulus has \$16 billion of spending in it. It calls for more taxes. That is very clear.

The President has more than \$316 billion of taxes over the next 5 years in his proposal. That is the largest tax increase in American history by far. And it has spending cuts, but spending cuts that only come in the third and fourth year of the budget resolution.

In other words, the philosophy of the Democratic proposal, and the Democratic proposal consists of that budget which was offered by President Clinton or brought to the Congress by President Clinton and the changes that have been subsequently made by the Democrats in the Committee on the Budget to that to add another \$62 billion of spending cuts to it. And we will come back to that in a little bit, perhaps in some of our dialog here.

But in that overall process, they have said, "We are going to do the spending part first. We are going to do the tax part second. And only later, trust us, we will get to the spending cuts, the real deficit reduction."

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this body know, certainly all of us that have been around here more than one session of Congress and, actually, even a freshman can know this from having observed the process here and having observed this body from afar in the past, that the Congress rarely, if ever, gets to the spending cuts, if they do not enact them up front.

□ 1530

So the philosophy of the Democrat plan is more spending, more taxes, and an ephemeral promise of spending cuts and deficit reduction in the future. That, Mr. Speaker, is a prescription for disaster.

The Republican plan, on the other hand, is labeled, I think, accurately. It is called cut spending first. Very simply, we believe that we ought to go after the spending part first. We ought to cut spending, have real spending cuts first, and then, and only then, if that is not sufficient to meet the kind of deficit reduction we need to have in order to have a balanced budget, then we would say to the President, Mr. President, come back to us. Come back to the American people and ask for more spending cuts, or then ask for a tax increase, but do not ask for the tax increase first and give us another one of those illusory promises that we are going to get spending cuts sometime down the road in the future.

If we weigh these two proposals in the balance, the Democrat proposal says "more spending, more government, and more taxes to pay for that." The Republican proposal is one that suggests that we should have less government, we should not have new taxes, and we should have real spending cuts in order to achieve the kind of deficit reduction we need.

In a very real sense I think this difference is one that has characterized the fundamental difference between

the Democrat and the Republican parties for a number of years. There are those from the other side of the aisle, my good friends on the other side of the aisle, that believe, and I know they believe very sincerely, very genuinely, that Government is the answer to the problems. If we just had more Government spending, if we just had more Government intervention, if we just had more Government programs then we could solve the problems that exist in this country.

Many of us on our side of the aisle believe that Government should be reduced in size, that it should be reduced in its scope of regulation of its involvement in the private lives of people in the private sector of our economy. Then, and only then, can we have the kind of engine of growth that is needed in order to grow and to solve the problems of this country, of productivity, of our ability to compete in the world, to solve the economic growth that is needed in order to reduce the deficit and to ultimately reduce the national debt.

That, Mr. Speaker, characterizes the difference between the two proposals that are before us today. Let me just give one other quick figure to summarize the differences. Then I will yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Very quickly, on tax increases, the Clinton proposal is \$316 billion of tax increases over the next 5 years. The Republican plan is no tax increases.

That is, the stimulus package and all the other investments called for by the President in everything from immunization to Head Start to demonstration highway and road projects and all kinds of investments and more Government programs is \$186 billion over the next 5 years of new spending. The Republican plan is no new spending.

The defense cuts, the additional defense cuts, in addition to the 25 percent that we are already making now in defense, the President would cut another \$112 billion from that. We have seen the problems of that in States like California, with the base closings that we are facing there now. We have seen the problems that that could pose for us when a country like North Korea pulls out of the nonproliferation pact on nuclear weapons and threatens to send this world into a very deep problem of nuclear proliferation there.

The Republican plan would call for an additional \$60 billion, and we believe that is a responsible additional reduction in defense spending over the next 5 years. No part of the budget has come close to taking the kinds of reductions over the last several years in real reductions of real dollars that defense has taken.

In nondefense cuts President Clinton would cut another \$156 billion over the next 5 years. We would cut \$370 billion of spending cuts.

Deficit reduction would be, under the Clinton plan, \$362 billion, and under our plan, \$430 billion.

There it is. There it is. More deficit reduction under our plan, about the same when we add in the additional cuts that the Democrats are talking about; roughly the same in deficit reduction. However, they get theirs by a factor of 3 to 1 by more taxes on the American people, and the hope, the promise, of those spending cuts coming in outlying years.

Ours is making the spending cuts now, putting them in place now so that we have those spending cuts not only this year but guaranteed for each of the next several years, without raising taxes on the American people.

Let me yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], who, I might add, has been one of the really hard-working members of the Committee on the Budget. It has been really a pleasure to work with him.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate working on the Committee on the Budget with the gentleman from Arizona. I would also like to recognize our ranking Republican, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who has shown great leadership in putting together a Republican plan, and another individual on the committee who I worked closely with, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

When we worked on health care costs and entitlements—which is a big part of what happened to the budget process—on the Committee on the Budget, we wrestled hard with what is the best way to assure prosperity for Americans.

We can certainly look at, are we going to increase Government spending, are we going to increase taxes, or on the other hand, are we going to leave the resources with the individuals by reducing or holding down the growth in taxes and holding down spending.

The Republican plan was basically very fundamental in its approach. That is that the individuals, the Americans of this country, are better off if they are allowed to keep their resources for themselves and spend as they see fit for their families and for their own security. So I think that the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget came up with a very responsible plan.

As the gentleman said in his comments, we are talking about cutting spending first. I do not think there are enough Americans out there who realize that we have this specific plan before the Congress that has come from the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget. It is a very responsible plan. It addresses the issue of accountability.

We have heard over and over again about how important it is that we have

accountability, that we have a budget process that Americans understand, so that they can express their concerns. We have identified a very specific plan, after being challenged by the OMB Director, Mr. Panetta, as well as by the current President, President Clinton, about being specific in our cuts.

Time and time again we heard about "Republicans, if you don't like the plan we are going to put forward, be specific in what you are recommending." This plan is specific.

I could not help but muse in the last Budget Committee meeting we had before we reported it out, that after we put together our specific proposals, our Democrat colleagues on the Committee on the Budget came up with an additional \$67 billion of cuts or thereabouts, where they would like to see some additional cuts. They were not specific, after challenging us time and time again to be specific.

I think this type of hypocrisy needs to be pointed out.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield back to me for a question?

Mr. ALLARD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I would say particularly on issue of the additional \$62 billion of cuts that were proposed in the committee by the Democrats to add on, I think it is important to note that they keep talking about how we have come with more cuts. The reason they came up with more cuts is because the Congressional Budget Office said their scoring, the amount that they have said they were going to get earlier in their cuts and the amount of revenue from their taxes, turned out to be totally misleading by a factor of \$55 billion.

To get back to the original proposal President Clinton had proposed, they had to come up with these additional cuts. I do not know how the gentleman felt, but I was really stunned and surprised in committee to find out that they were going to give no specifics to where these cuts were going to come from, after all these months or weeks that we had of having the President and Mr. Panetta stand up and say, "OK, Republicans, show us your cuts. If you have a better plan, show us where your cuts are going to be." Then we got to the committee, and they did not have a one of them.

Mr. ALLARD. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that I share the gentleman's astonishment at what happened in the Committee on the Budget. Having served in the State of Colorado Senate, we were always very specific. In fact, the budget was put right out for everybody to see, and I might add at this point in time we are still waiting to see the President's budget, what he has to propose, having missed his deadline.

We have before us a good Republican plan, something that I am certainly proud of. I think by the time the American people see through this plan they will begin to understand what we are talking about, and how we are going to go ahead and allow them to keep more of their wealth.

□ 1540

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield, I would just like to ask one further question. I see we have been joined by a couple of our colleagues who I would like to get involved in this discussion as well.

My colleague offered one really very important amendment to the Democratic plan, and I think we should point out the process that was followed. We have the Democratic plan which was on the table. Republicans offered their alternative. It was defeated on a party line vote. Then we proceeded to offer a series of amendments to their plan with some additional cuts to the Democratic budget and some specific ones that we had been working on. But the gentleman from Colorado offered one that was very, very important dealing with taxes, to eliminate the Btu or the energy tax.

I am wondering if the gentleman would share with us a little bit as to why that tax is such an inflationary tax, and really a bad kind of tax, and what the particular problems are with that tax.

Mr. ALLARD. I am glad to share some of my thoughts about that.

The Btu tax is a tax on energy consumption. When we look at that we should think about how that is going to impact our economy, and when I looked at it I became very, very concerned. With the background as a small business person I understand how when you put a tax like that in at the natural resource level it tends to multiply and add through the distribution process, because each time a good or service is sold or exchanges hands, then there is a sort of multiplier effect until it finally meets the consumer.

I think the Btu tax is very inflationary. I think that it is going to have a disproportionate impact on rural Americans. I think it is going to have a disproportionate impact on the elderly and a lot of people who are on fixed incomes.

So I looked at the amount of new spending that we had in the President's plan, and we had somewhere around \$143 billion in new spending programs. If we eliminated the Btu tax, the energy tax, which was somewhere around \$73 billion, that left us with \$70 billion that we could go ahead and then put toward deficit reduction.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield again, I wonder if you would agree with the statement that one of the things that is so insidious about a Btu tax is that by and large it is a hid-

den tax, that most Americans will see only the few added dollars that they have on their electric bill or their gas bill, and a couple of extra cents or a few extra pennies at the pump. That is bad enough, but it adds at every single level of production. At the mine there is an energy cost so that the ore coming out of the mine is going to cost more. The steel mill has an energy cost, so the steel costs more. The trucker that takes the steel or the steel product to the warehouse has an added cost, and so there is a cost there, and so on down the line right through the retailer that has a larger electric and heating bill, and it gets added in there, so that, it is a compounded kind of tax increase at every single level of production, and is enormously inflationary. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. ALLARD. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes, and the gentleman makes a very good point about how it is a hidden tax. But I would make an additional point to that which is that in addition to that, it is going to have an impact on the way we compete—American goods and services compete in an international market, because it is going to raise the price of all of those goods and services.

Some who support the Btu tax will argue that we can absorb that tax because they have an energy tax in the European Community. It is my understanding that they have based that energy tax on a condition that their major trading partners will also pass an energy tax before theirs goes into effect, which is Japan and the United States. And it is further my understanding that they have provided exemptions for industry, so that those goods are either directly exempted or there is some sort of a tax credit that comes in at the end. And it does create a real disadvantage for American products, in my mind.

Mr. KOLBE. And the bottom line is we get this tax increase, and we do not get any real deficit reduction in it.

Mr. ALLARD. And trade problems, and lots of costs on goods and services. And it is going to create a real problem, I think, for our economy.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and hope that we can continue this dialog.

I think what we have seen here is an illustration of what we have got. We have a plan that is going to tax, ask the American people to pay more taxes, and even by their own standards you do not get the real deficit reduction, because the deficit starts to rise again in the fourth year. So the American people are logically going to ask why I am paying these additional taxes when we are really not getting a reduction in the deficit. We need to have real deficit reduction.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS], who is a new member of the Budget Committee and has made some really outstanding contributions to our work. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for the excellent work that he has done as the head of our human empowerment group in our committee, and I appreciate very much his work and look forward to working with him in the future.

What I have here today is a chart, Mr. Speaker, that I think shows very clearly the choices available to the American people in this area. The President is constantly talking about a dramatic shift in priorities, and he is talking about a bold, persistent experimentation. He is right. He is talking about a dramatic shift in priorities, and he is also talking about bold, persistent experimentation.

Unfortunately, I think a lot of that bold, persistent experimentation is in places like our military readiness. But let me just describe what I am talking about in the major shift in priorities.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a chart showing the Clinton budget proposal. The Clinton budget proposal is dramatically different than what we have been under in the last 12 years, and certainly very different than the Republican alternative.

The Clinton budget proposal starts like this: It starts with 328 billion dollars' worth of tax increases. That is the largest tax increase in the history of this country. You start there, with a \$328 billion increase in taxes.

Then he calls for additional spending which could add to the deficit, and that is why we show it below the line here. He adds 230 billion dollars' worth of new spending on new particularly social programs.

The President would then cut 376 billion dollars' worth of programs, and thereby reduce the deficit by \$376 billion.

The net result of this tax increase, the largest tax increase in the history of the country, a tremendous spending increase, and then yes, some spending cuts, is a net reduction in the deficit over the 5-year period of \$474 billion.

The Republican proposal is rather different, startlingly different, in fact. What we have is basically zero in tax increases. There are some minor user fee increases that we could show on this chart, but frankly they would be so barely above the line that they would barely show up. But there are very, very slight increases in taxation, mostly in the form of user fees. For example, in national parks and that sort of thing.

Then you have zero dollars' worth of additional spending increases. There are no spending increases in our plan.

Then you have spending cuts of \$429 billion.

The new result of the Republican plan is a reduction in the deficit over 5 years of \$429 billion.

The President is right when he says that he is talking about a dramatic shift in priorities. Let me describe one of those that affects my State very, very nearly and dearly, and that is a loss of all of the military installations in Charleston, SC.

The President is talking about a spending increase, for example, for the National Service Corps here, and that is part of the \$230 billion. Then he is talking about a spending cut of \$376 billion, and out of that what is represented there is an additional \$60 billion in Defense Department cuts beyond what President Bush proposed.

As a result, you are talking about a shift in priorities, and he is right, it is a dramatic shift in priorities away from the military and toward this social spending in the form of this national service program.

I would point out to the President, Mr. Speaker, that we already have something of a national service program, and it is called the U.S. military.

□ 1550

In the military, we take people in, we teach them discipline, they learn a trade, and they might later go on and be part of the GI bill and get a college education. As a result, they get a tremendous amount of training.

In the meantime, the United States gets a national defense.

The President is right: He is talking a dramatic shift in priorities, shifting it away from defense readiness of this country and putting it into very different types of programs.

I ask the American people today, Mr. Speaker, which set of priorities we want to pursue. Do we want to go about disarming America, cutting defense an additional \$60 billion, doubling the amount of cuts that President Bush proposed, reshuffling the spending so the result is a tremendous increase in spending but not on defense, on other things, at the expense of our military readiness? This is the program the President is about. It is a dramatic shift in priorities, and I think it is one that deserves real close attention by the American people, and I would ask whether we really want to go down that road.

It is a road we went down before starting in 1976 with a man named Jimmy Carter, and it is a road that Ronald Reagan, in 1980, had to fix. He had to fix it because we had lost the military readiness of this country.

That is what the President is talking about, a dramatic shift in priorities.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I think he has pointed out very well some of the dangers that we have when we make defense reductions too quickly.

None of us who are engaging in this dialog at this moment were in the Congress of the United States when we last went through this, as the gentleman pointed out, in the 1970's but we all remember. We have all been through that before, and we all remember the humiliation of when we could not get three helicopters to Teheran in order to rescue our hostages there.

So I think it is certainly events just in the last few months in Somalia, in the Balkan countries, events over the weekend in North Korea suggest that it is still a very dangerous world out there, and there is no other country except the United States that has the political, the military and economic strength to remain a superpower.

I also appreciate the gentleman's comments about the taxes. I think one of the things that was so striking to me about the tax parts of the President's provisions is that many of it is labeled spending cuts when they are actually revenue increases. I liken it to Orwell's "1984" and the newspaper when we label now tax increases as contributions and spending is labeled as investments. So we have these new language words that are being used, but the bottom line is we have real tax increases.

One of those taxes that I think is perhaps the most, or one of the worst examples of that was in the area of Social Security tax where the taxable amount of benefits that would be subject to taxation is going to be increased from 50 percent to 85 percent, and that would be labeled not a tax increase, not a revenue, for all the seniors, millions of senior citizens, that would be paying that additional tax, but it is labeled a spending cut, and that is just plain dishonest.

One of the Members that has served on the Committee on Ways and Means with such distinction and also on the Committee on the Budget offered an amendment that dealt in very important ways with some attempts by the Democrats to basically once again get into the Social Security trust fund, and I rally appreciate having the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] here today, and I would yield to him, and perhaps he might like to make some comments.

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

Not only do I, or would I like, to discuss the Social Security trust fund and the so-called raid on the trust fund by the Democratic proposal, but I know the gentleman has mentioned this before and others before him have spoken about it, but when President Clinton and his Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, went around and talked about a change in direction, they meant exactly what they said. They meant they were going to change the direction from the private sector and the stimulus to the private sector to stimulating the public sector and trying to create jobs through the public sector.

Now, I have got a bridge in Brooklyn that I will sell to anybody who thinks that more taxes and more Government spending are going to create more jobs. Historically, every economic model that I have ever seen, and I am sure the gentleman has seen plenty also, indicates that every time that the Government takes more in taxes and spends more for programs that the economy stalls, and we lose jobs.

I think it is very important that the American people understand the significance of the change from the private sector in the 1980's that created about 20 million new jobs to the emphasis on the public sector, the Government doing more things for more people.

One of the taxes, or one of the so-called spending cuts, that the gentleman talked about was in regard to Social Security, and those people who now make \$25,000 in one way or another, and receive, or an individual who makes \$25,000 and receives Social Security benefits is now taxed on 50 percent of that income from the Social Security Administration, and a couple that makes \$32,000 is now taxed on 50 percent of that income.

What the Clinton Democrat proposal, the Committee on the Budget Democrat proposal says is that not only are we going to tax you on 50 percent of it, we are going to tax you on 85 percent of that money that you are receiving from the Social Security Administration, and for the first time in the history of the Social Security trust fund, we are not going to put that money into the Social Security trust fund; we are going to divert it; we are going to divert it to the health care trust fund.

I do not believe that the people of the United States, particularly our seniors right now, understand the significance of the transferring for the first time out of the Social Security trust fund into the health trust fund of any significant dollars.

Mr. KOLBE. To be quite honest, until you raised this issue in the committee last week, I do not think many of the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget were aware of this, because the gentleman, coming from the Committee on Ways and Means, that is exactly why he is there to bring that kind of expertise and knowledge to us, but I remember being absolutely stunned when he described this change to us.

This is the first time, is it not, that seniors will be paying the health part, the health insurance part? Traditionally that has been a tax.

Mr. BUNNING. Well, for someone to be paying a tax, that tax generally went directly into the Social Security trust fund. Now, for the first time, that is going to be diverted into the health care trust fund.

Somebody said, "Well, what difference does it make? It is all one big fund." Like the devil, it is. It is a sepa-

rate trust fund. In fact, you are not taxed on the Social Security part of it, or you are not taxed on your own wages, only a certain percentage, and the health care trust fund takes you up to about \$125,000 on your wages right now. So it is a completely different set of circumstances that we are talking about.

It is the first time that money is being diverted.

Mr. KOLBE. Then I would ask, would it not be very easy once you have done this to say, "Well, let us put not just the amount over 50 percent from 50 to 85 percent, but all of it into the health fund or all of it into the general revenue fund to pay for some of the other programs we have got here?"

Mr. BUNNING. If I were a senior collecting Social Security, I would be knocking on the door of every Member of this Congress trying to tell them, "Wait a minute, what are you doing? You are taking money out of our trust fund, diverting it to the health care trust fund. Please, do not do that, please."

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will refresh my memory, did we not go through a debate like this just a few years ago, and the senior citizens said, when we borrowed one time in order to help pay the immediate crisis when we reached the debt limit, as I recall, and they borrowed from the Social Security trust fund?

Mr. BUNNING. We did it exactly that way.

Mr. KOLBE. And then we banned it, did we not? We said we could not do that again? Is that not correct?

Mr. BUNNING. This time we are trying to change the laws so that we can do just exactly that.

Mr. KOLBE. Do it on a permanent basis?

Mr. BUNNING. And do it on a permanent basis for the additional money that we are talking about. I am frightened to death that it will have a direct effect on the integrity of the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. KOLBE. As I recall, the last time it happened that it was a matter of days that we borrowed from the Social Security trust fund, and it was repaid with interest to the Social Security trust fund. But this change in the law is forever. There is no interest, and it never comes back.

Mr. BUNNING. If the gentleman will yield further, you realize, and I do, too, anytime we change and increase the taxes on any given fund or we divert a tax to a specific fund, it seems like it is permanent always, and for the first time we are now telling those good recipients of the Social Security trust fund, "You had better watch out, because we are going to divert your money with this Clinton Democratic budget plan from the Social Security trust fund to the health care trust fund."

I think it is a bad precedent. It is bad policy, and we ought to really alert our seniors to this effect.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

On the larger issue of the taxes in general, I certainly concur with him that every economic model that I am familiar with from my days in graduate school studying economics would suggest that a tax increase is only going to have a negative impact on the economy, a negative impact on job creation.

□ 1600

And would it not be true, if the gentleman would respond to this, would it not be true that the converse is true; that we found in the capital gains cut in 1962, under President Kennedy, that we had a tremendous surge of job creation and, of course, the tax changes in 1981 resulted in the longest sustained period of economic growth in this country that we have had?

So, the converse is true, that if you cut taxes you actually stimulate the economy.

Mr. BUNNING. If the gentleman would yield further, not only that, but I think the 1990 budget agreement is a typical proof of the pudding that when, in fact, after a period of a long time of reducing taxes we then went back and increased taxes, it seemed like it pushed us into a recession, and the fact of the matter is now we want to, now as we are coming out, strongly coming out of recession, we want to again add a new tax burden to the American people.

Not only do we want to add a new tax burden, but we want to increase Government spending, add it to the increase in taxes.

I think we are dealing with fire, fire that we will all get burnt with down the road.

Mr. KOLBE. I agree with the gentleman. I think the tax increases proposed here, the largest in the history of this country, are going to have a negative impact on the economy. I notice the McGraw-Hill model suggests that it would have a loss of as many as 700,000 jobs as a result of this tax package.

If I might, I would like to yield to another distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget who has worked very, very hard, particularly in the area of health care legislation and reform and has worked on our task force in this area and has really been a leader on this issue.

I notice that we have been joined on the floor by our distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

I will yield to him in just a moment, but at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to comment, to pick up a little bit on the problems with the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The public should be aware that those tax increases did not come up to a level of \$30 billion a year when they were in full bloom. The tax increases proposed in this package, net tax increases, come up to a level of close to \$87 billion a year when you get out into the fourth and fifth years, almost three times the rate of tax increases as in the summit agreement of 1990.

I think it is important to note that the name of the game here is to try to reduce the deficit. The reason we want to reduce the deficit is that roughly 60 percent of the savings in this country, the private savings, are consumed by Government borrowing. Those are savings that do not go into the private sector, do not go into buying plant and equipment, do not go into new job creation, decrease our competitiveness; and that is what we are all about.

The other weakness of the summit agreement of 1990 was that it did achieve caps on domestic discretionary spending and defense spending and those, by and large, worked, although the initial increases were a little bit too great. Where it really failed was to get control of existing entitlement programs. That brings us back to health care, which I want to talk about in a minute.

But let it be said, to try to clarify matters, that what we proposed in the Budget Committee, by Republicans, were no tax increases, and spending cuts over 5 years of \$430 billion, the way I count it. What the Democrats have proposed are net new tax increases of \$267 billion over 5 years and only 160 billion dollars worth of net spending cuts.

Now, that does not include what we are going to propose as a supplemental appropriation bill, as I understand it, that totals another \$31 billion, which would increase the deficit, for the most part in 1994 but probably trickling over into 1995.

But I want to talk, if the gentleman would bear with me just a moment further, about health care costs. There is no component of the Federal budget or indeed of our economy that is increasing faster than health care costs.

On a national scale they are increasing at a rate of about 14- to 15-percent annually, close to four times the general rate of increase.

That is what really is pinching insurance companies, pinching families and pinching your Government.

Medicaid in the Federal budget last year increased over 20 percent; Medicare increased over 12 percent; and the prospects for the future if we do not come to grips with the things that are driving up health care costs are for them to increase at that rate, which is the principal factor for driving the Federal budget deficit.

It was the failure of the 1990 agreement not to get control of health care costs and entitlement spending that was out of control that has allowed the deficit to continue to grow, to sap savings and create the pressures of a \$300 billion-plus annual deficit.

Let me speak to this a little bit further because I am going to get more specific.

Look out over the next 5 years, the baseline cost on Medicaid is expected to increase \$66 billion if we do not do something. The baseline increase on Medicare is expected to increase \$112 billion, between the two of them increasing at a rate of close to 15 percent per year.

The President said in his State of the Union message that as a part of health care reform he would hope to get health care costs in the Federal budget and generally down to the general cost of the cost of living plus the demographic factors affecting those programs.

That would be somewhere in the range of 4 to 5 percent per year. They are in fact increasing at three times that rate.

So, we have a heck of a challenge. We have in this Congress, we as Republicans have it, the Democrats have it, the President has it, and the American people have it. We make an attempt in our budget proposal to try to begin to come to grips with this. But I can assure you that before this year is out, when health care reform proposals are laid on the table, we are going to be in for a second round unless we really come to grips with true reform that gets control of those things that are driving up health care costs.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman would respond: In his speech to the Nation right here is this body on February 17, the President said what he planned to do immediately on health care was to freeze payments to doctors and to hospitals. Now, why is that not a solution?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, I think there is probably something to be said for holding the line on payments for 1 year, but you cannot freeze it forever.

The only reason that would work is if you accompany it with something else, which we do in our Republican proposal.

We begin to try to deal with some of those factors that are driving up health care costs. This one is hotly debated, we looked into it thoroughly, it is very difficult to score in terms of legislation. We have malpractice reform legislation that has been proposed by the Republican conference last year. It is being reintroduced again this year.

It basically substitutes arbitration for litigation. The reason is not to relieve doctors of their responsibility nor to penalize trial lawyers. The purpose is to get control of defensive health care costs, which the AMA has estimated to constitute as much as 14 per-

cent of physicians' fees. Many hospitals would tell you that defensive practices which are unnecessary may constitute as much as 20 percent of their health care costs. So, what we are talking about doing in our proposal that would address rates to compensation for physicians with everyone except the primary care physicians and for hospitals on a 1-year stabilization level, would be to get them to focus on those defensive health care costs which can be reduced if it is accompanied by malpractice reform.

Mr. KOLBE. Would the gentleman agree that if you do not get at the underlying costs, the underlying driver costs that the gentleman just referred to, a plan that simply freezes payments, which results in what we have seen before, which is cost shifting, shifting to the private sector and other groups?

Mr. McMILLAN. True health care reform has really got to address the underlying cost drivers.

We attempt to deal with it in another case, under Medicare. The gentleman is certainly familiar with this, being from Arizona. But Arizona has an exemplary managed care program plan, which it has been estimated and scored by the Congressional Budget Office that if the same managed care approach were undertaken in the other 49 States, we would save \$10 billion over 5 years in Medicare/Medicaid.

□ 1610

So we include that in our reform proposal as a part of this budget process.

There is one other area I should mention, because it relates to what the gentleman from Kentucky was talking about briefly. We do believe that senior citizens with high incomes in excess of \$100,000 a year should pay a fair share of the premiums of Medicare costs, so we do have adjustments for families of over \$100,000 a year and another adjustment for families of over \$200,000 a year. I can assure them that the premiums they would be paying in total would constitute one of the cheapest health care insurance policies that you could find in this country.

Mr. KOLBE. I think if I could ask just one other question before I yield to our distinguished ranking member. One of the other things that was a very significant proposal in the gentleman's area of Medicare was to get us to the idea that those who benefit from the system ought to have some stake in the cost of that through copayment.

Would the gentleman just tell us what we are talking about?

Mr. McMILLAN. Generally Medicare is operated with a 20-percent copayment system, but we realize there are some people at the lower end of the income scale who may have difficulty achieving that, but there are some segments of Medicare in which there are no copayments, so our budget proposal

includes getting those copayments up to, in some cases, 10 percent in the case of home health care.

Incidentally, I was just talking with some home health care specialists from my district who think this is a good idea, if you are sensitive to those people at the lower income end of the scale who might not be able to pay that who are also paying high pharmaceutical costs, and so forth, and it is understandable that that probably needs to be means tested before it is finally put into effect.

But it is simply saying to people who are easily in a position to pay \$1,400 or \$1,500 a year if they make \$100,000 a year unearned income, that they should share in that cost.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's contributions to this.

We do not have to wait for the President to come up with health care reform ideas. That debate has already begun and it has begun because of the work the gentleman and other members of the health care task force have done and that the gentleman particularly has done in the Budget Committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and we will continue to try to exercise initiative in the area of health care reform, because we have a lot to contribute to the process.

Mr. KOLBE. It is an important part of the process. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have with us the ranking Republican member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. I would say there has been nobody who has worked harder and nobody who has been more of a leader in this body on this issue. He has really taken those of us who serve on the Budget Committee and helped to pull us together and come together with a proposal that I think all of us can stand here very proudly today to talk about, and I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I am glad we did not hear anything about "the distinguished gentleman", because sometimes you can confuse distinguished with extinguished. Maybe it would move from distinguished to extinguished.

I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for doing a great job in terms of our health care proposals, because they move us in the direction of where we as a nation really want to go: more copayments, means testing, entitlements for the people who are the wealthiest in our country, and in addition, the concept of managed care in the area of Medicaid and copayments. All health care principles that have been talked about but no one ever had the guts to lay them down on

the table. We have been able to do it in this proposal.

But what I wanted to say in a nutshell is that it is real simple. If you believe that the Federal Government is the answer to our problems in this country and if you think that spending more and taxing Americans more is an answer to the problems that we have in our Nation, then you have got to be for the Clinton plan because that is what it really does represent. These arguments about investments—investments are more spending.

I think that it is fine to have a debate as to whether the Federal Government ought to spend even more. I and the members of the Republican members of the Budget Committee do not think we ought to. We believe that the answer to our problems in this country is to get Government the heck out of the way and let people be in a position of where they can use whatever opportunity has been created in this economic system to better themselves—to not have the Government picking their pockets at every turn of the bend, and not only picking their pockets, but sending legions of bureaucrats to get in their hair no matter what it is they want to do.

I just say to the gentleman from Arizona, probably the most vivid example that I could draw would be to say to him, as my father who carried the mail on his back for 30 years said, is to stop and think about our experiences on Saturday mornings in the post offices around this country, standing in line trying to figure out how to be able to send something in the mail and the hassles that you go through trying to do that.

If you want to buy a home now, you have got inspectors coming in to try to figure out whether you have radon in your basement.

If you want to start a small business, the first thing you have got to do is hire an accountant and a lawyer to try to keep you out of trouble.

Those are not the way things ought to be operating in this country.

What the Clinton plan recognizes is that big taxes, big spending, big bureaucracy is the way in which the Federal Government ought to go, is the way that America ought to go.

Our plan represents less spending, less government, less taxes. We sure welcome that debate.

Some people would argue that these investments are critical. Well, as we are spiraling toward bankruptcy in this country, a fact that has been clearly established by Mr. Perot who said, "Put your specifics down on the table and let's get under the hood. Let's get busy and let's fix it." That is what this Republican alternative represents, getting under the hood, fixing the car, being innovative, being imaginative, being forward looking.

I think we have done one heck of a good job in terms of protecting the

American taxpayer and creating a new direction for the Federal Government.

Reagan said, "Let's get government off our backs and out of our pockets." We begin that journey, precisely that journey in our proposal that is designed to trim the size of the Federal Government and not to continue to burden people with more taxes and more spending.

We are proud of what we have been able to do. I think it is a clear choice.

Let me say one other thing to the gentleman from Arizona. The President laid down his challenge. "If you don't like what I'm doing, give us your specifics."

We are still waiting to hear the President's specifics. I think it is an unfortunate situation for the administration that the major newspapers in this country have said that the Republican plan is by far the most specific proposal that sits before us today and that it is a shame that our proposal, put together with 12 staff people, counting interns and a handful of budget associates, is far more specific and detailed than what the President of the United States was able to send us.

Again I say to the President, if he is listening, when he came up to talk to the Republicans, he said, "If you want more cuts, send us your specifics." We in fact have done it and we want his specific response and we want him to accept part of our agenda so that together we can represent change.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Again, I want to say that the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio on this committee has been absolutely outstanding and I appreciate that.

We have been joined on the floor by our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I welcome him to this discussion of the budget proposals, the Democratic proposals and the Republican alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

I just want to take this opportunity to thank each and every one of those on the Republican side who served with such distinction on our Budget Committee. I gave the committee through the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], a charge earlier in the year to conduct themselves as if we were in the majority in this House and that it was going to be our role and responsibility to do a credible job, to come up with what we thought was a good spending plan, and moreover to have a marked distinction between that of the President, meaning cut spending and defer any kind of tax increases as we see in the Clinton budget.

So in keeping with what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has just said, the gauntlet was laid down. Well, you fellows are pretty good at criticizing. Where are your specifics?

I just have to be mighty proud of the fact that you have come up with the specifics that you have, not all sugar and cream out there by any stretch of the imagination, but to do the credible job today you have got to make some difficult choices. You have made them. I am embrace them wholeheartedly and I think it gives us a good mark of distinction between what we are going to have presented on the other side of the aisle, and incidentally, with really no specifics presented to us by the President himself.

The other body may very well get somewhat of an advantage dealing with the subject after we do, but on the strength of what little information you all have to go on, I just think you did an outstanding job.

I appreciate the gentleman having taken this special order to make the case to the American people.

□ 1620

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The leader is absolutely correct. When the Democrats brought this additional \$62 billion of spending cuts to us last week in the Committee on the Budget, not one dime was specified, and obviously a budget resolution consists of numbers, numbers in categories under outlays and authorizations. But there has to be a policy that gets either of those numbers. There has to be something that went into it. If they show a reduction of, an additional reduction of, \$431 million, let us say, next year in one function, why is it \$431 and not \$430 or \$432, and yet they were not willing to specify where any of the possible cuts that would make up these additional reductions came from.

And so in that sense the Republican alternative is the only alternative out there that specifies the kind of policy that we are talking about that would get us to the real deficit reduction.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might make one further comment—and I am sorry I did not hear the earlier discussion—but in the defense area, for example, I just have, after the leadership meeting with the President this morning, I just have a little bit of a hunch that he may very well be having some reservations on his own, particularly now seeing what is happening around the face of the globe, that we ought not to be savaging our defenses at a time when there is so much insecurity around.

Mr. Speaker, I think our approach is much more reasonable, follows the downsizing that we were given by the former President, President Bush, through Secretary Dick Cheney, and to go beyond that benchmark I think really puts this country's effort on the defense side in real jeopardy to cope with the kind of conditions we have got around the face of the globe today.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for his comments, and for a final comment before our time is up I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, and then I will summarize here.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we are not supposed to be engaged in any sort of mutual admiration, but, as one who ran against the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to be the ranking member on this committee, and I lost by, I think, a few votes, and the gentleman from Ohio probably has a better count than I do, but I have been really delighted and proud to work with JOHN and support what he has done. He has just done an outstanding job in giving leadership to our side, not only in committee, but in the entire conference.

I even had one of our Democrat colleagues come up to me after our mark-up the other day and say, "You know, I've always thought JOHN was maybe a little bit too aggressive, but, you know, he really has done an impressive job," and I say to my colleagues, "In fact all of you have done an impressive job, and you come up with a lot of good ideas that I wish I had been able to vote for."

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for his leadership.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for his comments, and I know that every member, every Republican member, of the Committee on the Budget echoes that.

Let me just summarize again since our time is really up in this hour, and that is the differences between these two proposals. On the one hand we have a Democratic plan brought by President Clinton and amended by the Democrats in the Committee on the Budget that calls for a lot of additional spending; in fact, more than \$186 billion of spending in the next 5 years. It calls for a lot of tax increases; in fact, \$316 billion of additional taxes in the next 5 years. It crawls through those tax increases and some spending cuts, but spending cuts that will not come for at least 3 years—it calls for some deficit reduction.

The Republican alternative, on the other hand, gets the same deficit reduction with no additional spending, with no additional tax increases. It does it by cutting spending.

One is more taxes, more spending, more Government. The other is less taxes, less spending and less Government.

I think the alternatives are very clear, I think the choice for the American people the next time they have an opportunity to speak on this issue is very clear, and I appreciate the contribution of my colleagues to this discussion.

THE REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say off the bat that I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that we have got another little bit more of time if he can hang in and participate in this special order.

I want to pay the highest compliment to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] who has done an absolutely incredible job in our health care area and has been a great friend as we worked our way through difficult periods, as I know people are aware, in our own conference. He truly is a gentleman, and I have learned an awful lot from him personally.

I do want to say, however, that I would like to be able to say, "What a great thing that JOHN KASICH was able to do." This is not a John Kasich deal. This is a committee deal. This is what the Republicans of the House Committee on the Budget agreed to do, and I want to tell my colleagues that around here on Capitol Hill we do not have Members going to meetings, and participating and showing up in each other's office trying to give and take to actually write a document that is \$1.5 trillion worth, but that is exactly what the Republicans on this committee did, and I just have one thing I want to say before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, and that is:

"If you're looking for the real revolutionaries in the Republican Party, you don't have to go any farther than the staff down at Annex 2 and the Republican members of this Budget Committee. We had a very short period of time to put this proposal together. It isn't a perfect proposal. There's a lot of things in it all of us would probably massage differently. But, as a team, we've been united. We're forward-looking."

But I want to tell my colleagues something:

You ain't seen nothin' yet. If you think this is the end of the line, you're going to get sick of hearing from the Republican members of the House Budget Committee on this floor during authorization bills, during appropriation bills and with further reform operations that you're going to see out of us.

It is amazing because it is a very varied group. We have people that represent all kinds of points of view in all different parts of the country. We reconciled our disagreements in certain areas to be attained, and we are going to hang together, and I want to yield now to my dear friend from the State of Ohio, Mr. HOBSON.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say that we have had an interesting session here so far in our group coming together because I think one of the things that we did is, by dividing

up into teams to work on this budget, it gave everybody a feeling that they were involved in this process, and I know the freshmen that were there were pleased that they were included and can be involved in what was going on and learning about their specific area.

I know I enjoyed working with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] on health care. It was inspiring to do this because we had a number of different viewpoints that we came from, but we came together and said, "OK, this is how we're going to do this. We're going to make some real reform in here. We're going to do some new things. And we're going to have just a real solution and not just put something out for people to look at and then throw away."

I think the Republican plan really offers us a clear choice. It has no new taxes, less government, more jobs, more take-home pay. Deficits are reduced by controlling spending, not by increasing taxes and domestic spending. Our belief from our Budget Committee is that higher taxes now will stifle the economic recovery and actually increase the deficit, not lower it, and we looked around. We asked, "Is there any credibility to this? What are people around the country saying to us? What are the editorial writers saying? Are we credible in this?"

And when we started out, one of the things we all talked about, and JOHN and I talked about, was that we had to be intellectually credible in what we put out, and it had to be the truth, it had to be tough, and it had to be bold, and I think we have done that, and I think we won over some people who were probably our worst critics in times past, JOHN, and that, for example, the New York Times on March 11 says: "The Budget Committee Republicans' plan isn't flawless, but it calls Mr. Clinton's bluff, and deserves a serious airing."

Remember this is the New York Times speaking. "It involves no tax increases and, of course, deeper spending cuts than the Democrats propose."

And what do they say at the end? "But in their rush to act, the Democrats should not use the sheer force of their majority to mow down any dissenters. The Republicans have made a good-faith effort to enter the budget process this year. Their proposals deserve good-faith debate."

I say to the gentleman from Ohio, "I'm not sure we got all that, JOHN, but I'm hoping here tomorrow that we're going to be able to get that good-faith debate because we have some good proposals that should be. And even the New York Times on March 11, 1993, agrees with us on that."

And then, if my colleagues will look at the Washington Post on March 14, again it is not a group that one would normally say are going to be rubber

stamping anything that we put out, and again their headline reads, "The Republicans Find a Budget."

The committee Republicans, under the leadership of John Kasich, likewise distinguished themselves. For years Republicans have fled the field at budget time. Their goal has been to leave the names on no budget. This year Republican leaders have gone differently and put forward a plan to reduce the deficit as much as the Democrats would do, but without tax increases.

□ 1630

So we are finding allies in places that we did not think we would find. Even the Washington Post is saying hey, this deserves a look. It is not perfect. We know it is not perfect, but we are trying. We have given a better alternative.

Here is another one. David Broder says, again from the Washington Post on March 14, says, speaking of the budget, "The new ranking minority member of the House Budget Committee, John Kasich, and his GOP colleagues," that is us, guys, "deserve credit for assembling, with no great staff resources, an alternate budget that meets the test of being serious and substantive. The achievement is greater than its prospects for success."

That is why we are out here now. We want people to look at this and improve our success.

The article goes on to say,

Kasich and his allies said that if Republicans are to make an effective case for being returned to power, they have to demonstrate their seriousness about such large public policy problems as the budget deficit. They did that, and down the road one hopes there will be a reward for meeting this obligation.

We think our reward is in making this country better. We think our reward is in getting our policies adopted. And we have already found out that the other side has figured out some of these things are pretty good.

So what are they doing? Why, they are starting to look at some of these and adopt them as if they are their own. The part that we put in, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] may want to talk about them, I want to comment from one other article, from the Austin American-Statesman. I happen to know the publisher of this paper, because he used to live in my hometown and he worked for the Coxes, and this is obviously a Cox paper also, Roger Kinczel.

Their editorial says,

GOP plan on spending cuts deserves a look. The House Republican members of the Budget Committee have a proposal that would cut the deficit by \$429 billion over five years but would not have any tax increases. Whether the latter is possible or wise is problematic.

But some of the specific cuts in the GOP plan are well worth looking into. Although the House leadership says it will accept only complete floor substitutes for the Budget Committee's Democratic-dominated plan, there is a possibility that some amendments could be offered and accepted, or added in the conference committee process.

I guess what I am saying is that there is an outcry within the media here and certainly in our constituents. Our constituents are writing us saying, "Cut this spending. No new taxes. Give us some relief from this."

What the media seem to be saying here is, "Hey, other side, hey, majority, you can't have it all. Look at here. There are some good ideas here. Why not take some of these ideas? If you can't take it all, adopt some of them. These are worth looking at. This is real."

I think this is worth looking at, and I think these editorial writers, who obviously do not work for us, they are obviously people of good will, who said now is the time to make some real positive changes in this country. If we really want change, you have got an opportunity starting with this budget process to make change. Let us not just do things in the way of one sidedness. Where things are correct, where they are appropriate, let us adopt them.

Frankly, we ought to do this without any new taxes. If you want to go back home, that is what everybody is telling you: Cut spending, no new taxes.

Mr. INHOFE. If the gentleman would yield, I think as one who is not on the Committee on the Budget, and I am not, and the rest of you are, you are maybe being a little bit too modest. Because as I told the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], you may disagree with the program that you have and that you are putting forth, but you are being honest in the way you are presenting it.

When I listened to you read some of the commentary from people who generally are not very friendly to Republicans, I think one of the main reasons they are doing that is we are at least being honest on where we are cutting and what we are doing with this.

When the President came out with his program, under the list of budget cuts he had such things as fee increases for veterans when they go in to get treatment. He had a fee increase for private aircraft from \$5 to \$250. He called these spending decreases.

I would like just to ask you, Are you being totally honest in putting forth everything in there exactly as it is? I think you are and I think that is where you are getting your editorial support.

Mr. HOBSON. Well, I think that is one of the reasons we are getting our editorial support, and I agree with you, is when we list something in there, we have some user fees in there, but we call them user fees and we explain what they are.

When we have cuts, we explain where the cuts are. And not all the cuts are real popular with every segment of society. And, frankly, we had some real arguments within the Committee on the Budget as to whether we were

going to make some of these cuts in some of these areas. But we said if we are going to be true and intellectually responsible in this and true to our commitment to put forth a bold challenging budget, we are going to do it.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to underscore what the gentleman said. You see, we were bold enough to put our cuts on the table. What the majority party did, what the Democrat Party did in that committee was to come in with \$63 billion worth of unspecified cuts. And do you know why they did it? Because they did not want to put their fingerprints on making hard choices. And that is one of the real tragedies and the real unstated point of this whole debate, is that we were willing to be intellectually honest and list our user fees as user fees and our cuts as cuts. And what they did is they are the ones that laid the test out. They are the ones that said take the test. We took the test. We got an A on the test, and they flunked it. They flunked their own test, the test that they designed based on specific cuts, they got an F. And that is the tragedy of this whole thing.

So when they run around trying to say that the Republicans reduced this program or that program, they are not in the position to say anything, because we do not even know what in the heck they are doing in this proposal, and they are the ones that laid the challenge out in the beginning about the specifics.

Mr. HOBSON. You do not hear anything in the media at this point or from the White House spin office about not coming back with these specifics, because we did. And I do not know whether they are slow readers or what, because they have not responded to us. You have not had any phone calls, as I understand it, Mr. Ranking Member, nor have any of the rest of us that they have even read what we have said. So I guess our challenge to them is if you are not slow readers and if you have been through it, call us up and let us discuss some of these real spending cuts. We would like to know where the \$63 billion is going to go and where it is going to come from, and, frankly, we would like to know where in defense you are going to cut. Because one of the reasons we did not come forth with a more definitive plan, but we have it, in the defense area, is because in that area they did not come forth, once again, and be specific.

So we are a little upset about that. We have called. We laid our cards on the table. We have called the bluff. Come on down and let us get real about this thing, and let us work together on it to get it done. Because we are working for this country and we should have this dialog back and forth. And I see only silence now from the spin doctors.

Mr. KASICH. Let me just say we hear a lot of talk about working together

and obstructionism or whatever. We offered about 35 amendments during our committee markup. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has a list of them, and we hope to cover them soon, and to show that the Republicans tried to make a good faith effort to amend the Clinton package and to improve it and put in more specific spending cuts, all of which were rejected, but a point that I think needs to be made.

I would like to yield to a gentleman that I have the greatest respect for from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to add my voice to your salute of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], because I have seen a lot of contests for various leadership positions, and when that individual does not have the opportunity to be leader, he just walks away. I think that the committee has been strengthened so much by the active leadership participation of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Then I just want to say to you, I am so grateful for your leadership. I have been so hungry for the Committee on the Budget to step forward and attempt to do what needs to be done, and that is to help our country solve its deficit challenges.

I think the selection that took place last November was a message to Republicans and Democrats alike to be Americans first and Republicans and Democrats second. I think with all my heart and soul that we can lick this deficit problem if we work together.

When the President walked down the aisle right here and took the dais, I listened to what I thought was a very persuasive and moving speech. He said with no uncertain terms that the deficit was a dagger at our hearts, basically a noose around our country's neck, and we needed to address it.

□ 1640

And I think the President deserves the highest marks in making sure that this country is focused on that issue.

Before that speech, I was asked about Zoe Baird. I was asked about Kimba Wood. I was asked about whether I hired illegal aliens and so on. Then I heard a speech, and I heard a lot about spending increases. And I heard a lot about tax increases. And I waited to hear about spending cuts to deal with the very problem the President has told us is such a danger to the future prosperity of our country.

As you know, Mr. KASICH, we serve on the Committee on the Budget. All the experts have come to us and said, get this deficit down. That is the most important thing you can do. And so it without destroying the economy.

And that is exactly what our committee has sought to do. When we had the Committee on the Budget the next day and we had the presentation of Mr.

Panetta, I waited to hear where the spending cuts were. And they did not come. And then I heard what was a spending cut was the earned income tax credit, which really is a payment to people who do not have enough income to pay taxes.

Well, as you pointed out, and others, that is really not a spending cut. It is a spending increase. And then we heard about Social Security. And we were told that was going to be a spending cut. But really what that is is a tax on Social Security recipients.

And when we went through his budget, he and others who came forward were compelled to acknowledge that the proposal has \$4 of tax increases, more, in fact, and \$1 in spending cuts. So it is a 4 to 1 relationship.

Even when we were before the Committee on the Budget and we saw these \$63 million of new additional spending cuts, unspecified, the ratio is just slightly under \$4 of tax increase for every dollar of spending cut. It simply misses the mark that way. And it misses the mark another way.

The bottom line is, we have got to reduce this deficit. And it does not do it enough. And I just want to say to you that I am someone who has cut defense spending a great deal and advocated it, but in my judgment, the President's proposals, all unspecified, over \$110 billion of spending cuts, not specified, is simply too severe. It is too severe, as we see what is happening around our country. We simply will not be able to provide an adequate defense, if we cut too much. And we will cause tremendous economic dislocation, if we cut too much.

And the budget presented by the Republicans in the Committee on the Budget, I think, does exactly what is required in terms of getting the emphasis on spending cuts, not on tax increases.

I might be inclined to support some tax increases above and beyond to reduce this deficit more, but if we are going to deal with the numbers that we see the President submit to us in terms of deficit reduction, those should be done by spending cuts, not the 4 to 1 tax increase to spending cut.

Mr. KASICH, I have a lot more to say, but I know that there are other Members that want to make comments. Mr. KOLBE and I have been working on some proposals that we might get in a dialog about, but it is just absolutely essential that we can show the American people that we can reach the deficit reduction figures of the President and do it through spending cuts.

And again, I just want to thank you for getting on our backs these last 2 months. I make a prediction to you. I am absolutely convinced that what you have done on the Committee on the Budget with Republicans has helped unleash a force that in the next year is going to take books like Martin Gross

about the government racket and others, and we are going to go into some of these points that are made in these books and about bankruptcy in 1995. And we are going to come up with even more spending cuts that may cause some hardship but for the most part will get rid of the fat that we have got in government.

Even the Post Office is totally reorganized. And they are not firing and laying off those who are delivering the service. They went to management first, and they found that if they could reduce their management, that they are providing a better service at far less cost.

We are seeing it in the private sector. I know deep down inside, I know that this is going to be a tremendous effort on the part of the Republicans in the Committee on the Budget. I think we are going to succeed. I sincerely believe that the President, if he is listening, can gain a great deal listening in the next course of the year, and his people, to some of the proposals that we are going to bring forward.

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the very able distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a freshman member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be a Member of the House of Representatives first, but it is a special privilege to have been on the Committee on the Budget so far. I was real excited about the opportunity to serve on this committee, but now that I have been on it, I found it a very frustrating and maddening and disappointing experience.

And I understand why we are in the problem we are in even more, after having served on this for the past 2 months.

President Clinton is to be commended for making us focus more on the country on the deficit problem. Unfortunately, he has not seen the buttons around Washington so much which say, "It is spending. Stupid."

The budget cannot be brought under control until we address spending. We keep saying it over and over. And maybe someday we will learn it. It has to go after the spending side.

Well, what was disappointing and maddening about being on the Committee on the Budget is the Democratic members developed their program and presented it without the specifics. They challenged us to come up with specifics, and they just cast ours aside.

Luckily, we have had some good editorial comments around the country supporting our particular plan. However, the Democrats have not taken, given us much credit. And it is very disappointing, the attitude they have taken on our proposal.

As you said during the budget hearings last week, we presented numerous amendments. And they were very specific.

I thought I would mention two that I made amendments on, and I think Mr. KOLBE will be mentioning some others.

I made two amendments that were just cast aside. Let me tell you, one was a nonsensical bill called the Davis-Bacon Act; it goes back to 1931. It was put into effect to keep low-priced labor out of the South from coming up to New York. And it has what is called the prevailing wage.

It costs us over \$1 billion a year extra. If we are going to build an office building in Sarasota, instead of paying a carpenter \$12 an hour, we have to pay him \$15 an hour under Federal regulations. It is absurd.

Why should we be wasting \$1 billion. It has other restrictions, the number of helpers you can use and all the paperwork involved. And it costs more to build a Federal building. There is no excuse for that.

I proposed that amendment. That was the only amendment the Democrats accepted, but how they accepted it. They changed it. They said, "We will study Davis-Bacon."

Davis-Bacon gets studied every year, and it is their way to just put it aside and forget it, but it is an easy \$1 billion a year savings. It makes no sense to pay more than necessary.

I will give you another illustration of an amendment that was proposed and they flat-out rejected again. It was porkbarrel spending. The porkbarrel project of this decade is the demonstration project of the highway bill that passed in 1991. It is just loaded with pork, over \$4 billion of porkbarrel spending, including things like sidewalks in North Miami Beach, \$800,000 for the sidewalks in North Miami Beach and North Miami, because the Congressman who is now retired from that area was chairman of the subcommittee that had control of that issue.

These were projects that were not appropriated during the normal process but put in by the Committee on Appropriations, both Republicans and Democrats. But it is pure pork.

I made the amendment to do away with it, and it was just flat-out voted down, straight along party lines.

There was issue after issue that we brought forward with the amendments, specifics to cut the budget, and the Democrats refused to even consider them.

That is the maddening and frustrating part of this system. And I think our particular proposal, which is loaded with cuts, we may have to raise taxes, but we do not want to even talk about taxes until we get rid of the spending. Until spending is under control, we will never get this deficit under control.

I look forward to being able to debate our bill again tomorrow, and I am not optimistic our particular bill will pass tomorrow, but we know our bill is honest and straightforward and the Demo-

cratic bill has no input from us, unfortunately, and it is strictly an issue of which one is the best for the deficit. And there is no question about it. It is our bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], who is going to go through a litany of the amendments that were offered to the bill, an effort by the Republicans to improve the Clinton program, to take some of the taxes out and provide specific spending cuts that the President requested, every single one of them rejected.

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

In the last hour that was my time, I did not have an opportunity to discuss a couple of the specific things that the task force that I was in charge of on empowerment came up with. And I think those were some of the more dramatic and certainly some of the more difficult choices that got made in this budget proposal. And I would like to just share.

Mr. KASICH. I would just like to re-emphasize one point. The point is, during a 10½ hour debate before the Committee on the Budget, so nobody can be confused, the Republicans took amendments, they were not phony amendments. They did not represent unspecified cuts.

□ 1650

They represented specific changes in the Clinton program that eliminated the social security taxes, eliminated the energy taxes. It was designed to fix, to improve, to be constructive with the Clinton program, and every single one of those amendments was rejected on party lines for a Democrat package that had absolutely zero, zip, no, none, nil Republican amendments in it that replaced tax increases with spending cuts.

The President had said to us, "If you do not like the new taxes, give us the specific cuts." We gave it to him and we gave it to them, and they rejected every single one of them.

Let us be perfectly clear on what we are talking about here about these amendments, the procedures, and the fact that the Republicans on that committee were trying to be constructive. The obstructionists were the people who decided, "You take our program or no program."

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

Mr. KASICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. Those of us who sat through this process last week understood exactly what was happening. We did have constructive alternatives and constructive amendments and they were all rejected. Just to reiterate the process, we offered the Republican alternative as a package. That was de-

feated. Then we proceeded to offer a whole series of amendments dealing with specific cuts that we had included in our alternative, so we could deal with these one by one.

Granted that we could not put into a budget resolution the law that makes a specific change, to whether it is the Social Security Act or whatever it might be. As I said before, and as we discussed this issue earlier, it is policy that drives the numbers. If the Committee on the Budget refuses to deal with budget policy, if we refuse to get into a debate over these issues, then we are abdicating our responsibility.

Here are some of the amendments that were offered that came from our proposal that were rejected. Some of them we have already had some discussion about. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], our colleagues, discussed the Davis-Bacon and the Highway Administration project amendments.

Earlier in my time I had a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] about his amendment to eliminate the Btu tax. That was an amendment that did get a couple, no much—it was the only one, in fact, that got any kind of Democrat support. However, there were a few Democrats that understood that this is an enormously inflationary tax increase, the Btu tax.

Eliminating the Btu tax, \$730 billion of new taxes that the President has decided to put on the American middle class and poor people, as well as rich people, it hurts; in fact, it is a very regressive tax, because it will cut into those who are at the lower end of the income scale much more than those who are wealthy. That was defeated, taking those taxes out.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] had one on the sense of Congress that we ought to keep the money in the Social Security trust fund and not rob the Social Security trust fund for other purposes. That was defeated on a straight party line vote.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] had an amendment to eliminate the proposed income taxes on Social Security benefits. We are going to tax billions of dollars from senior citizens by raising the tax rates on the taxable income of Social Security benefits. From the 50-percent level to the 85-percent level of Social Security benefits will be subject to taxation.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman give us the total on that?

Mr. KOLBE. That goes down to people on the income level of about \$25,000. The total amount there is \$33 billion, \$33 billion of taxes that senior citizens are going to have to pay, and not into the Social Security trust fund but into the health insurance fund. That amendment was defeated on a straight party line vote.

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman will yield on that, I know the gentleman

from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] was out here and he talked briefly about this.

Let me ask the gentleman, does this then mean that the tradition of having the Social Security taxes flow into the program, the annuity program called Social Security, is now being changed?

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. For the first time ever, funds collected from taxation on Social Security benefits will not go to the Social Security trust fund, but will go to another use. Once we have broken that promise with the American people, with senior citizens, it is very easy to rob the Social Security trust fund for all kinds of other things.

I know my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, will remember the debate we had a few years ago when we had the crisis of the debt ceiling and they borrowed for a few days from the Social Security trust fund. It was all repaid with interest.

Guess what: This is never going to be repaid. This is a permanent stealing from senior citizens' taxes that is going to go not into the Social Security trust fund, but go for other uses.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I would make the argument that people are fully unaware that this is happening now, including members of our media; they are unaware of the fact that we are creating a precedent here when it comes to robbing the Social Security trust fund.

Would the gentleman agree with this? There is not knowledge that this in fact is being done?

Mr. KOLBE. They are completely unaware. I would tell the gentleman, when senior citizens learn that the Social Security trust fund is being robbed for these other purposes, there will be an explosion here. I absolutely agree.

If I might just run through a few of the others. The gentleman from North Carolina, my colleague, mentioned the Medicaid plan, the one to put people that are in Medicaid into a managed care program, as we have in Arizona, a program that works very well, I might say. My colleagues from Arizona know very well how the program has worked in that State.

What it does, basically, it is a capitated system that uses HMO's to provide good quality care for Medicaid patients. Now that we have had it in place on a statewide basis for 12 years, the studies have shown that we can save up to about 18 percent over delivering the same services under a fee-for-service plan.

Clearly the wave of the future is managed competition, and that is exactly what we are saying. We can start it right now with Medicaid recipients and start saving billions of dollars; \$10 billion could have been saved over the next 5 years if we had gone to that kind of system.

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman will yield on that point, does that mean

that some Medicaid recipients will no longer get health care, putting them into managed care? Is that what that means?

Mr. KOLBE. Absolutely not. In fact, the system in Arizona, and we call it Access, has worked extremely well. It is the wave of the future. I think it is interesting that people all over the country are now talking about the Arizona system of health care as the direction we ought to go. But it means good health care and choices. People get to pick their own primary care doctor in the HMO, and it works extremely well. Members will find a lot of satisfied customers in Arizona with that plan.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS] offered an amendment to privatize the Tennessee Valley Authority. That was defeated on a straight party line vote.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], my colleague, offered one on the space station. That was defeated, not on a party line vote, but it was defeated, not even considered.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] offered an amendment to reduce legislative branch funding by 25 percent, as we had in our proposal. That was defeated on a party line vote.

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman will yield, could we spend just a second on the legislative branch proposal that was rejected? Are we talking about Congress here? Is that what we are talking about here cutting, the operations of Congress?

Mr. KOLBE. We are talking about the Congress of the United States. I think if we are going to be serious about deficit reduction we can start right here at home, absolutely.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KOLBE. I certainly will yield to the gentleman from California. I did not see the gentleman on the side of me here.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the support that the gentleman offered in our deliberations in the Committee on the Budget, and that our distinguished ranking member offered for fulfillment of one of President Clinton's campaign promises: to cut congressional spending on itself by 25 percent.

Of course, we are spending over \$3 billion a year in this enterprise. There is no reason in the world that 535 men and women cannot get by with something under 30,000 staffers, but that is in fact the kind of thing we are looking at. We even offered an amendment—

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield a second? I come from a city called Westerville, OH. Our population is about 30,000 people.

Is the gentleman telling me that there are more people, or about the same number of people, who work as staff people to the Congress of the United States as live in my hometown of 30,000 people?

Mr. COX. Unfortunately, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that he is exactly right. So stark is the difference between what Congress spends on itself and what any other legislature in the world spends on its own staff, that no other major country in the world comes near to us by an order of magnitude.

The next closest is Canada, and Canadian legislators have a staff that is one-tenth the size of what we have here in the U.S. Congress.

Really, what this suggests is that there is nothing that Congress is willing to cut, nothing that the Clinton administration is serious about cutting, because, after all, where is the constituency for more congressional staff? It does not exist. It is only the Members themselves.

□ 1700

Mr. KASICH. Except the Social Security benefits of the senior citizens who are now going to be paying taxes on Social Security and have the funds transferred into an account that does not provide Social Security benefits; is that correct?

Mr. COX. I am just stunned by the disingenuousness of an administration that says we are spending cutters because we are going to increase the taxes on low-income senior citizens. They are going to nearly double the taxes on low-income seniors so that now a senior citizen making \$16,000 a year, a couple with joint incomes of \$32,000 a year are going to pay increased taxes.

We offered a Republican amendment to get rid of these increased taxes on low-income senior citizens. That amendment was going to be paid for, in a budget sense, by not enacting some of Bill Clinton's proposed spending increases. That was defeated.

As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] was about to mention, I was happy to offer an amendment in the Budget Committee to simply repeal in advance all of Bill Clinton's proposed spending increases, which amount to \$16.8 billion in the current fiscal year, \$189 billion of brand new spending on top of that that President Clinton is proposing for fiscal years 1994 through 1998, and interest costs from this new deficit spending of \$38 billion over that period, for a total of \$244 billion of new, brand new spending. Now if you are in a hole, stop digging.

But what are we doing when we are looking at this enormous deficit? The President of the United States is saying I want \$244 billion in brand new spending that we are not even interested in doing at the moment. This is absolutely absurd.

Now just to put this in perspective, do you remember the 14-year-old boy that sent \$1,000 into the U.S. Treasury to help take care of the deficit? He was from North Dakota and he is in high

school. And the President of the United States picked up the phone and talked to him. There was a camera on either end, one in Air Force One, and then on the other end with the boy. The President milked that for all of the PR that it was worth. And then the next day he said to United Press and to USA Today that he was thinking about asking for a similar \$1,000 contribution from everybody. Now with 110 million taxpayers in America, roughly if everyone ended up giving that extra \$1,000 like this 14-year-old did, and the interest went straight to the deficit reduction, we would be talking about a total of \$110 billion. That falls precisely \$132 billion short of the amount of new spending that Bill Clinton himself proposed in the State of the Union Message.

If we just stopped the new Clinton spending we would do more, one-quarter of a trillion dollars' worth of deficit reduction, than anything he is talking about in his own program.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman will yield back for a minute, I think he has made a very important point. I want to discuss three other amendments that came in my area. But I think the gentleman made a very important point that ought not to be lost on people, and that is that the \$16.8 billion that the President is talking about in this fiscal year, the economic stimulus, because it comes under a declared emergency, is not counted in any of the spending increases that we are talking about of the \$186 billion of additional spending over the next 5 years that the President is talking about in his so-called investments. Is that not correct?

Mr. COX. That is precisely true. It is a ruse, and it is disingenuous. We are not operating under any emergency now except the emergency that is imposed by this enormous deficit.

Mr. KOLBE. And that amount will not do anything except increase the deficit by that amount.

Mr. COX. No. As a matter fact, the Republicans are now filing amendments where we hope to have an opportunity to strip this new spending when it comes to the floor, and yet, as our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who is sitting here can tell us, we may not even have the opportunity to offer these specific spending cuts when new spending is coming to the floor under the guise of a dire emergency. There is no emergency here but the emergency posed by deficit spending itself.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

If I might just mention three other amendments that came in in the area that I had worked on?

Mr. KASICH. Let me just ask the gentleman because people are watching this show and they are trying to say to themselves, "This can't be so. There's no way that they could have been offer-

ing specific cuts to eliminate the Social Security taxes, the energy taxes; there's just simply no way this could be true. There must be something phony here; they are not telling us the whole deal."

Let me ask the gentleman why in fact would they have rejected our efforts to trim the new spending? Why is it they would have rejected the idea of eliminating the taxes with specific spending cuts? Is there a side of this story that we are not telling?

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman has a good point. It is a good question, especially since the President and the chairman of the Budget Committee said that they welcomed us coming up with additional spending cut suggestions, and yet when we offered them we were turned down. So we offered specific suggestions on where we could make additional savings, and all of them were rejected, and they really were reasonable ones.

Let me tell Members if I might about one of those. One would have taken all of the food and nutrition programs and put them in a block grant. By doing that and reducing the administrative overhead, still allowing 5 percent of the total cost to be spent, but taking the WIC program, the commodity supplemental program, the T-FAT, the school lunch program, all of those programs and putting them together, and allowing the States to have one set of eligibility requirements, allowing the States to administer it as one program instead of six, seven or eight different programs, by targeting it to those who are 185 percent of poverty or under so that it goes to those who need it the most instead of having the wealthiest kid get the same school lunch subsidy as the poorest kid gets, we could have saved—we could have saved \$2.2 billion over the next 5 years by doing that. We could have made that savings just in the administrative costs from that kind of reduction. So that was rejected on a straight party-line vote. After, of course, there were lots of comments about this is a wonderful idea. It ought to be looked at. But no, we do not agree with that.

Those are the kinds of things that I think do boggle the mind to try to understand as to why they are not going to consider these kinds of cuts. And of course, the only answer they had was, well, the budget resolution is really just dollar amounts, you understand, it does not have any specific policies in it.

Well, policy is what get us to the numbers. We have said it over and over again, and it is time that we did that.

If I might just mention two others that my colleague from Connecticut and I worked on, the tough ones. These are not the easy things to do, but I think it is kind of the tough decisions that Republicans were willing to make. We would have raised the retirement

age for civilians in the Federal Government to 62. As it is now, a Federal Government worker can retire at age 55 with the requisite number of years of work. This would have gradually, not immediately, but 1 year every 2 years, so that it would have taken 14 years to phase it in completely and would have raised it to age 62. By doing that, in the first 5 years, even though we would have only raised the retirement age 2 years, we would have saved more than \$14 billion in 5 years. Twenty years out, 30 years out, we are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars of savings.

Is that reasonable? Of course the rest of the world is moving to raising retirement ages. Private retirement is 65, and the earliest you can get Social Security is 62. Why does it not make sense to gradually raise that retirement age to 62?

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman would just yield on that point, and if the gentleman from Connecticut could get to the microphone as well, they talk about this thing, you know, and we talk about cuts. I mean what we are talking about here is a reform that over a 14-year period of time would phase the retirement, civilian retirement age up to 62. Do you want to know what, folks? This is going to happen. This is going to happen. They may vote us down, and they may reject this over and over again, but this is going to happen. And the gentleman from Connecticut has a vivid example of what happened in Connecticut with the retirement program up there, and I wonder if he might enlighten us.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman will yield, I think it is extraordinarily important to recognize that in the private sector people do not retire at age 50 and 55. They certainly do not get cost-of-living increases. And I think the reason why I was so supportive and co-sponsored the amendment dealing with the retirement age and the cost-of-living increases is that it makes no sense for the private sector to work to age 65 so that a public employee can retire at age 55. And it certainly makes no sense to provide a cost-of-living increase for someone age 40 where by the time they are 55 they will be making more in retirement than they made when they were actually working, and yet still have a second job. And that in no way is to disparage public employees. We are grateful for public employees and their service, but your amendment, that was adopted by the entire Republican Budget Committee, was an amendment that made such logical sense because it took 14 years to move the retirement age from 55 to 62. So someone near the retirement age right now, if they were 50, or 49, would be able to retire before the age of 62. And it allowed them to recognize the fact that they were close to retirement age, but in the long run you were just talking about the savings in the next 5 years.

□ 1710

What about the savings to our country in the next 10, 20, 30, and 40 years by increasing the retirement age?

Mr. KOLBE. As I suggested, and as the gentleman correctly points out, after you phased this in completely after 14 years, your savings are going to be not in the neighborhood of the \$14 billion we are talking about but tens and scores of billions of dollars, so the savings would be simply enormous by doing that.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would yield further, just to point out, we faced this same issue in the State of Connecticut where State employees could retire at age 50 and 55. We recognized we needed to increase that retirement age and did. If it is right for the State employees that we retire at an age closer to what happens in the private sector, it is right for Federal employees as well, and this is an area where the public is not hurt at all.

I think the public employees are providing their useful service by continuing to work, and we can take advantage of their talents and not lose them at such an early age.

Mr. KASICH. I would say to the gentleman that I want to yield to the gentleman to explain the second amendment. You know, people say that this is a tough thing to do. This is the right thing to do. This is about doing the right thing, not the political thing, the right thing. But, you know, what is funny is the right thing is the political thing. The right policy is the best politics.

I yield to the gentleman to explain the second proposal.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I think that is exactly right. The second one deals with military retirement. I yield to no one in my defense of veterans. I am a veteran myself, having served in Vietnam. I represent a lot of veterans, a lot of active-duty military people, and I think the time has come for us to take a good, hard look at our military retirement system.

We would not change it. We would not change the military retirement system that allows someone to retire after 20 years of service or 25 years or 30 years. All we would do is say that once they retire they do not draw the cost-of-living adjustment every single year until they reach age 62.

Mr. KASICH. What percentage of those people who are drawing COLA's and retirement right now have second jobs, by the way?

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman anticipated my next comment. Ninety-five percent of people who retire from the military go on to get another job and have another income.

So what is the logic, what is the logic of saying, "Yes, you are out there working, earning an income, and you are also going to be drawing a retire-

ment that is going to increase every single year because of the cost-of-living adjustment?" So what we would do is say, "You can retire the same as before, and you did before, and you will get that retirement at the age of whatever age you retire at." Let us say you went in at 22 as an officer and you retire in 20 years at 42; you are going to have another 23 working years. But we say that at age 62 then you readjust your base, and you start drawing your cost-of-living adjustment from that point on. You lose nothing in your retirement years, because you get the cost-of-living adjustments thereafter based on a recalculated retirement income.

So it is a logical proposal, one that, again, recognizes the reality of what is happening today with people out there working a second job after they retire from the military.

It also is a matter of parity, because it says that those who draw Social Security can first draw at age 62; now, with our civilian retirement, they would be gradually raised to 62, and the military has a reason to have an early retirement, but they do not get the added retirement income until age 62.

With that, we could save another \$5.5 billion over 5 years, but the savings in outlying years, a generation away, and for gosh sakes, it is time we started thinking a little bit longer into the future and thinking about that next generation; in the next generation, again, you are talking about not \$5 billion, not \$10 billion, not even \$50 billion, but hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. KASICH. I ask the gentleman, when Ross Perot gets up and says, "Let us get under the hood and fix it," is he not talking about the programs of making the civilian retirees go from 55 to 62 like they do in his company? Is that not getting under the hood and fixing it just like he is saying?

Mr. KOLBE. The Budget Republicans got under the hood, and they had things that fixed it. We put in new spark plugs, we changed the oil, and we would fix this engine of Government. We would make it work and make it work efficiently and make it work right, and in a way that is fair, fair most of all to the American taxpayer, fair to those who are recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. KASICH. May I ask the gentleman, because he was so eloquent in committee in explaining the different approaches just in a nutshell, the different approaches to Government that these two plans represent?

Mr. KOLBE. There is a very clear, difference that is represented by these two plans.

It is very obvious when you look at it, the Democrat plan is based on more taxes, more spending, and larger Government with ephemeral promises of spending cuts somewhere down the

road, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years away, and very clearly this is the philosophy the Democrats over the years have expressed over and over again, that Government can solve the problems, Government can fix things, Government can make the economy work.

Republicans do not believe that. Republicans believe we should allow the private sector to work; we should allow people to make decisions about their own lives, their economic lives, their private lives. So we believe, and it is reflected in our budget proposal, that there should be no additional spending, there should be no additional taxes, there should be deficit reduction that comes with spending cuts. Cut spending first. It is as simple as that.

That is the difference in the philosophy between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield very briefly to the gentleman from Michigan who has been waiting very patiently to join, another freshman Member.

As I spoke to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS], he said he was thinking about the freshmen doing a column talking about how we faced up to the hard choices and the Democrats ran the other way, and I said, "Why don't you just entitle it 'Lead or Leave?'"

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for yielding.

As a freshman member of the Committee on the Budget, it seems to me the overall questions is: Do we believe it is good for Government to spend more than we take in? You know, we have got American families out there right now that are having difficult times. They are cutting off the music lessons, they are saying, "Cancel the orthodontist."

If we believe there is any significance in the economists who suggest that when Government sucks up half of the savings of the private savings of this country with this kind of overspending, that money is no longer available to borrow to go to college, it no longer is available to buy a new home, and most importantly, it is no longer available to business.

So if we really believe that Government should live within its means, stop the credit card mentality, then we have got to move ahead.

Some have suggested that the Kasich plan, the Republican Budget Committee plan, goes too far, it really cuts into spending, and that it is going to hurt somebody someplace; well, again, if we believe that it is important, then just do it. We have got to do it.

In fact, I have even written a proposal that balances the budget in 5 years.

I would just like to conclude by saying that it is easy to be somewhat cyn-

ical looking at a Congress that perpetually spends more and more every year and we go into debt deeper and deeper, but after my association with gentlemen like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], and certainly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], it has given me renewed vigor to do the kinds of things that I think are important, and that is to let the private-sector industry develop and expand by stopping Government from reaching into the pot of available money and stop overspending.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further on that point, I think he is exactly right, that there is a fundamental here, a question of whether we want to spend more money than we take in.

Someone asked just a moment ago, and I think it was my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, why is it that this happens, why do grown-up men and women chronically spend more money than they take in. Why is it that when Ross Perot asked us to open up the hood and look underneath and fix the spark plugs and change the oil that we are not competent enough to do that? I think the answer is that we are using bad economics, wrong economics. We picked the wrong Mr. Goodwrench to go under the hood.

We can show exactly why that is true. Our economic forecasts, the models that we use to measure the results of the policy choices we make here are chronically wrong.

They keep predicting improperly what is going to happen when we change taxes or when we change spending.

Let me give you a quick example: In 1990 we had the famous budget summit agreement when leaders of Congress and the administration went out to Andrews Air Force Base, and by the way, in an extralegal procedure way outside our budget law, they came up with a very substantial tax increase, and the whole budget agreement that caused President Bush no end of heartache.

It was predicted, as a result of the allegedly tough choices that were made in that 1990 budget agreement by the Congressional Budget Office, that in 1994, next year, the deficit would be down to \$56 billion, and the following year, 1995, it would be down to \$29 billion. They thought that the 1990 budget agreement and those big tax increases were going to produce smaller deficits.

Very recently, Dr. Reischauer, who runs the CBO, came before our Budget Committee and said, "I am sorry, but our model was wrong again. We were wrong by 880 percent. We now estimate that the deficit for 1995 is not going to be \$29 billion as a result of that 1990 budget agreement, it is going to be \$284 billion."

Well, do you think that they learned after repeatedly predicting improperly

what is going to happen? The evidence is they do not. In 1990 they predicted that the deficit for what same year was going to be 92 percent smaller than it really was. They predicted that the budget deficit for the next year was going to be 95 percent smaller than it really was. They were off by 115 percent about this year's deficit.

□ 1720

For 1993, the current fiscal year in which we are at this time, they were off by 140 percent.

Well, this is the kind of consistent error that leads you to consistent policy mistakes.

I am here to tell you that Bill Clinton's numbers are wrong. We have been dealing with that budget proposal of his as if the numbers are honest, but we know that when you are off by 92, 95, 115, 140, and 880 percent in your forecasts year after year after year, there is something wrong with the way you are predicting the results of the tax increases that you are proposing.

When we raise taxes on the American people the way the Clinton budget proposes, we are going to find that several of them do not work at the same job, at the same pace, with the same reported taxable income that they would have otherwise. We are going to find that there is not as much savings left over, there is not as much investment and there is not as much economic growth which affects the tax base and permits us to get out of this deficit mess that we are in.

We find that what Bill Clinton mistakenly calls spending cuts are not spending cuts at all. \$1.3 billion in spending cuts, according to Bill Clinton, are coming from the fact that he is not going to give Federal workers a raise next year. Only in Washington does this kind of economics make sense. I submit that that is why year after year after year we continue going back to the well with higher and higher deficits, and the Republican approach is much more sensible because it comports with real-world economics.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The fact is that politicians like to spend more than they like to cut. The American people are going to have to start giving us the backbone we need.

I yield back to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. We have about 2 minutes left, and I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to observe, not as a member of your committee, but I appreciate your giving me a little bit of time here; as a voice from the wilderness of the Armed Services Committee, let me mention one thing. The only area in which President Clinton is trying to cut is in the area of our military. If we would just think back, think about history, 1980, we were so

dangerously low we could not even get spare parts for our vehicles. That was a \$250 billion defense budget. What he is proposing for 1996 would be a \$221 billion defense budget. That is not even talking about 1980 dollars. In reality, using 1980 dollars, that would be a \$125 billion defense budget, which is one-half of what was too low in 1980.

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

We are down to our last 30 seconds. I want to thank all the members of the committee for participating in this special order and in the whole process. We are going to hear a lot more about this in the next couple of days.

Just remember that if you are for more taxes, more spending, more Government, you got to go with Clinton. If you are for less spending, no new taxes and really reshaping and changing the Federal Government, you got to go with the Republicans on the House Budget Committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues today in this special order to celebrate Women's History Month and to recognize the significant achievements and contributions women have made throughout our history in all areas of our society and culture.

Today, I would like to take this opportunity to honor an extraordinary woman of great integrity, courage, and strength.

I speak of Queen Liliuokalani, the eighth and last ruling monarch of the kingdom of Hawaii. A composer, scholar, philanthropist, and ruler, Liliuokalani was an extraordinary woman who was called upon to lead her people in extraordinarily difficult times. The strength and wisdom she portrayed during Hawaii's most turbulent era continues to inspire modern day leaders in the native Hawaiian community.

Lydia Kamakaeha Kaolamalii Liliuokalani was born in Honolulu on September 2, 1838, into a family of Alii, or high chiefs. Her mother was related to Kamehameha I, the first king who united the Hawaiian islands under a single monarch.

As was the custom of the day, she was adopted at birth by the High Chief Paki, to solidify loyalty and good will among the families. Throughout her childhood she was known as Lydia Kamakaeha Paki and was closer to her foster sister Bernice than any of her natural brothers and sisters.

Well educated at the missionary sponsored Royal School, Lydia was an avid student, mastering the English

language and excelling in music and poetry.

In later years she described her childhood as light-hearted, merry and happy—a sharp contrast to the more difficult times that lay ahead for Lydia and her people.

Living among the royal circle and sharing the life of the court of Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma, Lydia gained valuable experience dealing with politicians in Hawaii and from foreign governments.

She accompanied Queen Kapiolani, the wife of Kalakaua, on a state visit to the court of Queen Victoria in England, traveling across the American continent by train to Washington where the royal party was received by President Cleveland.

Though she lived among the privileged Lydia was very cognizant of what was happening to the Hawaiian people during her lifetime.

As business interests grew in the islands, non-Hawaiians were taking more and more land for sugar, pineapple, and other lucrative industries, and vying for more political power to control the monarchy and eventually move the kingdom toward annexation with the United States. The Hawaiian people were losing control of their land, their country, and their own lives.

In addition to the loss of much physical property, diseases previously unknown to the Hawaiian were introduced by the new arrivals to the islands. They took a great toll on the native population. When Captain James Cook arrived in the Hawaiian Island in 1778, the Hawaiian population was estimated to be about 300,000. However, a century later, during Liliuokalani's lifetime the number had sharply declined to only 40,000.

Lydia's ascension to the throne began when her brother, Kalakaua was chosen to rule the islands upon the death of Lunaililo, or Kamehameha the IV. With no heir, Kalakaua designated his sister, Lydia, as heir apparent. From that time on she was known by her royal name, Liliuokalani.

As the future leader of the Hawaiian people, Liliuokalani felt it was necessary to visit the many villages across the islands that made up this tiny kingdom. She later wrote that she felt it was "necessary to make a tour of the islands to meet the people, that all classes, rich and poor, planter or fisherman, might have the opportunity to become acquainted with the one who some day should be called to hold the highest executive office."

Perhaps it was during her encounters with the people of Hawaii that she truly realized the fate that had befallen her people.

Liliuokalani became Queen on January 29, 1891, upon the death of her older brother King Kalakaua. She was 52 years old.

By the time she became Queen, the Hawaiian monarchy had been reduced

to nothing more than a ceremonial figurehead by the passage of the "Bayonet" Constitution in 1887.

It was during the reign of her older brother, Kalakaua that a group of 13 caucasian businessmen, known as the Committee of Safety, forced the King to sign a new constitution which diminished the power of the monarchy, ousted his appointees and established a ministry that was responsible to the legislature and not the King.

In addition a law was passed requiring voters to earn incomes of \$600 a year or own \$3,000 worth of property which barred many Hawaiians from voting and allowed newly arrived Americans and Europeans to vote, further reducing the influence of the Hawaiian people over their nation's political life.

Upon taking the throne, Liliuokalani was determined to restore power to the monarchy and to the Hawaiian people. She aligned herself with a group of about 3,000 Hawaiian politicians who had begun a campaign during the reign of Kalakaua for a constitution that would return the monarchy its sovereign powers.

Two years later, on January 13, 1893 the Hawaiian legislators were able to oust the cabinet, the first step necessary to restore power to monarchy. The Queen quickly appointed her own cabinet and drew up a new constitution which would restore power to the monarchy the only way to lessen the influence of the outside businessmen and give the native Hawaiian a voice in their government.

Just as quickly her opponents led by the 13-member Committee of Public Safety, which represented various American and European planters, missionaries, and business people organized to block the Queen's new constitution by making plans for the formation of a provisional government and ousting the monarchy altogether.

The Committee of Public Safety gained the support of the United States Minister, John L. Stevens. On January 16, 1893, Minister Stevens called upon American troops from the navy cruiser U.S.S. *Boston* to land in Honolulu and keep close watch over Iolani Palace.

On January 17, 1893, the Committee of Safety proclaimed the abrogation of the monarchy and the creation of a provisional government and the intention to apply for annexation to the United States.

Liliuokalani was faced with a grave decision—oppose the Committee of Safety and risk bloodshed among her people, or abrogate her throne.

Later that day, Liliuokalani under protest yielded her authority to the provisional government. She believed that once the U.S. Government realized the injustice that had been committed by the Committee on Safety and Minister Stevens, her country would be rightfully returned to the Hawaiian people.

Queen Liliuokalani:

To President Harrison, after yielding her throne (Jan 19, 1893):

"It is with deep regret that I address you on this occasion. Some of my subjects, aided by aliens, have renounced their loyalty and revolted against the constitutional government of my Kingdom. They have attempted to depose me and to establish a Provisional Government in direct conflict with the organic law of this Kingdom. Upon receiving incontestable proofs that his excellency the minister plenipotentiary of the United States aided and abetted their unlawful movement and caused United States troops to be landed for that purpose. I submitted to force, believing that he would not have acted in that manner unless by authority of the government he represents.

"This action on my part was prompted by three reasons, the futility of a conflict with the United States, the desire to avoid violence and bloodshed and the destruction of life and property, and the certainty which I feel that you and your government will right whatever wrongs may have been inflicted upon us in the premises . . ."

Unfortunately, she was wrong. Liliuokalani was arrested and brought to trial by the provisional government. She was imprisoned in her home and finally she was forced to sign a formal abdication statement on January 24, 1895.

Liliuokalani was the most influential woman in Hawaiian history, and a woman of great importance in the history of the United States. Her legacy lives on today. As the last monarch of a lost kingdom, she has become a symbol of a revived movement in Hawaii for sovereignty and self-determination for the native Hawaiian people.

History books should include a chapter on our Queen Liliuokalani.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD at this time a congressional resolution designating the month of March 1987 as Women's History Month.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Whereas American women of every race, class and ethnic background helped found the Nation in countless recorded and unrecorded ways as servants, slaves, nurses, nuns, homemakers, industrial workers, teachers, reformers, soldiers and pioneers;

Whereas American women have played and continue to play a critical economic, cultural and social role in every sphere of our Nation's life by constituting a significant portion of the labor force working in and outside of the home;

Whereas American women have played a unique role throughout our history by providing the majority of the Nation's volunteer labor force and have been particularly important in the establishment of early charitable, philanthropic and cultural institutions in the country;

Whereas American women of every race, class and ethnic background served as early leaders in the forefront of every major progressive social change movement, not only to secure their own right of suffrage and equal opportunity, but also in the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, the industrial labor union movement and the modern civil rights movement; and

Whereas despite these contributions, the role of American women in history has been consistently overlooked and undervalued in the body of American history:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of March, 1987, is designated as "Women's History Month", and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH].

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise today in celebration of Women's History Month.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when we are recognizing the accomplishments of women, I would like to acknowledge a woman who made a significant contribution to the improvement of the health and welfare of the Navajo people.

Annie Dodge Wauneka, the legendary Mother of the Navajo Nation, is perhaps best known for her work to combat the effects of tuberculosis on the Navajo Nation. Also notable among her accomplishments was her election in 1951 to the Navajo Tribal Council, the governing body of the Navajo Nation. Ms. Wauneka was the first woman elected to such a position and remained the only woman throughout her 28-year tenure on the council.

Her political career was shaped at an early age as she traveled the reservation to attend political meetings with her father who was the chief of the Navajo Nation. Born in 1910, Ms. Wauneka was educated in boarding schools hundreds of miles from home. Upon her return to the reservation, she married and raised six children while assuming responsibility for her father's vast land and livestock holdings.

Upon her election in 1951 to the tribal council, Ms. Wauneka broke a centuries-old tradition that women stayed home and managed the family and home while men were charged with tribal governance. Rather than let this fact intimidate her, she approached her new position with zeal.

In 1953, tuberculosis was ravaging the Navajo Nation. Knowing little more about the disease than that it was killing her people, she worked tirelessly to convince those affected to seek treatment, even though to the Navajo, a visit to the hospital was thought to mean certain death. She transported doctors from home to home across the 25,000-square-mile reservation in a horse and buggy. Through her efforts, hundreds of deaths from TB were prevented.

As a result of her work on the reservation, Annie Dodge Wauneka was presented the Medal of Freedom by President John F. Kennedy in 1963. She was one of the first recipients of this award.

Internationally, Annie Dodge Wauneka is known for her integrity and her compassion. In some circles,

she is known as the Mother Teresa of American Indians. Throughout her life she has been recognized for her achievements, including such honors as Arizona Woman of the Year in 1958 and she was bestowed in 1972 with a doctor of humanities, honoris causa, an honorary degree from the University of Albuquerque in New Mexico.

It is only fitting that today as we recognize the accomplishments of women throughout history, we include Annie Dodge Wauneka among those women who have made significant contributions to the lives of others.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure now to yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for this wonderful initiative, for the time she has taken to help us to think about what women have meant to other women who are struggling even now for their full place in our society, and, when the gentlewoman invited us to design our remarks around a role model, I did not have to think long. Immediately there came into my mind a woman who I regard as one of my mentors. Her name is Fannie Lou Hamer.

Fannie Lou Hamer had 6 years of education. I have a law degree and master's degree, and yet it is Fannie Lou Hamer who taught me and mentored me even though I do not believe that she understood or particularly believed that she was a mentor. It was not a word in Fannie Lou Hamer's vocabulary.

I met Fannie Lou Hamer as a law student when I was part of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the Deep South.

Who is Fannie Lou Hamer? Why should she mean anything to women or to anyone in this Chamber?

Fannie Lou Hamer is dead now. She died of cancer in the 1980's. She was the youngest of 20 children born in the Mississippi Delta, loved it to her dying day, one of the great stories of the civil rights movement of any race, of any gender.

I say to my colleagues, if you were to remember her for her stated accomplishments, you would have to remember that she helped form the Delta ministry, the community development program in the Delta of Mississippi. But she would probably be most remembered for cofounding the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

I ultimately became associated with that party that simply wanted to be a part of the Democratic Party. I helped write the brief, and Fannie Lou Hamer and others from Mississippi came to Atlantic City in 1964 to say to their party: "Open the party to everybody. We are Democrats. We want to be Democrats."

Ultimately a compromise was reached to allow two members of the delegation to sit. The challenge was to the Mississippi delegation itself. What was won, however, was a pledge from the National Democratic Party to seek delegations that included black delegates, and that, I might add, has become a bipartisan pledge because, as a result of the work of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and Fannie Lou Hamer, no political party in the United States will ever exclude people based on race again. Indeed, Fannie Lou Hamer came as a delegate 4 years later, in 1968, to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

Fannie Lou Hamer was, in my estimation, the mother of all role models. The best role models are those who do not try to become, or pretend to be, or hold themselves out to be. I first met her in 1963 when I was sent to fetch her from a jail in Winona, MS, having just arrived fresh, bushy-tailed and wide-eyed from law school in the Delta at a time when, to say the least, it was one of the closed parts of American society. Fannie Lou Hamer had come home from a conference, gone into a bus station to use the facilities, and promptly had been arrested. They then proceeded to beat Mrs. Hamer, as was the custom in the Mississippi of the day. Lawrence Guyot, who now lives here in the District of Columbia and was then a SNCC member, went the 9 miles to get her, and they put him in jail and began to beat him, too.

Here comes ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, then Eleanor Catherine Holmes from Washington, DC, sent down to try out a version of the Freedom Schools for which the summer of 1964 was to become known in history. This, of course, was 1963.

Law student that I was, I inquired before I went over of the nearby police chief of the matter and indicated to him that I had phoned everybody in the North. They knew I was going, and I did not intend to be jailed. I asked him to call over to Winona to tell him I was coming. The long and short of that was, unlike Fannie Lou Hamer, I was not beaten, and we got her out of jail.

□ 1750

She became a legend and is in the class of Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, and of Mary McLeod Bethune. She is at one with Jane Adams, Margaret Sanger, and Eleanor Roosevelt. As an inspirational speaker, she was in a class with Martin Luther King, Jr., himself. She worked in the cotton fields for 18 years until SNCC came into Mississippi. She was old enough to be our mother, but she decided she wanted to go to vote too, particularly since the literacy test was the reason that blacks could not vote in the delta.

As a matter of fact, the plantation owner where Fannie Lou Hamer had begun working before she was 6 years

old recognized by the time she was 6 that she could read, and she became a timekeeper on the plantation. So Fannie Lou Hamer knew she could read and went to register.

When she registered, the man who owned the plantation where she was a sharecropper said to her that she must either withdraw her registration or leave the plantation. That was no Hobson's choice for Fannie Lou Hamer. After 18 years, knowing how to do nothing but pick cotton, or so she thought, she left the plantation, she and her husband.

What they endured for the years following was nothing short of terrorism, on and off, sometimes in the day, sometimes in the night. This woman of little schooling was a lady of very great talent, analytical, oratorical talent, with the ability to somehow make us understand where we must go. She was a woman of great love, however; always profoundly black, always reaching out to the poor whites in her native Sunflower County.

Indeed, the ultimate vindication of Fannie Lou Hamer's life is the cooperative farm where she started to raise animals and vegetables for the poor blacks and poor whites in Sunflower County. Fannie Lou Hamer lived to see what I thought I would never see, and that is that her native town, Ruleville, MS, actually declared a Fannie Lou Hamer Day. Blacks and whites in the Mississippi Delta who had lived together and lived apart all of their days gathered round this extraordinary woman. That she lived to see it is what is most important.

She stood for strength and humor and love, and the most determined honesty. She is remembered for her extraordinary speech on the floor of the 1964 convention declaring that she was sick and tired of being sick and tired. So all over America today people are heard to say they are sick and tired of being sick and tired. Not all of them, however, come in the spirit of Fannie Lou Hamer who paraphrased the words of John F. Kennedy one day and said, "Ask not what your movement can do for you; ask what you can do for your movement."

So for those who did not have the great and enormous pleasure of seeing or knowing Fannie Lou Hamer, understand how she would have approached the predicament of women and of people of color today. Not in hatred, ever. She was a woman of profound love. Not with finger pointing. But with that extraordinary skill that somehow brings your adversary to you. Would that there were more Fannie Lou Hamers in the America divided by race, that seems to have lost that magic moment in the 1960's when we all believed it could be one people, one Nation. We have got to get back to that, even without Fannie Lou Hamer, with only her indomitable spirit and memory.

Fannie Lou Hamer will be remembered as long as the civil rights cataclysm of the 1960's is remembered. She will be remembered for running to sit in this House of Representatives as an active protest. She was not even allowed on the ballot. She will be remembered for sitting in that balcony when she challenged the delegation from the State of Mississippi. That delegation, now more than most in this country reflects, finally begins to reflect, what Fannie Lou Hamer stood for. The Mississippi Democratic Party that excluded her is now the most integrated Democratic Party in the United States of America. Mississippi has sent a black man here who served on the same committee with the dean of the delegation, Mr. WHITTEN.

I am sorry that Fannie Lou Hamer did not live to see that, for that indeed was her goal, even as she challenged the Mississippi delegation in this House.

So much that Mrs. Hamer stood for has indeed come to pass. When we are demoralized and believe that somehow the progress that we knew in the 1960's and 1970's cannot return, much less be improved, we ought to remember where we started, and particularly where women like Fannie Lou Hamer started—nowhere, with nothing.

Fannie Lou Hamer will be remembered always for a principled ideology that was never faddish, always encompassing all people, yet profoundly militant, rooted in the necessity of struggle.

I shall always remember her for the song she used to lead us in in the churches of the South where we would gather every night to sing, to pray, to plan. Near the end of every night meeting the time would be reserved for Mrs. Hamer, and she would rise to somehow sum it up and pull it all together. What a speech she could have made in this House of Representatives.

At the end of these extraordinary speeches, full of love, full of struggle, somehow with a perfect balance between the two, after she had finished what she had to say, after we had been brought to our feet with the inspiration that she had to give, she would break out into what became her theme song.

Fannie Lou Hamer we remember. Every time we sing it, anywhere the tune is heard in America, we shall remember you. "This little light of mine," she used to sing, "I am going to let it shine, let it shine, let it shine, let it shine."

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. I certainly remember much of Fannie Lou Hamer's history, and I wish that all the children in the classrooms across America could have heard the gentlewoman present this magnificent history of this enormously important woman in the life of America, in our current life in

America, and I thank the gentlewoman very much for those words.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me. I am particularly grateful she has given us the opportunity to acknowledge and pay tribute to Women's History Month.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that we acknowledge the role that women have played in history in this year, as there is history being made with the number of women serving in the U.S. Congress and in the Senate.

□ 1800

Rather than bring attention to a particular woman, I would like to talk about some of the women who have gone before us and particularly in my own State of Washington, which has made some history of its own this year with the large number of women elected to public office. But it is those women who preceded us that have made it possible for us to play this role at this time in our Nation's history. But it was not always so. It was not until 1889, Mr. Speaker, in our State that the constitution of the State of Washington was amended to allow all people, men and women, to vote in a school election regardless of sex.

In 1896, an amendment to the constitution had said that all male persons of the age of 21 years or over possessing the following qualifications shall be entitled to vote at all elections. But 3 years later, women were only allowed to vote for school elections. And it was not until 1910 that all persons of the age of 21 years or older were given the vote.

During the first 30 or 40 years of Washington Legislatures, it was not only difficult for a woman to be elected, but impossible for her to take an effective part in the legislative process.

As we are all familiar with, the fate of most legislation is decided in committee. And until 1972, in the State of Washington, when committee proceedings were finally opened up to the public and to the press, all committee proceedings were held in secret. And in the early days, leadership saw to it that no woman member was appointed to a committee of any importance. If she were lucky, she might find herself assigned to the committee on public morals or the committee on drainage, dikes, and ditches, which was never known to have a meeting.

This dilemma was summed up by one of the most determined of the early women legislators, Maude Sweetman, who served four terms in the house of representatives from 1923 through 1929. She published her experience in a little book called "What Price Politics?". In

it she described her efforts to win a significant committee assignment.

During her third term, there were only 11 members of the house who were senior to her. It had always been the custom in Washington State, as it still is today, to appoint members of the all powerful rules committee on the basis of seniority, and since the committee had 15 members, Mrs. Sweetman felt that she was entitled to a seat on it.

Now, at that time the house was controlled by two powerful veteran legislators. One was the head of a timber company, and the other, a fishpacker who had gotten his start shanghaiing crews aboard the sailing ships on Puget Sound.

When Mrs. Sweetman approached one of them, he told her, "You wouldn't like it on the rules committee. We put our feet on the table, and we smoke and we cuss and we call a spade a spade."

The press reported that "Many of the male representatives feel that Mrs. Sweetman should be happy to have a seat in the House at all, without hankering after the softer chairs of the Rules Committee."

When she remained firm in her demands, the house leadership cut the rules committee from its traditional 15 to 9 members. Soon after, she gave up the legislature in disgust.

About the same time, Rebecca Jan Hurn was the first woman ever to be elected to the State senate. Miss Hurn was a member of the Central Methodist Church in Spokane. Incidentally, she had a law practice in Spokane starting in 1913 and was elected to the senate in 1923 and served two 4-year terms.

A poll was taken in her district by her friend and campaign manager, Miss Fannie Ackley. The question was asked, "Would you vote for a woman?" Some of the answers that were given:

"I'll never vote for a woman. The Bible says we shouldn't."

"I don't think it is nice for women to sit in a hall where men smoke and drink and swear."

"Nope. God made women for the pleasure of man, not for politics or business."

Miss Ackley also asked whether a woman's brain or refining influence might not have a beneficial influence on politics. Here were some of the answers:

"Maybe they are smarter than men and the Lord knows they are more honest, but I'd never vote for a woman."

"I won't vote for a woman because women should stay at home. If women are not married, they should get married."

When informed that Miss Hurn's opponent was a bachelor, the man returned, "Well, if a man doesn't want to get married, that's his business. That should not be held against him."

Miss Hurn, in her statement of why she wanted to be a member of the State

senate, said: "I am qualified for this position, have a right to run for it, and I am in the race. The fact that Washington has not as yet elected a woman to the State senate should not mean it never will."

A real pioneer in our history, and we owe so much to women like Senator Hurn.

In the 1930's, there were women like Belle Reeves, who subsequently served with distinction as secretary of state; Pearl Wanamaker, who was one of the State's outstanding superintendents of public instruction; and Julia Butler Hansen, who retired in the 1970's from her position as chairman of the transportation committee. She has to be the woman of achievement in Washington politics. She served with distinction for 22 years and lost a bid to become the first woman speaker of the house by a single vote. She went on to become one of the most powerful forces in the U.S. Congress and held the same seat that I now occupy some 20 years ago.

Hansen gained the respect of her fellow legislators through her expertise in a field that even to this day is considered by many to be a man's field: transportation. She did more to build Washington's highway system than anyone else.

Another woman who served in the house for 12 years, from 1949 to 1961, was Eva Anderson, representative from Wenatchee. Mrs. Andy, as she was affectionately called, encouraged women to take an active role in politics, campaigning, and to get out and be involved. She urged women to use their rights—to vote and serve on juries. She set up the first adult education program in the State. In her six terms in the legislature she emerged as a tall person in Olympia. She grew with the job and her enthusiasm spurred others to action.

With the coming of open meetings and public disclosure laws in our State, women really became a force in Olympia. It was through participation in good government proposals that many of today's women officeholders served their apprenticeships.

And today, Mr. Speaker, the State of Washington is first in the Nation for the percentage of women serving in the State legislature. We have 38 women out of 98 in the house of representatives and 17 out of 49 in the State senate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, again, my colleague for celebrating women's history. And let us thank the women and men of this country who have helped, through their vote, to give us the opportunity to participate in history in the making.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her contributions and, like perhaps a few left in the House of Representatives, I personally have very strong, vivid memories of Julia Butler Hansen and her remarkable personal-

ity, which just permeated all the work that she did.

She was a tremendous leader. I came at a time when Julia was already here, and we made up a team of eight women Members.

Mrs. UNSOELD. I bet you were a powerful group.

Mrs. MINK. Those were the days.

That brings me to conclude this special order by noting that times have changed in the House. When I came, as I said, there were only eight Members, female Members. Today there are 48.

□ 1810

In going over the list of women Members of the House, I would like to point out that 27 States have at least 1 woman Member. That is a significant step forward, considering where we were just a few months ago.

California, of course, has the most Members with seven, and Florida and New York with five Members. We are making history, and I would hope that as the years go by, and as the country continues to celebrate March as Women's History Month, that many of the leaders that are beginning their tenures as new Members of Congress will be noted for their tremendous contributions to the policies and the direction that we hope this country will take, a much more humane, compassionate, caring country that devotes its energies to the human needs of our society.

I am confident that as more women join this institution, that those are the directions that women will lead us toward.

I noticed coming to the floor a Member who has been waiting here for hours previously and now has joined us. I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], my colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on the Budget, who has already made a mark on both committees.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I was chair of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women in Santa Rosa, CA, when Women's History Week was created. Our intention was to give both male and female students and their teachers a real appreciation for the contributions and accomplishments of American women in the building of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment here to recognize the women who were part of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women, and who were the real mothers of this idea: Molly Murphy MacGregor, Bette Morgan, Evelyn Truman, Beverly Homan Trynn, Mary Ruthsdotter, Nancy Belden, Paula Hammett, Bonnie Eisenberg, Roberta Hollowell, and Barbara Tomlin.

The women's history project was a great success in Sonoma County and through these same women's efforts,

was soon repeated in school districts throughout the country.

Later, in 1980, the National Women's History Project, a nonprofit business, was founded in my district, in Santa Rosa. Its goal is to promote women's history functions and provide women's history posters, books, videos, and curriculum materials to schools nationwide.

By 1987, the entire month of March was recognized by Congress as National Women's History Month, and special programs, supported by the National Women's History Project, have been organized by libraries, museums, Federal offices, military bases, schools, and community groups in small towns and large urban centers from coast to coast to celebrate the place of women in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud of my friends and colleagues from Sonoma County who have reclaimed women's history for our country.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her contribution, and want to commend her for leading the country and initiating the first celebration of National Women's History Week. I had no idea she had such a prominent role, and it was really as a result of the success of her project there in Sonoma County that we now have a national celebration. I really want to commend the gentlewoman for her early pioneering efforts in this way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank my colleagues for their participation in this special order, and for their patience in waiting out the time for this to take place.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I wish to share with the citizens of the United States the story of the Sewing Circle, a group of 10 women from Montgomery County whose dedication and generosity helped our soldiers during World War II and whose friendship remains today. As a reporter, I covered the Sewing Circle women and was impressed by the strength of both their commitment to the community and to each other. During World War II, they spent much of their time sewing for the Red Cross at Einstein Hospital in northeast Philadelphia. Their friendship stood the test of time, and they continue to meet every Tuesday.

Today, only four of the members of the Circle are still with us: Ruth Myers, Rose Ettelson, Dorothy Bennet, and Sajie Stein, all in their nineties. Sarah Blanckensee, another Sewing Circle member, recently passed away. This is a tribute to Sarah and to all of the members of the Circle; their love for one another and for our great Nation stands as a testament to the strength of women throughout the ages.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in this recognition of Women's History Month and to reflect on the accomplishments of Caroline Love Goodwin O'Day, the other Congresswoman from Rye, NY. She served in

the House of Representatives with distinction from 1935 to 1943. Her portrait hangs in a place of honor in my office.

Caroline O'Day began her service to this country even prior to taking public office in 1935. As a member of the board of directors of Lillian Wald's Henry Street Settlement on the lower east side of Manhattan, O'Day worked on improving the lives of inner-city residents. As a supporter of organized labor, she was a member of a commission to create a minimum wage scale for laundry workers. She was also an active member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, an organization which grew out of the National Women's Party.

While in Congress, Representative O'Day continued her support of the labor movement as a champion of President Roosevelt's New Deal programs and was an advocate of pro-labor legislation, specifically legislation affecting the rights of children.

Unfortunately, many of the problems Representative O'Day struggled to overcome in the 1930's and 1940's continue to plague our Nation today. As we take this month to reflect on the accomplishments of American women, I look to Representative O'Day as an example of what one woman can achieve. Let us all resolve to continue her efforts to work toward the development of a nation and a world free of poverty and hatred, with real promise for equality and prosperity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget this month's unsung heroines. They are the women who inspire us and protect us—mothers, daughters, friends, mentors, and teachers—each with her own contribution to our history. With every lesson and through every encouragement, they have helped to inspire and shape this Nation.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be here in celebration of Women's History Month to highlight the achievements and contributions women have made throughout history. As I look at this Chamber, I am extremely proud to be a member of the freshman class that has ushered in so many women of various ethnic backgrounds. Although we are representing distinct communities across the Nation, we all want to come together to promote the rights of women. I therefore would like to take this time to celebrate Women's History Month by recognizing the significant change that has taken place in this country with the influx of new female Members of Congress.

As women we always have to prove ourselves in a skeptical male world. I am sure that many of my colleagues will relate to the experiences that I have had throughout my life, both personally and professionally. As we walk down the street to our places of employment we have to contend with the lewd stares from men who see us as nothing more than objects. Then we must walk into our jobs and face the prospect of not being taken seriously by our male colleagues or dismissed as just another group of women whining for what we want.

As women we have to prove that we can be effective leaders, that we can make difficult decisions and stand firm in those decisions, that we can be tough in negotiations, that we will not shrink in debate or allow ourselves to

be shouted down, and that we will not wince at confrontation.

It is with this conviction that women across the country became determined to be heard and speak out against violence and injustice, and in favor of legislation that would change our lives for the better. It was the combination of those women who felt motivated to run for office and those who voted for them that helped to bring about a significant change in the Congress and the White House. The November election ushered in so many women from diverse backgrounds, and we are now larger in number and can effectively focus on the needs of women today.

We now have a President in the White House that has placed women's issues on the front burner. We have also been fortunate to be given a role model for our children, First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, who time and time again proves that a woman can be successful and tough in business and be a caring mother and wife for her family. Hillary Clinton has been an advocate of children's rights and has withstood all criticism—from inane Washington Post Style section comments on her clothing to her unprecedented involvement with health care reform. Her ability to move forward in the face of adversity sends a positive message to women around the country.

Just as we have elected a President that has placed women's issues on the front burner, Congress has recognized the needs of women, particularly in the areas of health and in the workplace. We have passed and the President has signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act, which provides up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for the care of a newborn child or for a family illness. We have also passed the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill, which includes funding for breast and ovarian cancer, and special provisions to include women and minorities in clinical research trials. And the President has lifted the restrictive gag rule that threatened access to family planning clinics for many low-income women across the Nation.

Despite these triumphs for women in Congress and the White House, despite our empowerment and the fact that we have overcome so many obstacles, we still are not safe on the streets of our cities. This is why we must continue to struggle, we must continue to fight for our fundamental right to be treated as equals in our society. We have come too far to have our needs shoved back into the closet and away from national attention.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month to celebrate the achievements and contributions women have made throughout history. I would also like to thank Congresswoman PATSY MINK for organizing this special recognition for women's contribution to the history of our country. It is very important that women's contributions of whatever proportion be recognized.

Today, I would like to pay a special tribute to an extraordinary woman in the history of our country, Jeanette Pickering Rankin, the first woman Member of Congress. I salute Jeanette Rankin not only as the first woman Member but also because she was a woman before her time. She worked to secure the right to vote for women and then served two separate terms in the U.S. Congress. She was

a devoted advocate of the peace movement and was the only Member of Congress who voted against both World Wars. I admire her courage to follow her convictions and speak her mind. She was forward thinking and determined in the face of very daunting odds.

As a woman Member of the House of Representatives, serving with the largest delegation of women Members ever, I am proud and honored to follow in her footsteps and be a voice for other women. It is my hope that with the women Members working together, we can achieve goals and dreams that Jeanette Rankin never thought possible.

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Mrs. MINK, for organizing this special order this afternoon to pay tribute to women in U.S. history who paved the way for many of us, and to whom we owe a great debt.

As a Congresswoman from southern California, I could not have come of age in politics without being aware of and in awe of a great lady of our not-so-distant past, Helen Gahagan Douglas. Helen Gahagan Douglas represented the 14th Congressional District of California from 1945 to 1951 but remained in the public eye until her death in 1980.

Helen Gahagan Douglas first became known to the world as a beautiful, glamorous, talented actress who could light up the stage with her presence. Later, as a Congresswoman and an ardent supporter of the New Deal, she became known as the woman who lost to Richard Nixon in one of the most celebrated and vitriolic U.S. Senate campaigns in American history. Today, when the name of Helen Gahagan Douglas is mentioned, the most common response is "Didn't she run against Richard Nixon for the Senate?" But there was so much more to this outstanding woman. There is so much that we can celebrate during this week of honoring important women in history.

Helen Mary Gahagan was born on November 25, 1900, in Boonton, NJ, raised in the Park Slope section of Brooklyn, and attended boarding school in Massachusetts and Barnard College in New York City. Against her family's wishes she pursued her interest in the theater and had a marvelous career on Broadway, where she met and married the actor Melvyn Douglas.

She became a believer in the policies of the New Deal when on a cross-country tour in 1932 she saw firsthand the desperation of the migrant workers of the late Depression era. This marked the advent of her political ideology.

Years later she became politically active after a concert tour of Central Europe in the late 1930's. That tour brought her face to face with the full force of European fascism and nazism. She came back to the United States determined to make a difference and involved herself slowly in grassroots circles of the Democratic party in California.

In 1944, Mrs. Douglas ran for the congressional seat in Los Angeles vacated by retiring Representative Thomas F. Ford. During the race she was quoted as saying:

I am interested in politics because of deep convictions that government is just what you make it. If you are not interested, and do nothing about it, you have no right to complain about what your government does.

Mrs. Douglas ran a grassroots campaign, and won.

After her election to Congress in 1944, representing the 14th Congressional District, she earned a rare freshman appointment to serve on the House Foreign Affairs Committee where she was an ardent supporter of the United Nations, the Marshall plan, and the independence of the Philippines. She was appointed by President Truman as alternate delegate to the U.N. Assembly in 1946. In domestic affairs she sponsored legislation protecting the consumer, working people, women, children, and the home.

She continuously fought for minorities, for the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised, for the rights of the people and against the rights of the powerful. Her liberalism won her as many ardent supporters and fans as it did enemies.

She was too liberal for some Democrats of her time. To the wealthy she was a liberal traitor to her class, to the Communists she was a social Fascist in her vigorous support for the Marshall plan. The Jeffersonian Democrats fought against her, and the Daughters of the Confederacy hated her defense of black soldiers during World War II.

She was a strong opponent of the McCarthy era anti-Communist efforts. She was one of only 17 Members of Congress to vote against contempt citations for the Hollywood 10, writers and entertainers who refused to answer allegations about Communist Party activism.

In response to allegations that she was a Communist sympathizer, she delivered on the House floor a speech she entitled "My Democratic Credo," which asserted that communism was not a serious threat to American democratic institutions but demagoguery and false charges were. How prescient she was.

In 1950, Helen Douglas and Richard Nixon, both Members of the House of Representatives, ran for the U.S. Senate seat vacated by retiring U.S. Senator Sheridan Downey. It was a campaign in which the Nixon forces labeled Mrs. Douglas "The Pink Lady," and published her liberal voting record on a pink circular, deliberately misrepresenting her record as being far more left than the Democratic majority. It was a nasty, innuendo-filled campaign designed to win in those Red-baiting days, and it left a long-lasting impression on the Nation's consciousness. Helen Douglas lost the election, but Nixon earned a reputation that stayed with him throughout his political life.

The 1950 Senate race marked the end of Helen Gahagan Douglas' political career, but she remained active in politics supporting Democratic candidates and humanitarian causes. She returned to the theater occasionally and became a lecturer and an author.

Decades later she was still remembered for her failed Senate race in 1950. When the Watergate scandal erupted over the Nation, she was given renewed attention by the media. When asked to reflect on the Senate campaign, Mrs. Douglas consistently refused to criticize Nixon for the excesses of that 1950 race. However, in 1974 she did voice her support for the impeachment efforts. Still, more than two decades after the fateful race of 1950, bumper stickers were seen in California that read "Don't blame me—I voted for Helen Gahagan Douglas."

Upon her death from cancer on June 28, 1980, the Philadelphia Inquirer wrote of her,

As a gifted actress, sensitive politician and indomitable, caring person, Mrs. Douglas was an inspiration to all who were fortunate to come in contact with her * * *. Cancer wasted [her] body, but could not weaken her spirit. She leaves us the example of her talented gracious life and the words she often uttered when refusing to criticize Mr. Nixon for the excesses of his 1950 campaign. "One must always look to the future," she would say, "not the past."

That was Helen Gahagan Douglas.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in celebrating Women's History Month.

Today, and throughout the month of March, we salute mothers, wives, and grandmothers, women from the business sector, health care providers, teachers, musicians, homemakers, laborers, child care providers, and sisters from all walks of life and all cultures and ethnic backgrounds who, with a common goal of a quality of life for all, have in their own way made a difference in their communities and toward the betterment of our country as a whole.

Throughout the United States, women are role models representing the very meaning of Women's History Month.

They represent the rich heritage of women's contributions, the courage that women have demonstrated throughout history, and the struggle that women have overcome. In my own district, Juana Gutierrez, Aurora Castillo, Bernadette Nishimura, Mary Guerrero, Lily Okamoto, and Lula Meschack, are examples of the strength and courage of which I speak. They, as women everywhere, are living examples of women's ability to balance their family, personal, professional, and community commitments. They do this voluntarily, unselfishly, and in an outstanding way. They are dedicated to a better quality of life for all in this society. Through their unique life experiences, women bring new perspectives and ideas to policies and decisions impacting all of our lives.

With 46 percent of the working population being female, we must all work together to ensure that women are represented proportionately in all professions—that women receive equal pay for equal work—that they have adequate child and health care—and that we continue to promote the status of all women.

If we allow inequalities to exist for any sector of our society, we subject us all—men and women—to cruel limitations of our quality of life and fulfillment of our own potential to contribute to this society.

I am very pleased that we as a legislative body have taken time to commemorate Women's History Month, because we as a representative body are drawing public attention to the significance of women in their role as history makers.

It is through this public reminder that women's struggles will be highlighted and women's equality in America will become a reality.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, while researching and documenting our Nation's history, historians have traditionally overlooked the accomplishments of women in society. I am proud to sponsor National Women's History Month, as a partial remedy for this omission.

Since 1987, National Women's History Month has been a means for government, schools, and other organizations to highlight and pay tribute to the historic accomplishments of women in the past. Furthermore, National Women's History Month provides us with an opportunity to recognize today's women, who are making history with their extraordinary contributions in fields as diverse as politics, art, business, theology, and education. But perhaps most importantly, commemorating women's history inspires our Nation's youth to dream about the things that they themselves might someday achieve.

Traditionally, women have made unsung but lasting contributions by raising strong and stable families, educating their children, organizing and managing local charities, and being spiritual leaders in our churches. Working within the social structures of the day, women used their intelligence, compassion, and sense of social justice for the betterment of society.

Yet there have always been women who bucked the system and made contributions by forging new paths. Anne Hutchinson and Mary Baker Eddy were influential theological rebels; one protested vociferously against religious intolerance and orthodoxy and the other founded a new church based on her unique spiritual benefits. Harriet Beecher Stowe, the author of the controversial and highly acclaimed book "Uncle Tom's Cabin," was addressed by President Lincoln as "the little lady who started the big war." We owe much to the activist Susan B. Anthony, who worked tirelessly to give women the right to vote. Authors such as Edith Wharton, Willa Cather, and Eudora Welty bequeathed as powerful and beautiful portrayals of life in the South and in the West. And we in Maine still glow with pride when we remember our Margaret Chase Smith, who delivered a scathing oratory against McCarthyism to her complacent colleagues in Congress.

Today, we have nationally recognized trailblazers like Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM for future historians to ponder. Also deserving of recognition are the superwomen of recent decades who work fulltime while raising children.

Learning about the contributions women have made to our society encourages young girls and women to think about the things that they, too, might accomplish when they are older. Understanding that many women have had to break down barriers to achieve their goals will inspire youth not to be discouraged by barriers, but to be challenged by them and to persevere.

For these reasons, I am proud to cosponsor National Women's History Month, and I urge you to join me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 143 if you have not already done so.

THE SOLOMON CONSENSUS PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I have enjoyed this previous

special order by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. It was very enlightening and very educational.

Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief tonight. I know it is getting late, and the Speaker and everyone else would like to go home. I really do need to rise today, however, to talk about the budget alternative which has been named the Solomon consensus plan, that cuts spending by \$485 billion and even more importantly, reduces the deficit by \$637 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this consensus plan is offered by a true cross-section of Republicans from all over this country. Some of the major sponsors are the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCREARY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton came to Washington nearly 2 months ago espousing his intention of reducing the Federal deficit. We all want to do that. Describing himself as a new Democrat, he promised to offer something else besides the failed tax-and-spend policies of past liberals, and in the wake of the State of the Union, President Clinton proposed new taxes and new spending as a way to grow the economy. He also held out the promise of spending cuts to achieve deficit reduction goals.

However, his plan ignores economic and, for that matter, political history. Since World War II Congress has been much more eager to increase taxes than to cut spending. In fact, for every dollar in new taxes which Congress has imposed in the last 50 years, Congress increased spending by almost twice that much, by \$1.71.

Mr. Speaker, since the historic 1990 budget agreement in which then-President Bush grudgingly accepted a tax increase in the name of deficit reduction, since that time the Congress spent \$2.37 for every \$1 it raised in new taxes. Now it appears that President Clinton's plan, while still lacking specifics, would encourage Congress to spend, and listen to this, \$4.81 for every dollar in new taxes. Do the Members hear that? I said \$4.81 in new spending for every \$1 in new taxes. This is absurd. What happened to reducing the deficit?

If the Members or I had our own personal budgets and were faced with a shortfall, what would we do? We would not spend beyond our means. If we could not afford something, we would either do without it, or we would give up something else.

Of course, I do not believe that President Clinton wants to increase the Federal deficit. I really do not. Like Presi-

dent Bush and President Reagan before him, I truly think he envisions that Congress will accept its promise to cut spending in the years ahead. But, my colleagues, if Congress went back on the very same assurance when it promised Ronald Reagan that it would cut spending following his tax cut, what makes us think that Congress will cut spending in conjunction with the Clinton tax hike? Who in their right mind would impose such a double hit on the American people?

Mr. Speaker, why should we object to these new taxes? The other night President Clinton called any objection to his plan as merely being status quo. Members of Congress, I do not think the American people are going to have much patience with that type of sophomoric behavior of pointing fingers at each other.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain something. The middle class will only be able to contribute to the budget deficit solution if they remain fiscally solvent. A financially healthy middle class remains the critical key to maintain economic stability and promoting growth throughout this entire economy.

□ 1820

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the tremendous inhibition to growth which middle-class tax increases will place on our ability to achieve Federal solvency.

In addition, the President's tax increases on the middle class are counterproductive and will make the middle class feel like it is running harder and faster just to stay in place, a situation which we need to relieve and not aggravate.

How would the present tax proposals on the middle class promote such frustration? As I have already mentioned, what Congress takes in new taxes it doles out in new spending and more. That is history. All the pain and all the sacrifice which comes from higher taxes will be squandered on everything except reducing the deficit.

The administration's Btu energy tax, for instance, will frustrate the middle class tremendously because they will end up shouldering most of that tax burden. Right now, the middle class is struggling to keep its head above water to pay for increased costs in necessities such as food, gasoline, electricity, home heating fuel, and all manufactured goods, all of which will be hit with a Btu tax, leading to price increases on all those products. The middle-class taxpayer will also pay substantially more in property taxes to finance the billions of dollars in added energy costs to State and local governments, all those local government buildings, all those local government trucks and equipment, all of the State government trucks, and equipment and buildings, all having to heat their

buildings and to use energy to keep open.

That is a bit ridiculous, is it not? We are asking people to pay more in property taxes so that the State and local governments can afford to pay their own energy taxes. Mr. Speaker, how in the world can the middle class survive if they are paying the local and State governments' tax burdens in addition to their own?

The tax will also adversely affect the middle class because the Federal Government will have to foot the bill to pay, and listen to this, over \$1 billion in new energy taxes for its own Federal buildings and agencies, such as the military, such as the post offices and all of their trucks, cars, and automobiles, and other Federal facilities who are going to have their energy costs skyrocket because we in this Congress are going to implement a Btu tax. We are going to give the Federal Government the money to pay those bills. Who is going to give it them? Well, you guessed it, the middle class in the form of higher Federal income taxes in the years to come, so they are going to get stuck with property taxes to pay the increased fuel costs for local and State government, and they are going to pay through the nose with income tax increases to pay for the Federal costs.

I mean, what are we doing? We are raising the costs of energy that we are all going to have to pay for. And Members, the Btu energy tax is not the only tax which adversely affects the middle class in this Clinton budget.

Now how about the Social Security tax increase? The administration's Social Security benefit tax proposal would place unmerited fiscal burdens on middle-class senior citizens.

Now most Social Security recipients do not possess multiple sources of income, though it is true that some of our Nation's seniors are considered well off, thanks to hard work and dedication when they were younger. They should not be penalized for their success.

I am going to tell you something. I am 62 years old, and my wife and I raised five children, and we now have two grandchildren, and I am going to tell you something. I was born back in 1930, right at the beginning of the Depression. And I can recall my mother, after my dad died when I was 2 years old, working for \$5 a week and trying to support me. And then later on when I became of age and I got married, and we had five children, I can tell you that for every single week of my life, even when I was in the Marine Corps making \$75 a month, I put away \$1 a week. I am a Scotsman, and my parents and my grandparents inbred that into me, that you had to save for a rainy day. And my wife and I, at great sacrifice to even our kids, put away that \$1 a week, and later on it was \$2, then \$5, and \$10. But we saved some money.

As it stands now, President Clinton's proposal would increase the amount of Social Security benefits subject to taxation from 50 to 85 percent for recipients earning more than \$25,000. The proposal attempts to raise \$21 billion from the fixed income of senior citizens.

Now that means we are penalizing all those people who have worked and saved all of their life. And they may have a combined Social Security income now of \$13,000. And they may have a retirement pension from General Electric Co. where the husband worked on an assembly line creating steam turbines, and now he has a pension of \$10,000 to go along with his \$13,000 of income. And his wife may have worked for IBM right next door, and she may have a \$8,000 retirement income. This puts them up to \$32,000. Now, they have worked and saved, and they have put away that dollar that GERRY SOLOMON put away every week for 40 or 50 years. And now they have a little money in the bank, and they are collecting income from CD's. That pushes their income up to \$38,000. And President Clinton wants to tax their Social Security benefits because they saved money for those 50 years. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

We cannot expect the middle-class seniors to cover their increasing costs of living on a decreasing fixed income when we as their Government cannot even cover our own Federal living expenses on our bulging tax income that is coming into our coffers.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to create a stimulus we cannot continue to restrain our stimulant, the stimulant being the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, another tax increase which will frustrate the middle class is the Clinton corporate tax increase. When we hear the term corporate tax, the first thing that comes to mind is big, fat CEO's of major corporations who abuse their perks and privileges for their own selfish ends. Increasing the corporate tax sounds good when the goal is penalizing corporate abuses, but the fact of the matter remains that this goal will be better accomplished by, for instance, limiting the amount of corporate tax deductions to \$1 million in salary for any corporate officer, and not allowing them to writeoff the expense for any additional salary they may take out. That makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, under President Clinton's budget, the people affected by this corporate tax increase will be middle-class America, specifically middle-class businessmen who provide 75 percent of all of the new jobs created in America for your kids and mine, working people who will experience layoffs from their corporate employers, and older people who rely on dividend income to help meet their daily expenses.

Now additionally, economists agree that the corporate tax increase will

compound the real problem. That is to say, by raising the operating cost of a business through an increased corporate tax, businesses will continue to rely on debt rather than on assets and savings. My friends, fiscal solvency depends on building up and using assets and savings, not accumulating debt and using deficit financing. That is why small businessmen are successful in America. But if you are going to raise their corporate taxes, you are going to take away that opportunity.

Now maybe the Federal Government has been lucky in getting away with this deficit financing all of these years.

□ 1830

But the corporate world faces the world of reality, and we should be encouraging them to save rather than surrender their savings to pay increased corporate taxes to give us here in Washington more money to spend.

After looking with aversion at these tax proposals, I submit to you that our best path to national fiscal solvency remains very, very clear. We must cut spending. We must nip this disease in the bud, this disease which may be more properly called spendicitis.

The only way to deal with this disease is not to tax the American middle class into oblivion. But, rather, to cut spending, my colleagues. The only way to cut spending is to actually do it.

Now, what should we do, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, what should we do?

If President Clinton wants to ramrod this tax-and-spend proposal through this Congress, maybe he will get his way, and maybe he will muster the necessary votes. After all, everybody knows the Democrats control this House, they control the other body and they certainly control the White House. However, now is the time not to point fingers. Now is the time to compromise.

Each side should be willing to bend a little in order to forge a workable compromise for the good of this Nation.

In all of the debate over the President's \$178 billion stimulus package, it has been hard to differentiate about who stands where on which issues. Generally, Democrats favor raising taxes to deal with the deficit. Republicans oppose taxes on the middle class as a means of deficit reduction. In other words, both sides of the aisle agree on the goal of deficit reduction.

By focusing on this common bipartisan goal instead of partisan differences, perhaps we can actually accomplish something through compromise, and, Mr. Speaker, I call on President Clinton to listen to this offer, and I am asking him to listen to this Republican who at 6 o'clock in the morning back in 1982 told my hero, President Ronald Reagan, "no" when he asked me to vote for a tax increase; in 1990, when President Bush called me at 6:15 in the

morning and asked me if I would vote for a tax increase, I had to tell him "no."

I am standing here today saying that I will compromise and go along with some tax increases if we can have real meaningful spending cuts that are guaranteed. Now, on behalf of this old right conservative and deficit hawks like myself and moderate Republicans as well whom I mentioned some of earlier in the debate, I propose to the United States that we could get the support of many, many Republicans in raising taxes on millionaires, that is to say, real millionaires, not people who suddenly are surprised to learn that the arcane administration income formulas have made them millionaires.

In order to achieve real deficit reduction and to achieve fairness in the U.S. Tax Code, we are willing to raise taxes on real millionaires. We are even willing to create a new tax bracket for Americans who earn more than \$200,000 in adjusted gross income, and that means \$230,000, \$240,000, and we are more than willing to plug some abusive tax loopholes by reducing the writeoffs for corporate officials.

But we remain, Mr. Speaker, adamantly opposed to any new taxes which will affect the middle class and small business either through taxing energy, Social Security benefits, or corporate dividends. We cannot continue to impose unduly heavy tax burdens on the middle class, because they are the ones that pay the load. They are the ones that keep this economy going. You cannot expect them to come up with an additional \$500 to \$750 out of their pockets all across this Nation.

You are talking about people who are making \$30,000 and \$40,000 and \$50,000, who have two or three kids to put through college. Do you know what taking \$750 a year out of their pockets means to them? It means they do not buy the refrigerator, they do not put the downpayment on the new car, they do not buy whatever additional necessity is needed.

What do you think that does to the economy of this Nation? They are the ones that are being hit the worst by this proposed tax increase.

What do we ask in return, Mr. President? Well, first, we ask that he forgoes raising taxes on the middle class and set aside his efforts to push a fiscal stimulus through increased taxation as the Nation is undergoing economic recovery; in other words, no new spending.

Second, taxes on energy, Social Security, and, indirectly, dividends will harm the middle class and still not achieve meaningful deficit reduction. Therefore, they must be dropped, Mr. Speaker.

The President claims these middle-class taxes are necessary to reduce the deficit by \$465 billion over 5 years. But at the end of the 5-year period, accord-

ing to the President's budget, that still leaves an annual deficit of \$232 billion. What kind of progress have we made there, Mr. Speaker?

These middle-class tax increases must be dropped from this budget proposal. Otherwise, the economy will suffer.

But you have to ask: If the tax increase on the middle class is taken out of the picture, we will need to make up the difference with almost \$300 billion in additional spending cuts above and beyond what President Clinton has proposed. To make up that difference, my fellow deficit hawks and I have offered a tremendous list of spending cuts. They are all right here to choose from.

While just about all spending can be justified in some way, Mr. Speaker, we need to cut. I cannot say that enough. We have to cut spending, and we have to do it now.

Of course, the first place many of my colleagues here will look to is defense. But you can only bleed one part of the budget so much before you bleed it dry. We are close to doing that right now with the defense budget. But even this hawk, and I helped lead and carry the water from the Reagan administration all through the 1980's that built up our national defense, that gave us the ability to bring down communism all over this world, even I would propose that we do not cut defense more than \$60 billion over 5 years, which is cautiously agreed to by my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and Republican members of the Committee on the Budget, but we do support that \$60 billion cut.

From that baseline, we have seriously examined the specific budget cuts offered by President Clinton and those offered by our other colleagues who have offered amendments to cut, namely, Democrats, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], also chairman of the Porkbusters' Coalition, and we have also looked at the other side of the Capitol at the plans put forth by Senator HANK BROWN of Colorado, Senator PETE DOMENICI of New Mexico, Senator PHIL GRAMM from Texas, and Senator TRENT LOTT from Mississippi, and we have included many of them in our consensus substitute.

Additionally, we have adopted some of the recommendations put forth by the Grace Commission nearly a decade ago that this Congress has completely ignored over the years.

Mr. Speaker, all of these spending cuts have been included in the Solomon consensus budget, making our budget in a sense the only bipartisan offering to this House. All of these cuts combined result in spending cuts of almost \$500 billion over 5 years.

Let me tell you what else the plan includes. As I said before, we include many of the Clinton cuts, we include some of the conservative Democrat cuts, all of the Republican alternative cuts, plus deeper cuts including such things as the superconducting collider which every editorial across this country is telling us we should cut out. We spread out the space station making substantial cuts there, and we go on with a long, long list of other cuts.

In addition, this Solomon consensus that we have presented to the Committee on Rules today contains more deficit reduction than any other plan currently before the House, and that is what we are talking about, deficit reduction. All of the tax increases are dedicated to deficit reduction in our plan. That means that if there is \$150 billion in new taxes, it goes to deficit reduction, not to more spending.

As a matter of fact, in our budget, we have no new spending, period. Everything is stopped dead in its tracks, and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, spending cuts come before tax increases.

Have any of you Members gone home lately and have you talked to the people out in the street? They want you to put spending cuts in effect right now before the tax increases, not after.

We also cut Clinton's tax increases by more than 50 percent. We cut spending by \$270 billion more than Clinton. We reduce the deficit by over \$150 billion more than Clinton, and we leave a 1998 deficit level of \$18 billion lower than Clinton with less than half the tax increases.

That shows you that all of the tax increases that we are willing to concede and vote for are going to deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, our plan calls for a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto to be put on this floor by May 1, 1993, for a legitimate up-or-down vote so each Member can be held accountable for the problems that have caused these huge deficits and problems that could be partly cured by a balanced-budget amendment put out to the people to ratify and a line-item-veto amendment so that whoever the President is he would have the right to line-item out these pork barrel projects that sometimes seem to get scattered all over these bills that we pass in this House.

□ 1840

Finally, our plan is the only plan that would be voted on this floor in the next 2 days which carries mandatory sequestration cuts. That means across-the-board cuts come into effect immediately if Congress exceeds the budget limits that we are going to pass here in the next few days.

Well, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I apologize for taking up all of this time. This proposal has two priorities: They are—and this is what the

American people have been asking for—fairness in U.S. Tax Code, and meaningful deficit reduction that can be enforced.

I urge all Members to take a hard look at this consensus plan. It is the plan the American people want us to adopt. I would submit a detailed summary of that plan.

The plan referred to is as follows:

SOLOMON CONSENSUS PLAN CALLS FOR DEEPER CUTS

(Based on the latest available Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation estimates and Kasich #1 Policy Assumptions)

FEATURES

4:1 ratio spending cuts to new taxes, compared to 0.8:1 ratio in Clinton's plan.

Dedicates all of the tax increases to deficit reduction.

No new spending.

Cuts Clinton tax increases by more than half—with no tax increases on the Middle Class.

Contains some of Clinton's cuts.

Contains the Republican Alternative's cuts.

Includes much deeper cuts, including the Super Collider and more!

Spending cuts occur before tax increases.

Cuts spending \$265 billion more than Clinton.

Reduces deficit by \$171.5 billion more than Clinton.

Leaves a 1998 deficit level \$18 billion lower than Clinton with less than half the tax increases.

Only plan with balanced budget amendment and line-item veto.

Only plan with mandatory sequestration cuts if actions by Congress exceed budget limits.

The Solomon consensus plan cuts Clinton tax increases by more than half by: eliminating Btu energy tax, eliminating Social Security tax, and removing tax increase on corporations, thereby removing the taxes which erode the buying power of Middle Class Americans and severely impact economic growth, and by activating a new tax bracket at \$200,000 instead of \$140,000.

The plan retains Clinton's proposals to: Place a surtax on quarter-millionaires and deny deductions on executive pay exceeding \$1 million, but expands Clinton's tax to include athletes and entertainers. It retains Clinton's proposals to deny lobbying expense deductions and increase miscellaneous taxes to plug tax loopholes on business-expense abuses (club dues, food, entertainment, etc.).

To stimulate the economy, the plan provides vital tax incentives by: extending expiring business tax incentives, restoring real estate passive loss. Providing capital gains tax deductions for startup companies, and repealing luxury tax on boats.

TAX INCREASES: 5 YR TOTAL

(In billions of dollars)

	Clinton plan	Solomon (consensus)
Quarter-millionaire surtax	28.4	28.4
New tax bracket (over \$140,000)	61.8	None
New tax bracket (over \$200,000)	None	47.9
Miscellaneous tax increases, including user fees, tax on club dues, food, entertainment, et cetera	75.3	75.3
Deny deduction on executive pay over \$1 million, including pro athletes and entertainers	1.0	1.0
Deny lobbying deductions9	.9
Btu energy tax	71.4	None

TAX INCREASES: 5 YR TOTAL—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

	Clinton plan	Solomon (consensus)
Social Security tax	29.1	None
Increase tax on corporations	30.2	None
Increase estate taxes and AMT	27.1	None
Other miscellaneous taxes	10.8	None
Total 5 yr tax increase	336.0	149.7

SPENDING CUTS

(In billions of dollars)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	5 yr total
Clinton plan	6.0	10.8	35.2	71.9	95.8	219.7
GOP alternative (Kasich No. 2)	38.8	71.2	94.3	114.9	131.5	450.6
Solomon consensus plan (based on Kasich No. 1)	41.7	71.3	102.5	124.1	145.5	485.1

Note.—Based on Congressional Budget Office baseline.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

(In billions of dollars)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	5 yr total
Clinton plan	33.0	47.4	86.1	138.1	161.3	465.8
GOP alternative (Kasich No. 2)	38.8	71.2	94.3	114.8	131.5	450.6
Solomon consensus plan (based on Kasich No. 1)	65.6	101.5	132.8	158.8	178.8	637.0

Note.—Based on Congressional Budget Office baseline.

DEFICIT LEVEL

(In billions of dollars)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Clinton plan (chairman's mark)	253.7	237.0	204.0	183.6	198.4
GOP alternative (Kasich No. 2)	247.9	213.2	195.7	206.8	228.2
Solomon consensus plan (based on Kasich No. 1)	221.1	183.1	157.2	162.9	180.9

Note.—Based on Congressional Budget Office baseline.

Appropriate committees are instructed to report to the House floor:

1. A true line-item veto statute.
2. A Constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget.
3. Legislation establishing (Gramm-Rudman) procedures triggering mandatory sequestration cuts when actions by Congress cause deficits to exceed the limits established by this budget over the next 5 years.

Thank you so much for your patience, and I thank the staff.

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

HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of St. Patrick's Day I have taken out a special order to discuss human rights in Northern Ireland and the need for justice.

Too often in Northern Ireland justice is only as good as the last judge.

If there is one thing that both Catholics and Protestants need in Northern Ireland, it is a bill of rights providing for the protection of basic civil liberties for both communities.

It is just wrong that in Northern Ireland where human rights abuses have consistently

been documented by Amnesty International and the International Helsinki Watch Committee that no bill of rights exists.

The British Government may seek to run from its record of human rights abuses in Northern Ireland but they can't hide.

Such fundamental rights associated with our own democracy as the right to trial by jury, the right to remain silent, freedom of the press, and the right to due process of law simply do not exist in Northern Ireland by act of the British Government.

Just last week, the British parliament reenacted so-called emergency legislation denying these same basic rights.

There is no room for violence in settling these political issues. The threat posed by the IRA and the Protestant paramilitaries like the UVF and the UDA in Northern Ireland must be condemned by all. The Provisional IRA's outrageous bombing campaign in Britain and Northern Ireland does nothing more than divide people further. The increase in sectarian attacks against Catholics by the UVF and UDA for no other reason than their religion is further evidence of these organizations' cruelty and cowardice.

At the same time, the killing of 130 unarmed members of the Catholic community by the British Security Forces and the RUC in the current conflict is also wrong. The very fact that one of the few British soldiers convicted of murdering a Catholic without provocation has been allowed to reenter the British Army only alienates the Catholic community further from British rule. And it underscores the need for a bill of rights.

Today, joined by my colleagues in the House, I am announcing that we have filed a House concurrent resolution calling on the British Government to meet its obligation to justice and equal protection under the law in Northern Ireland by making a bill of rights initiative possible.

The concept of a bill of rights has won the backing of all political parties in Northern Ireland.

Our resolution also asks the European parliament to send the British Government a similar message. As a signatory to the European Convention on Human Rights, Great Britain can no longer ignore its responsibility for maintaining civil order in a way that at the same time respects human rights in Northern Ireland.

Rather than continuing as protagonist of the conflict in Northern Ireland, Great Britain can instead become an agent of justice by serving as the driving force for a bill of rights.

In that way, some sense of justice may at long last be brought to the families and the memory of two Catholic teenage boys, Michael Joseph Tighe and Aiden Macanespie, shot dead without provocation by British Security Forces.

There are, of course, other issues that cry out for attention in Northern Ireland. The fact that Catholics are 2½ times more likely to be unemployed in Northern Ireland than Protestants along with continuing unemployment discrimination on the basis of religion, also serves as a source of instability and alienation.

And, yet there are some instances of progress on the fair employment front. Shorts

Bros. Aircraft, a formerly British Government-owned firm, has made demonstrable improvements in hiring more Catholics at all levels of its work force. I am pleased that an amendment I offered to the Defense Authorization Act of 1988 served directly to drive those changes. I will in Congress be joined by my colleagues in looking at other constructive ways in which our Government can spur the cause of fair employment in Northern Ireland.

Finally in this season of St. Patrick, we also restate our support for the appointment of a special peace envoy. I am gratified that President Clinton stated his support for the appointment of an envoy last year.

I strongly believe that the United States, through the vehicle of a special envoy, would be in a unique position to encourage the peace process in Northern Ireland.

The time for the issuance of well-meaning platitudes on Northern Ireland by the United States Government has long since passed. Let us work to promote peace in Northern and an end to the senseless killing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time every year, the Irish and the Irish at heart join together to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. Unfortunately, for much of the rest of the year, the concerns of the Irish are largely forgotten. For this reason, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] not only for organizing tonight's special order, but also for his dedication to this issue for the other 364 days each year.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, I have continually worked to heighten the awareness of my colleagues regarding the problems in Northern Ireland. Therefore, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Congressman KENNEDY's resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) calling for the establishment of a bill of rights for Northern Ireland.

Many do not realize that the people in Northern Ireland, while British citizens, do not enjoy the same judicial system as the British. Currently, many trials are subject to the diplock courts, courts without any trial by jury. While the British do have fears of jury intimidation, the result of the diplock courts is a system which creates a greater mistrust and leads to further suspicion between the two communities.

Additionally, deep-rooted religious discrimination continues to exist against the Catholic minority, discrimination that we would like to address through the MacBride principles.

Innocents on both sides constantly fear the loyalist and nationalist terrorist organizations.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support Congressman KENNEDY and to cosponsor this resolution calling for the adoption of a bill of rights for Northern Ireland.

For over 200 hundred years, the citizens of the United States have enjoyed basic freedoms that many people around the world can only dream of. This resolution calls for the adoption of a bill of rights for Northern Ireland, a concept endorsed by every political party in Northern Ireland.

Accordingly, let us take advantage of this St. Patrick's Day to reflect on the positive events that have taken place throughout the world during the past few years, and to resolve to strive to eliminate the troubles of Northern Ireland and to bring peace and justice to Ireland.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today through March 26, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for Tuesday, March 16, and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for Tuesday, March 16, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, on March 18 and 23.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, on March 17.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, on March 18.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONDIT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAUGHLIN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY, for 60 minutes, on March 18 and 23

Mr. STARK, 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. KOLBE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. DICKEY in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. HYDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. MANTON in two instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. SKELTON in three instances.

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. 750. An act to extend the Export Administration Act of 1979 and to authorize appropriations under that Act for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 400. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the treatment of settlement agreements reached with the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1993, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

908. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Thrift Depositor Protection Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

909. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's report "Annual Energy Outlook for 1993," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790d(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

910. A letter from the Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Rural Health Care Transition Grant Program," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ww note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

911. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

912. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report entitled "Annual Report to the President and the Congress on the Performance Management and Recognition System,"

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5408; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

913. A letter from the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Oil Pollution Research, transmitting notification that the Committee's biennial report will be submitted in the spring of 1993, pursuant to Public Law 101-380, section 7001(e) (104 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

914. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on development assistance program allocations for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 416. A bill to extend the period during which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code remains in effect, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 103-32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1140. A bill to provide for the treatment of certain aircraft equipment settlement leases (Rept. 103-33, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 130. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-34). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 131. A resolution providing for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998 (Rept. 103-35). 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. SWIFT (for himself, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina):

H.R. 1339. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the waiting period for disability benefits shall not be applicable in the case of a disabled individual suffering from a terminal illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) (all by request):

H.R. 1340. A bill to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to repeal exclusive representation, to remove any requirement that individual employees join or pay dues or fees to labor organizations, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BYRNE:

H.R. 1342. A bill to provide financial institution regulators with whistleblower protection; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts to purchase first homes or pay higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the U.S. Postal Service from disclosing the names or addresses of any postal patrons or other persons, except under certain conditions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 1345. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 280 South First Street in San Jose, CA, as the "Robert F. Peckham United States Courthouse and the Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 1346. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located on St. Croix, VI, as the "Almeric L. Christian Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 1347. A bill to modify the boundary of Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1348. A bill to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the provisions of law preventing Members of Congress from sending mass mailing within the 60-day period immediately before an election be expanded so as to prevent Members from mailing any unsolicited franked mail within that period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. EWING, Mr. FROST, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVY, and Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1350. A bill to grant a Federal charter to VietNow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1351. A bill to establish the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program for intensive training in the Japanese language, government, politics, and economy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 1352. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to extend eligibility to junior and community colleges for grants and fellowships for food and agricultural

sciences education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. DELAY):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion of dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MALONEY:

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to have laws that would permit a parent who is chronically ill or near death to name a standby guardian for a minor child without surrendering parental rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. RIDGE):

H.R. 1355. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to exclusion for admissions fraud, procedures for inspecting aliens seeking entry to the United States, and increasing penalties for certain alien smuggling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 1356. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park, to create the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Conservation Area, to include the Gunnison River in the Nation's Wild and Scenic River System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 1357. A bill to authorize each State to control the movement of municipal waste generated within the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 1358. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to the innocent land owner defense and municipal liability, and to amend that act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to used oil; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 1359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are required to leave their employment because of certain medical or family reasons will not be denied unemployment compensation when they are ready to return to work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1360. A bill to regulate aboveground storage tanks used to store regulated substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURTHA (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 1361. A bill to expand the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend the National Apprenticeship Act to require minimum funding for certain outreach recruitment and training programs, to restore a national information collection system, to require in-

creases in force within the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor and to limit decreases in such force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 1363. A bill to rescind a portion of the funds available for HOPE grants, and to transfer an additional portion of the funds to the HOME investment partnerships program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to protect elected judges against discrimination based on age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize accelerated payments for short-term, high-cost courses taken by veterans pursuing post secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 1366. A bill to correct the tariff rate inversion on certain iron and steel pipe and tube products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. FURSE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming):

H.R. 1367. A bill to provide that a portion of the income derived from trust or restricted land held by an individual Indian shall not be considered as a resource or income in determining eligibility for assistance under any Federal or federally assisted program; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIDGE:

H.R. 1368. A bill to establish the Congressional Office of Inspector General; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Rules.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1369. A bill to reduce the duty on imported minivans if such minivans are administratively reclassified at a higher rate of duty and domestic automakers increase prices on domestic minivans at a rate greater than the rate of inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to change the rate of duty for certain bicycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1371. A bill to provide for additional extension periods, not exceeding 2 years in the aggregate, in the time allowed for re-exportation of certain goods admitted temporarily free of duty under bond; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1372. A bill to reduce the duty on ceramic statues, statuettes, and handmade flowers until January 1, 1995; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 1373. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to require merchant mariners' documents for certain seamen; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1374. A bill to discourage domestic corporations from establishing foreign manufacturing subsidiaries in order to avoid Federal taxes by including in gross income of

U.S. shareholders in foreign corporations the retained earnings of any such subsidiary which are attributable to manufacturing operations in runaway plants or tax havens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the foreign tax credit and deduction for taxes paid in lieu of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1376. A bill to provide an educational experience in the United States to children from areas affected by civil strife in Ireland; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 1377. A bill to authorize the provision of assistance for the victims of torture, including rape and other war crimes, in the former Yugoslavia, and for the families of such victims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to designate the week of March 28, 1993, through April 3, 1993, as "Distance Learning Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY:

H.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 7, 1993, through June 14, 1993, as "National Flag Celebration Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. BONIOR):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, President of the Republic of Kosovo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution condemning North Korea's decision to withdraw from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WATT, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 24: Mr. DELAY and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 27: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WATT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. MEEK, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GENE GREEN.

H.R. 109: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 159: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 167: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 171: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 214: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 302: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 304: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ARMEY, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 356: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 357: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 360: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 369: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 416: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 417: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 465: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 494: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DORNAN, and Mrs. BYRNE.

H.R. 520: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. NATCHER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERUTER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PENNY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 522: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MANTON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 526: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 535: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LINDER, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. DEAL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KLINK, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. MALONEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DREIER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SABO, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 567: Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 591: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 634: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 649: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 723: Mr. KIM and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 728: Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MEEK, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 736: Mr. MCCREY and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 737: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 741: Mr. WELDON, Mr. LEVY, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 749: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 773: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 799: Mr. COX, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 824: Mr. GALLO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 847: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 886: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 887: Ms. FOWLER and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 894: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 903: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 911: Ms. FOWLER, Mr. SHAW, Ms. THURMAN, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 941: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 960: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1029: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1030: Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1031: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 1067: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1106: Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1140: Mr. FIELDS of Texas and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1141: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1164: Mr. EVANS and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1172: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 1209: Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 1230: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1243: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1295: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 1296: Mr. HALL of Texas and Ms. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 10: Ms. DANNER and Mr. TUCKER.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. OBEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 86: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. FROST, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. KASICH, Mr.

LEVIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FISH, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHARP, Mr. ROTH, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WISE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. GORDON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MFUME, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DREIER, Mr. KIM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DELAY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. McCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 117: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HUFFINGTON, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H.J. Res. 134: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FROST, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TANNER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SARFALUSI, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. MINETA.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. STARK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CRAPO.

H. Res. 38: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Res. 54: Mr. MACTHLEY.

H. Res. 83: Mr. BLUTE.

H. Res. 86: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. COX, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOPETSKI,

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ZIMMER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

18. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council of Honolulu, HI, relative to the formation of an economic conversion task force; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1335

By Mr. BAKER of California:

—On page 26, strike lines 1 through 8.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

—On page 17, strike lines 1 through 5.

—On page 19, line 13 after section 1101, strike "and other related activities such as food services, school health services, arts education, and transportation, without regard to whether such activities are otherwise authorized under such section".

By Mr. COX:

—On page 25, strike lines 15 through line 20.

By Mr. GINGRICH:

—On page 13, strike line 10 through page 15, line 14.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON:

—Strike the item relating to "FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION—GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION".

—Strike the item relating to "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES".

—Strike the item relating to "FOREST SERVICE—CONSTRUCTION".

—Strike the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE".

—Strike the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS".

—Strike the item relating to "INDEPENDENT AGENCY—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE—FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND".

By Mr. McHugh:

—On page 11, line 24, strike "37,844,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,044,000".

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE III

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 1993

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "The Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1993".

SEC. 302. LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RECESSION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 which is subject to the terms of this Act if the President—

(1) determines that—

(A) such recession would help balance the Federal budget, reduce the Federal budget deficit, or reduce the public debt;

(B) such rescission will not impair any essential Government functions;

(C) such rescission will not harm the national interest; and

(D) such rescission will directly contribute to the purpose of this Act of limiting discretionary spending in fiscal years 1994 or 1995, as the case may be; and

(2) notifies the Congress of such rescission by a special message not later than 20 calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriations act for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, as the case may be.

The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriations bill under this paragraph.

SEC. 303. RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.

(a) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission disapproval bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) a congressional review period of 20 calendar days of session during which Congress must complete action on the rescission disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval;

(2) after the period provided in paragraph (1), an additional 10 days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission disapproval bill; and

(3) if the President vetoes the rescission disapproval bill during the period provided in paragraph (2), an additional 5 calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(c) If a special message is transmitted by the President under this Act and the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the period described in subsection (b), the rescission shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in subsection (b) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

SEC. 304. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "rescission disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which only disapproves a rescission of discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1994 or 1995, in whole, rescinded in a special message transmitted by the President under this Act; and

(b) the term "calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

SEC. 305. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.

(a) **PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.**—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this Act, the President shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

(1) the amount of budget authority rescinded;

(2) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(3) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority pursuant to this Act;

(4) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission; and

(5) all actions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the rescission and the decision to effect the rescission, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(b) **TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES TO HOUSE AND SENATE.**—

(1) Each special message transmitted under this Act shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each such message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(2) Any special message transmitted under this Act shall be printed in the first issue of

the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(c) **REFERRAL OF RESCISSION DISAPPROVAL BILLS.**—Any rescission disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(d) **CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) Any rescission disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(2) Debate in the Senate on any rescission disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed 1, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(e) **POINTS OF ORDER.**—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission budget authority transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission disapproval bill.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.