HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 29, 1993*

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 29, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Teach us, O God, that just as the rain appears to disrupt the patterns of daily life, still it nourishes the soil and causes the flowers to bloom, the seed to grow and bear its fruit. So, Almighty God, we know that the hurdles of daily living cause agitation and disorder, yet, too, we believe that the rain of Your good spirit, which offers us growth and confidence and hope and peace, is with us always. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule I, further proceedings on this vote will be postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GREENWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution designating April 2, 1993, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.".

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2. An act to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 662. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, and title XIX of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections relating to the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992;

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to designate May 3, 1993, through May 9, 1993, as "Public Service Recognition Week";

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through 17, 1994, as "Jewish Heritage Week";

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1993 as "Civil War History Month";

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution designating the week beginning June 6, 1993, and June 5, 1994, "Lyme Disease Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate the week of March 28, 1993, through April 3, 1993, as "Distance Learning Week"; and

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1993, and April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2) "An Act to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FORD, Mr. PELL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. WARNER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Thursday, March 25, 1993:

H.R. 904. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84—36 U.S.C. 1402(a)—the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. YATES of Illinois;
Mr. LANTOS of California;
Mr. NADLER of New York;
Mr. FROST of Texas; and
Mr. GILMAN of New York.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a)(2) of Public Law 101-363, the Chair appoints the following Member of the House to the National Advisory Council on the Public Service: Mr. MCCLOSKEY of Indiana.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498, 20 U.S.C. 4412, the Chair appoints to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development the following Members of the House: Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

There was no objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 715a, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Mr. DINGELL of Michigan; and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act, 20 U.S.C. 76h(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members of the House: Mr. YATES of Illinois; Mr. WILSON of Texas; and Mr. MCDADE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object to point out to the Chair and to the House that we are going through a long procedure here of things that are being done in this House by unanimous consent, which means that the minority is essentially acquiescing to a lot of these things happening.

The fact is that over the last several weeks we have seen more and more of the rights of the minority taken away from us, and if we are to proceed with this kind of comity in the House, where we allow these things to take place by unanimous consent, I would suggest that we need to get some degree of understanding of what the minority's rights are.

I refer specifically to the fact that in the last 2 days of last week, the minority was cut off from its special orders by actions of the majority. And if this pattern is going to continue, then my guess is that it is going to become increasingly difficult to do things by unanimous consent in the House of Representatives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Members are appointed.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to section 103, Public Law 99-371, 20 U.S.C. 4303, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University the following Members of the House: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan; and Mr. GUNDERSON of Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection pursuant to the provisions of section 1295b(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. MANTON of New York; and Mr. KING of New York.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Congressional Award Act, 2 U.S.C. 803, the Chair appoints the following individuals to the Congressional Award Board on the part of the House:

From the U.S. House of Representatives: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and from private life: Mr. Michael A. Reza of Hacienda Heights, CA, Ms. Mary L. Howell of Arlington, VA, and Ms. LaBrenda Garrett Stodghill of Washington, DC.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 2501 of title 44, United States Code, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Mr. SHARP of Indiana.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the provisions of section 1424(b)(1) of Public Law 102-325, the Chair appoints the following members to the National Commission on Independent Higher Education on the part of the House: Sister Maureen A. Fay of Detroit, MI and Mr. Philip M. Phibbs of Tacoma, Washington.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chair how many of these there are today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman this is the last one.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the members are appointed.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES REVIEW PANEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BILL THOMAS, ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 26, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Rule LI, clause 7(a)(4), I hereby appoint the following Members of the Committee on House Administration to the Fair Employment Practices Review Panel: Bob Livingston (LA), and Jennifer Dunn (WA).

I respectfully request that you inform the House of this action.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Ranking Minority Member.

□ 1510

A NECESSARY CHANGE IN THE TAX CODE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I also want to take this occasion to point out that it is by the sufferance of all the Members of the House that 1 minute speeches are given each day, and that this time set aside for the Members to say that which is on their minds does require unanimous consent of the House.

If in fact the majority party is going to use their majority numbers in order to undermine debate on the floor and

squeeze down the ability of the minority to participate in this body, then we at some point will have no option but also to use our rights to impact on those things that the majority wishes to do.

I have no intention of doing that at the present time, but it is becoming a very difficult situation where special orders are taken away, where 1 minute are limited, and where a number of things are done which have adverse impact on the ability of the minority to participate effectively in the House.

Mr. Speaker, with that I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Carnival Cruise Lines, made famous by the Love Boat TV program, made $500 million in profits between 1985 and 1988, half a billion dollars in profits. What grabs me is the old Love Boat program did not pay one red cent in taxes. They would have paid over $200 million in taxes, but guess what, the Love Boat crews said, Carnival said, "We are a Panamanian company. We are incorporated in Panama." Even though 80 percent of every dollar they earned was from Americans, they did not pay one red cent in taxes. If that is not enough to float your boat. The middle income people in America are paying all the taxes and these creeps are finding loopholes in our Tax Code to drive the deficit through.

I say it is time we stopped taxing the American worker and start putting the tax program to these creeps by changing the Tax Code that is for sale, manipulated, and ripped off at every turn of the road.

THERE MUST BE RESPECT FOR THE MILITARY IN THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, how many of my colleagues have visited Arlington National Cemetery and seen those thousands and thousands of crosses which identify members of the armed services who have died for their country? I do not now know how many of my colleagues have gone to veterans' hospitals and seen people without arms or legs or who are blind, or who have been burned beyond recognition by defending the country that they love so much.

When I see people show disdain for our military it really concerns me. Those people laid their lives on the line for us day in and day out, year in and year out. Millions of them have lost their lives and their families have suffered dearly.

When I read in the paper this week that a young lady at the White House said to Army Lt. Gen. Barry McCaffrey that she did not talk to people who were in uniform, obviously because she has no use for them, it made my blood boil. Mr. Speaker, if any of my colleagues happen to be talking to the President of the United States I would like them to tell him, tell President Clinton, fire this lady. Get her out of there. If she does not respect the military she should not be in the White House.

TRIBUTE TO COL. JERRY SAGE

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, during this period of our country's history when we are debating deep cuts into our defense and perhaps the security of this great Nation, I would like for us to pause and recognize the passing last week of a true American hero—retired Col. Jerry Sage, a former World War II prisoner of war who made his home in my small town of Enterprise, AL.

Jerry, who retired from the Army March 1, 1972, after 30 years of devoted and outstanding service to his country, earned the name of the "Cooler King" because he was in solitary confinement 15 times while a prisoner in camp Stalag Luft III in Sagan, Germany.

He worked for over 15 months on the huge, three-tunnel project known as "The Great Escape" and the actor Steve McQueen portrayed Jerry in the movie about the efforts of those courageous men.

After numerous attempts, the former Office of Strategic Service [OSS] member made his final escape across Poland after being a prisoner of war for over 3 years.

Jerry served in William "Wild Bill" Donovan's OSS, which was the forerunner of the CIA. Missions of the OSS, he said in his book "Sage" on which the movie "The Great Escape" was based, were to collect and analyze strategic information, plan and operate special services including sabotage, psychological warfare, and similar clandestine operations that did not fall within regular Armed Forces' jurisdiction.

A British colonel in Algiers gave Jerry the code name "Dagger". When captured in Germany he claimed his aircraft had been shot down and it was never discovered he was an OSS officer.

Despite the hardships he endured as a prisoner of war his devotion and dedication to his country and fellowman never weakened. In the last paragraph of the epilog in his book, Jerry wrote:

> I'm a very happy man and a very grateful one. I plan to spend the rest of my days thanking God for His care and help and my country for the rich opportunities I've been given. Helping my fellowman in this great country seems to be best possible way of showing my gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, Col. Jerry Sage did just that. He proudly and faithfully served his God, his fellowman and his country until he died last week.

RETAIN KENTUCKY'S U.S. ATTORNEYS DURING ONGOING INVESTIGATION

(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, accepting full well the opportunity and the authority that the President has to replace all U.S. attorneys at this change of administration, and accepting the fact that the Attorney General, Ms. Reno, has the opportunity of carrying out that order, as she has, I would hope that the resignations which now will be proffered by all U.S. attorneys, including the U.S. attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, Mr. Joseph Whittle, and the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Ms. Karen Caldwell, I hope those proffered resignations will not be accepted by the Attorney General and by the President until such time as the ongoing investigation called BOP TROT, an investigation of members of the Kentucky General Assembly and former members with respect to white-collar crime, fraud, and other activities of that nature, is concluded. It is important that these kinds of investigations proceed to a definitive conclusion. They are painful, they are difficult, they are upsetting to all of us in public service, but they must go forward.

I would once again encourage the administration not to accept those resignations until such time as these investigations have had a full chance to mature.

JOBS—AT WHAT COST?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in 1992 we heard much from then candidate Clinton about jobs and growing the economy. Hence the so-called stimulus bill that sailed through the Democrat-controlled Congress. Putting aside for a moment that a good chunk of the billions in deficit spending in that bill is high cholesterol pork, let us look closely at the jobs created. By the administration's own estimates, the Clinton taxing-and-spending program will create about 200,000 full-time-equivalent jobs. That is fewer jobs than the economy is creating all by itself right now. How much will these jobs cost the American taxpayers? A few stats from the Appropriations Committee in the other body: The average new mass

transit job will cost $83,000 each. Small business loans will create jobs at an average cost of $214,000 each. At the National Science Foundation it'll be $86,000 for each job. Create jobs? Maybe, but at what cost? Hardly a bargain for taxpayers, whose share of the soaring Federal debt will soon exceed $17,000 for every man, woman, and child. Who's in charge here?

□ 1520

OTIS PITTS, JR., NAMED DISASTER RELIEF COORDINATOR FOR SOUTH DADE COUNTY

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I have stood here many times pleading with the Congress to please help south Florida in their disaster relief. We have had over 86,000 jobs lost because of this natural disaster.

I come before Members today to thank Secretary Cisneros and President Clinton for appointing someone to coordinate all of the efforts in south Dade.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform our colleagues of the recent announcement by the President naming Mr. Otis Pitts, Jr., as his coordinator of disaster relief activities in south Dade County, FL. I am pleased that President Clinton has taken this important step to better organize Federal efforts to bring some relief to the people of south Florida who experienced so much devastation as a result of Hurricane Andrew.

Otis is the right person for this job. He has been involved in housing needs for a long time, he is highly respected in the community, he is fully acquainted with the available resources and knows his way around the bureaucracy. I would like to commend the President for making this fine selection which holds promise for south Dade.

Many promises have been made to the people of south Dade, more promises than deliveries. While we are still working to ensure the release of funds made available in the wake of the hurricane, we are now realizing that important needs are unmet by last year's legislation. One of the most urgent needs is crisis intervention in the area of mental health. While people have been living for the past 7 months in tents, without jobs or income, and with other pressures brought about by the disaster, there is a sharp rise in cases of spouse and child abuse. The Miami Herald has reported the alarming signs of stress on elementary school students. Over two dozen children have tried to kill themselves, the kind of situation which does not usually follow natural disasters.

I hope that my colleagues will do what they can to support the kind of assistance to south Dade County that will help these fellow Americans to get on their feet again so that they can again lead productive lives.

DEBT CEILING/BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, as we speak March Madness is taking place.

To many, this refers to the annual rite of the NCAA basketball tournament. Like many sports fans across the Nation, I am also enjoying the games being played between talented student athletes.

Today, however, I rise to speak of another kind of March madness—a madness within this Chamber. This madness is the impending vote to raise the debt ceiling—for the 33d time in 10 years.

This time, the debt ceiling will be temporarily raised by a quarter of a trillion dollars. And we've been told this will only last 6 months.

What we must insist on—before this vote—is the passage of a real line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment. I urge my colleagues to restore fiscal responsibility in Congress.

LEWIS F. POWELL, JR., COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today about Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr., a fine Virginia gentleman and a great American jurist. In 1987, Justice Powell resigned his seat on the U.S. Supreme Court after 15 years as an Associate Justice. Today the Virginia delegation wishes to honor him by sponsoring a bill to name the Federal Court Building in Richmond, VA, the Lewis F. Powell, Jr., Courthouse.

Educated at Washington and Lee University and Harvard Law School, Justice Powell was active in national legal affairs, serving as president of the American Bar Association and president of the American College of Trial Lawyers. While president of the ABA, Mr. Powell labored continuously to improve access to legal services by developing the program, Legal Services for the Poor.

In 1972, Lewis Powell became the first Virginian appointed to the Supreme Court since the Civil War. Justice Powell brought to the Court a careful, thoughtful, and pragmatic approach to the law. He strove not for grandiose principles or abstract legal concepts, but for the justice and fairness that each party sought and deserved.

Mr. Speaker, we are therefore proud to propose the name of Lewis F. Powell, Jr., as the name of the Federal Courthouse Building in Richmond, VA.

AN ADMINISTRATION BUILT ON DECEPTION WILL NOT SURVIVE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, an administration built on deception simply will not survive, and deception is exactly what we have so far from the Clinton administration. Let us look at some of them.

Deception No. 1, we are told that the 1980's were a terrible economic time. The truth is that it was the longest period of peacetime economic expansion in history. Our economy grew by one-third, an economy equal to the whole economy of West Germany.

Deception No. 2 told us that tax cuts for the rich led to huge deficits. The truth is that tax cuts for everyone produced more tax revenues, not less. We got more money out of the rich, and by the end of the decade the rich were contributing a greater percentage of tax revenues.

Deception No. 3, we are told that Bush and Reagan created the deficit. The truth is that Presidents do not create deficits; Congress creates deficits.

Deception No. 4, the economy is in terrible shape and we must have a stimulus package. The truth is that the economy is growing at a rate of 5 percent.

Deception No. 5, the plan to increase taxes and boost domestic spending is something new, the change that the people voted for last year. The truth is that this is the same old plan that has been pushed by the Democrats in this body for many, many years.

Abraham Lincoln had something to say about fooling the people, and the bottom line of it was that it will catch up with you eventually.

FUNDING FEDERAL MANDATES

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I hosted a breakfast recently with county commissioners from all around the State of Ohio. Whether they were Democrats or Republicans, urban or rural, they all voiced a similar message: Do not pass unfunded Federal mandates.

In the 102d Congress, 15 new Federal mandates became law. Already this year, we passed motor-voter legislation, a bill in which Washington takes credit for doing good, but will not shell out a penny to pay for it.

What do Federal mandates do to State governments. Medicaid costs in Ohio went up 18 percent last year. At

the same time, Federal Medicaid mandates of the past 2 years have cost all the States at least $38 billion, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. Ohio, which has a constitutional obligation to balance its budget, had to cut education 3 percent last year to make ends meet. This means the Federal Government has indirectly mandated cuts in school funding and other programs, while the Federal budget goes up. This is absolutely wrong and it must change.

Congress should fund all the new responsibilities that it hands down to State and local governments. Now we have the hypocrisy of laws that try to make Congress look good, at the expense of more competent governments that balance their budgets year after year.

HEARINGS ON RESIGNATIONS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that today I have written to the appropriate subcommittees of the Government Operations Committee and the Judiciary Committee, both of which I am a member of, asking them to hold hearings on the decisions of Attorney General Reno to request the resignations at one time of all of the U.S. attorneys. I have raised this question on hearings for two reasons.

First of all, it has been suggested publicly that this policy really had the purpose of stopping one investigation of a senior Member of this House of Representatives. In my opinion, we cannot leave such a suggestion unresolved, and the purpose of the hearing would be to invite those who claim they have some evidence that that was the purpose of this policy to come forward and testify, and of course to allow the Attorney General of the United States to respond.

Second, aside from any political allegations, I think the House of Representatives should look at the administrative effect of this kind of a policy decision. How will replacing all of the U.S. attorneys before their successors have even been nominated, much less confirmed, affect ongoing investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I say what is the rush?

RAISING DEBT CEILING IS IRRESPONSIBLE

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, this week we are scheduled to vote on an increase in the national debt. Some will argue that there is no choice, that we have already done what has been done and have to raise it. Others, say it is irresponsible and to vote "no."

Either way, the real measure of irresponsibility is the national debt. We can talk about the budget, and there is smoke and mirrors in it. We can talk about outlays and authorizations and investments, and sacrifice and real cuts, and no cuts, but the bottom line is the debt, and it continues to go up for you, and for me, and for every family in this country.

You can cover it however you wish. The debt really is the bottom line. And this debt, and this vote this week to increase the limit on the national debt demonstrates the need for changes procedurally.

Mr. Speaker, we need a balanced budget amendment so that we have some discipline, some responsibility in this House about spending. We need a line-item veto so that we can talk about pork, and take some things out of the packaged programs that no one has even had a chance to see. We need to reform this House.

THE EXCELLENT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BAKERSFIELD ROADRUNNERS

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge excellence. It is my pleasure to inform you that last Saturday, California State University Bakersfield, accomplished something that no other school in the history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association has ever achieved.

The Roadrunners, under the leadership of Athletic Director Rudy Carvajal and Coach Pat Douglass, played 33 basketball games; they took the floor at home and on the road 33 times and won all 33.

The historic 33d victory came at the birthplace of basketball—Springfield, MA, and was the championship game of the NCAA divisions II men's basketball tournament, played before a national network television audience.

Mr. Speaker, Bakersfield is rightfully proud of the Roadrunner players, Athletic Director Carvajal, Coach Douglass, and their record-setting 33–0 championship season.

□ 1530

WHY WE NEED TO PASS THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

(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, Ross Perot told the Small Business Committee last week that we absolutely must address the fundamental problems driving U.S. businesses overseas, especially excessive regulations and high tax rates.

Mr. Perot also acknowledged that low wages alone do not drive businesses to other countries.

In fact, one of the primary reasons companies are moving their operations overseas is high export barriers. Currently, the tariffs NAFTA would remove force businesses to establish operations in places like Tijuana—just to allow them to sell their goods in the Mexican market.

NAFTA would allow businesses to remain in the United States while taking advantage of growing markets in Canada and Mexico.

Exports accounted for 70 percent of GNP growth over the last 3 years. NAFTA will generate an added surge in exports—creating a net gain in American jobs, according to the overwhelming majority of economic studies.

Mr. Speaker, let us say "yes" to jobs for American workers, yes to open markets for U.S. goods, yes to a higher standard of living for Mexican workers.

Let us say "yes" to NAFTA.

TIMBER: A RENEWABLE RESOURCE

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, affordable housing is fast becoming an endangered species, and a part of the reason is that the price of lumber has gone skyrocketing.

This little piece of lumber which I hold in my hand, in October 1992, cost 6 cents. Now, in March 1993, this same piece of wood costs 13 cents. Can you imagine? It does not take a great mathematician to determine how much a new house would now cost as compared to what it would have cost in October 1992.

We hope that when President Clinton and Vice President GORE attend the timber summit soon to be held in Oregon that they take into consideration that artificial restraints on the full use of our natural resources like timber are foolhardy for us and for our future. Remember that timber, lumber, is a renewable resource, not one that we would drive out of existence. It is a renewable resource, and we need to use it.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, Ross Perot told the American people the other night that the American people were conned by the 1990 tax-and-spend increase bill passed by Congress and that the elected officials did not keep their promises to us that spending would be reduced. He said if the Democrats' tax-and-spend bill works exactly as planned, it would add another $1 trillion to the national debt in the next 4 years. And yet, the Democrats want to increase the debt ceiling this week.

The voters will no longer tolerate massive tax increases for the purpose of sustaining wasteful spending. Congress has a responsibility to exercise self-restraint by initiating a balanced budget amendment that will create spending caps and strong tax limitations. If Congress does not take the initiative to reduce the deficit by cutting spending, the American people will quickly shorten our tenure.

A large consensus of the Perot volunteers say, the condition the Federal Government must meet in order to get any more tax money from us is to reform itself; not raising the debt ceiling.

I do not doubt that the other 80 percent of American voters are echoing the same call to responsibility. After all, doesn't the Democrats' plan depend heavily on tax increases? How can the voters be sure that Members of Congress are not using increased revenues to sponsor more spending programs as they have in the past? How will voters know that the new plan is not a gimmick, leaving no net deficit reduction at all?

Mr. Speaker, the only way to assure that revenues are used to pay down the debt is to pass a balanced budget amendment.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY HAS GONE AWRY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the New York Times reported on its front page the following:

Many scientists, economists and government officials have reached the dismaying conclusion that much of America's environmental program has gone seriously awry. These experts say that in the last 15 years environmental policy has too often evolved largely in reaction to popular opinions, not in response to sound scientific analysis.

As a result, many scientists and public health specialists say billions of dollars are wasted each year in battling problems that are no longer considered dangerous.

Even the EPA, which loves these types of regulations and would understate their cost, says that environmental regulations now cost us $140 billion a year. Most of these are laws to which the New York Times said that Congress did not even give rudimentary cost-benefit analysis.

Most environmental activists are wealthy or at least upper income and thus are insulated from the economic harm their policies cause. But now, as the New York Times points out, environmental overkill has cost this Nation hundreds of billions. It has cost us millions of jobs. It has made everything much more expensive.

Environmental extremists have really hurt the poor and the working people of this country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). 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.

AUTHORIZING FBI TO OBTAIN CERTAIN TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBER INFORMATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 175) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to obtain certain telephone subscriber information.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 175

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

SECTION 1. REQUIRED CERTIFICATION.

Section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REQUIRED CERTIFICATION.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or his designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director, may—

"(1) request the name, address, length of service, and toll billing records of a person or entity if the Director (or his designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director) certifies in writing to the wire or electronic communication service provider to which the request is made that—

"(A) the name, address, length of service, and toll billing records sought are relevant to an authorized foreign counterintelligence investigation; and

"(B) there are specific and articulable facts giving reason to believe that the person or entity to whom the information sought pertains is a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801); and

"(2) request the name, address, and length of service of a person or entity if the Director (or his designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director) certifies in writing to the wire or electronic communication service provider to which the request is made that—

"(A) the information sought is relevant to an authorized foreign counterintelligence investigation; and

"(B) there are specific and articulable facts giving reason to believe that communication facilities registered in the name of the person or entity have been used, through the services of such provider, in communication with—

"(i) an individual who is engaging or has engaged in international terrorism as defined in section 101(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act or clandestine intelligence activities that involve or may involve a violation of the criminal statutes of the United States; or

"(ii) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power under circumstances giving reason to believe that the communication concerned international terrorism as defined in section 101(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act or clandestine intelligence activities that involve or may involve a violation of the criminal statutes of the United States.".

SEC. 2. REPORT TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEES.

Section 2709(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after "Senate" the following: ", and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] 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. 175 amends the Electronic Communications Privacy Act to permit the FBI to have access—without a court order—to name, address, and length of service information for certain phone subscribers. More specifically, it modestly expands the FBI's so-called national security letter access to phone company information regarding subscribers who are in contact with either first, terrorists or foreign intelligence officers, or second, any agent of a foreign power if the conversation concerns terrorism or illegal intelligence activities. The FBI must report its use of this authority to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

The language of this bill has been arrived at through discussions with the FBI over the past several years. The provisions of H.R. 175 are identical to a section included in the crime conference report in the 102d Congress.

I offer my special congratulations to Mr. EDWARDS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, for successfully taking the lead in negotiating this necessary, but carefully circumscribed provision. I also wish to recognize Mr. HYDE, ranking member of the subcommittee, for his good efforts on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to support H.R. 175.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will allow the Federal Bureau of Investiga-

tion to obtain telephone subscriber information relevant to an authorized foreign counterintelligence investigation in certain limited circumstances.

Under the Electronic Communication Privacy Act, the FBI has the authority to obtain the telephone toll records of a suspected agent of a foreign power or a suspected international terrorist. Often when the FBI receives the toll records, however, some of the numbers are unlisted and the phone company cannot reveal the name and address of the unlisted subscriber. This legislation will modestly expand the authority of the FBI by allowing them to obtain the names and addresses for the unlisted phone numbers only where there is reason to believe that the telephone conversation was with an individual engaged in international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate my support for this bill, but I do want to bring to the attention of the Members, and specifically to direct my comments to the chairman of the committee, that the request that was made by the Justice Department to consider this very legislation was well timed and very much necessary.

□ 1540

A similar request has been undertaken the last several years to do a similar thing with some parts of our domestic communications arena. The same Justice Department, albeit under different chieftains, has felt that where the communications industry has refused by their interpretation of the Communications Act to accord access to certain public information at a time of emergency without a court order, we have sought in legislation that we have introduced to at least allow the quick response by written request or by oral request for an emergency situation that arises from this type of situation.

The Justice Department has asked us to produce that. We have done so in the last several years.

Now, in the committee hearing that we had several days ago, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], very kindly acknowledged that a request that we would make for a separate proceeding to determine the merits of my legislation would be given consideration, and for that I am grateful.

I just simply want to point out that we have a tandem here. The Justice Department requests the legislation that is in front of us; the Justice Department has requested the legislation that I seek; the Justice Department feels there is a tremendous loophole that is being used by foreign entities in this case. The same kind of loophole exists as to domestic entities in ours. The tandem allows us to request the consideration that has already been accorded to us by the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill modestly expands the FBI's authority to obtain without a court order information identifying subscribers of unlisted telephone numbers. The language was carefully worked out among the FBI, the two Judiciary Committees and the two Intelligence Committees in the last Congress. I especially want to thank the House Intelligence Committee and its chairman, Mr. GLICKMAN, for their support and assistance on this important matter.

This bill is identical to legislation that was reported favorably by the subcommittee and full committee last Congress. The language passed the House twice, once as part of the crime bill and once freestanding. It also passed the Senate, but in a different vehicle, and never made it to the President's desk.

This bill is very relevant to the ongoing investigation of the World Trade Center bombing. It allows the FBI to identify persons in telephone contact with suspected foreign spies or terrorists. Normally, telephone toll records and information identifying subscribers with unlisted phone numbers are private and the phone company will not disclose the identity of the subscriber without a subpoena. This bill allows the FBI to obtain the identity of subscribers where there is a suspected link with espionage or terrorism.

It is a modest change, but one that is very important to the FBI. We have struck a careful balance between the needs of the FBI and the privacy of Americans.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 175, which concerns a matter within the jurisdiction of both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

H.R. 175 represents a very narrow and carefully drawn expansion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's authority to utilize the national security letter under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act [ECPA].

ECPA was enacted in 1986 to provide privacy protection to telephone subscriber information and toll billing records. In general, Government entities may only have access to this information, without the subscriber's consent, pursuant to a subpoena, court order or search warrant, and only if the information is relevant to a legitimate law enforcement inquiry. ECPA provides an exception for counterintelligence cases, however, and thus allows the FBI to obtain subscriber information and toll billing records where the FBI certifies in writing to the telephone company that the information sought is relevant to an authorized foreign counterintelligence investigation and the subscriber is believed to be a foreign power or agent of a foreign power.

A national security letter is an extraordinary device which allows the FBI to compel the production of information without the judicial review and the association with a criminal investigation normally required by law. Expansion of the reach of the national security letter is not to be undertaken lightly.

Nevertheless, in the last two Congresses, the FBI made a persuasive case to the Judiciary Committee on Civil and Constitutional Law and to the Intelligence Subcommittee on Legislation which I now chair, that the national security letter should be available in cases in which individuals contact suspected foreign intelligence officers or suspected terrorists, or where the substance of the conversation concerns international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities that may involve spying or an offer of sensitive information protected by law. These conversations in which individuals volunteer to commit espionage are not now covered by the national security letter exception. In fact, the FBI argues it might have been able to prevent the compromise of highly sensitive information given to the U.S.S.R. by Ronald Pelton, a former employee of the National Security Agency, if it had had this expanded authority.

The Subcommittee on Legislation held hearings on this issue in 1990 and 1991. The FBI originally proposed that phone companies be required to identify all persons who had been in touch with foreign powers or suspected agents of foreign powers. This language would have been too broad and not narrowly focused on the FBI's demonstrable needs.

The Intelligence Committee worked closely with the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Law to fashion an amendment to ECPA that would address the legitimate concerns of the FBI in a way that is sensitive to the dangers inherent in the national security letter exception. The legislation was originally included in the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1991, which was not enacted last year. Chairman EDWARDS and his staff are to be congratu-

lated on their leadership on this issue and their persistence in moving the negotiations and the legislation forward over several years.

H.R. 175 amends ECPA to allow the FBI to request the name, address, and length of service of a telephone subscriber where the FBI certifies in writing to the telephone company that the telephone service has been used to contact a suspected foreign intelligence officer or suspected terrorist, or the circumstances surrounding the conversation indicated that the conversation involved international terrorism or an offer to spy.

H.R. 175 is a delicate balance between our desire to give the FBI the means to fight terrorism and espionage and our responsibility to protect individuals from unreasonable intrusion by the Government. I assure my colleagues that the Intelligence Committee will continue vigorous oversight of the FBI's use of national security letters and urge their support for the legislation.

□ 1550

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] for yielding this time to me. I have had the privilege of serving on that committee as well and I compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] who has been a leader in this effort to draw the balance between giving the FBI the necessary law enforcement tools to deal with terrorism and espionage, at the same time protecting civil liberties. I think this bill reflects that compromise.

Mr. Speaker, monitoring the foreign counterintelligence and counterterrorism activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] is a responsibility shared by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Judiciary Committee.

The legislation now under consideration, H.R. 175, represents a resolution to a problem first brought to the committees' attention several years ago. Under existing law, the FBI has the ability, through use of a device known as a national security letter, to compel the production of telephone subscriber information and telephone billing records when the subscriber is believed to be a foreign power or agent of a foreign power, and the information is relevant to an authorized foreign counterintelligence investigation. The national security letter is not, however, currently available to assist in the identification of the users of telephone service when the service has been employed to contact a suspected foreign intelligence officer or suspected terrorist, or to conduct conversations involving terrorism or an offer to commit espionage.

In 1990 and 1991, the Intelligence Subcommittee on Legislation conducted hearings on an FBI request to expand the permissible use of the national security letter to cover all contacts with foreign powers or agents of foreign powers. Concerned that the Bureau's request was too broad to justify the utilization of an extrajudicial procedure like the national security letter, the subcommittee refused to endorse it. In the fall of 1991, however, hard work on the part of Chairman EDWARDS and his staff, and FBI representatives, resulted in a narrowing of the reach of the requested expansion, and a provision identical to H.R. 175 was made a part of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1991. That provision had the support of the Intelligence Committee, and H.R. 175 does as well.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must be vigilant in ensuring that the warrant requirements which normally apply to the nonconsensual production of information are not casually waived. In my judgment, the limited expansion of the national security letter exception provided by H.R. 175 does not constitute an unreasonable intrusion into constitutionally protected individual rights and liberties. It is a measured addition to the tools available to the FBI to deter terrorism and espionage, and it deserves the support of the House.

Mr. HYDE. 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. MONTGOMERY). 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. 175.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. 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.

DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 829) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize funds received by States and units of local government to be expended to improve the quality and availability of DNA records; to authorize the establishment of a DNA identification index; and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 829

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 "DNA Identification Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FUNDING TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND AVAILABILITY OF DNA ANALYSES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES.

(a) DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (20) by striking "and" at the end,

(2) in paragraph (21) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and", and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(22) developing or improving in a forensic laboratory a capability to analyze deoxyribonucleic acid (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'DNA') for identification purposes.".

(b) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Section 503(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) If any part of a grant made under this part is to be used to develop or improve a DNA analysis capability in a forensic laboratory, a certification that—

"(A) DNA analyses performed at such laboratory will satisfy or exceed then current standards for a quality assurance program for DNA analysis, issued by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 3 of the DNA Identification Act of 1993;

"(B) DNA samples obtained by, and DNA analyses performed at, such laboratory will be accessible only—

"(i) to criminal justice agencies for law enforcement identification purposes;

"(ii) for criminal defense purposes, to a defendant, who shall have access to samples and analyses performed in connection with the case in which such defendant is charged; or

"(iii) if personally identifiable information is removed, for a population statistics database, for identification research and protocol development purposes, or for quality control purposes; and

"(C) such laboratory, and each analyst performing DNA analyses at such laboratory, will undergo, at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days, external proficiency testing by a DNA proficiency testing program meeting the standards issued under section 3 of the DNA Identification Act of 1993.".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(11) There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1998 $10,000,000 for grants to the States for DNA analysis.".

SEC. 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PROFICIENCY TESTING STANDARDS.

(a) PUBLICATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PROFICIENCY TESTING STANDARDS.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall appoint an advisory board on DNA quality assurance methods. The Director shall appoint members of the board from among nominations proposed by the head of the National Academy of Sciences and professional societies of crime laboratory officials. The advisory board shall include as members scientists from state and local forensic laboratories, molecular geneticists and population geneticists not affiliated with a forensic laboratory, and a representative from the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The advisory board shall develop, and if appropriate, periodically revise,

recommended standards for quality assurance, including standards for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analyses of DNA.

(2) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after taking into consideration such recommended standards, shall issue (and revise from time to time) standards for quality assurance, including standards for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analyses of DNA.

(3) The standards described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall specify criteria for quality assurance and proficiency tests to be applied to the various types of DNA analyses used by forensic laboratories. The standards shall also include a system for grading proficiency testing performance to determine whether a laboratory is performing acceptably.

(4) Until such time as the advisory board has made recommendations to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director has acted upon those recommendations, the quality assurance guidelines adopted by the technical working group on DNA analysis methods shall be deemed the Director's standards for purposes of this section.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.—For administrative purposes, the advisory board appointed under subsection (a) shall be considered an advisory board to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply with respect to the advisory board appointed under subsection (a). The board shall cease to exist on the date 5 years after the initial appointments are made to the board, unless the existence of the board is extended by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 4. INDEX TO FACILITATE LAW ENFORCEMENT EXCHANGE OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may establish an index of—

(1) DNA identification records of persons convicted of crimes;

(2) analyses of DNA samples recovered from crime scenes; and

(3) analyses of DNA samples recovered from unidentified human remains.

(b) CONTENT OF INDEX.—Such index may include only information on DNA identification records and DNA analyses that are—

(1) based on analyses performed in accordance with publicly available standards that satisfy or exceed the guidelines for a quality assurance program for DNA analysis, issued by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 3 of the DNA Identification Act of 1993;

(2) prepared by laboratories, and DNA analysts, that undergo, at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days, external proficiency testing by a DNA proficiency testing program meeting the standards issued under section 3 of the DNA Identification Act of 1993; and

(3) maintained by Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies pursuant to rules that allow disclosure of stored DNA samples and DNA analyses only—

(A) to criminal justice agencies for law enforcement identification purposes;

(B) for criminal defense purposes, to a defendant, who shall have access to samples and analyses performed in connection with the case in which such defendant is charged; or

(C) if personally identifiable information is removed, for a population statistics database, for identification research and protocol development purposes, or for quality control purposes.

(c) EXCHANGE SUBJECT TO CONCELLATION.—The exchange of records authorized by this section is subject to cancellation if the quality control and privacy requirements described in subsection (b) of this section are not met.

SEC. 5. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

(a) PROFICIENCY TESTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GENERALLY.—Personnel at the Federal Bureau of Investigation who perform DNA analyses shall undergo, at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days, external proficiency testing by a DNA proficiency testing program meeting the standards issued under section 3(a). Within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall arrange for periodic blind external tests to determine the proficiency of DNA analysis performed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation laboratory. As used in this paragraph, the term "blind external test" means a test that is presented to the laboratory through a second agency and appears to the analysts to involve routine evidence.

(2) REPORT.—For five years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and Senate an annual report on the results of each of the tests referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) PRIVACY PROTECTION STANDARDS.—

(1) GENERALLY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the results of DNA tests performed for a Federal law enforcement agency for law enforcement purposes may be disclosed only—

(A) to criminal justice agencies for law enforcement identification purposes; or

(B) for criminal defense purposes, to a defendant, who shall have access to samples and analyses performed in connection with the case in which such defendant is charged.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If personally identifiable information is removed, test results may be disclosed for a population statistics database, for identification research and protocol development purposes, or for quality control purposes.

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—(1) Whoever—

(A) by virtue of employment or official position, has possession of, or access to, individually identifiable DNA information indexed in a database created or maintained by any Federal law enforcement agency; and

(B) willfully discloses such information in any manner to any person or agency not entitled to receive it;

shall be fined not more than $100,000.

(2) Whoever, without authorization, willfully obtains DNA samples or individually identifiable DNA information indexed in a database created or maintained by any Federal law enforcement agency shall be fined not more than $100,000.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Bureau of Investigation $4,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 through 1998 to carry out sections 3, 4, and 5 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 Illinois [Mr. HYDE] 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 require.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 829, the DNA Identification Act of 1993, is a timely piece of legislation that draws upon the crime-solving breakthrough technology of DNA. While encouraging the use of such technology, the legislation also ensures that DNA testing will be subject to rigorous quality standards and strict confidentiality requirements.

DNA analysis allows law enforcement officials to use blood or hair samples from a crime site to determine the genetic code of the perpetrator. This code is then matched against the code of a suspect. Since each person has a unique code, a match is an extremely reliable indicator of identification.

H.R. 829 authorizes $10 million per year for grants to States for establishing laboratories to perform high quality DNA analysis. Receipt of funds is contingent on compliance with an FBI quality assurance program, proficiency testing and privacy restrictions which limit access to DNA samples to law enforcement purposes. The FBI is authorized to establish a DNA database with privacy restrictions and can receive $4.5 million per year to implement the DNA program.

Mr. EDWARDS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, deserves great credit for bringing forward this innovative and promising and practical legislation that will materially aid in crime solving. Mr. HYDE, ranking member of the subcommittee, also deserves credit for his work in full support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support H.R. 829.

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

Mr. Speaker, when properly performed, DNA analysis has proven an extremely effective investigative tool in the criminal justice process. As DNA technology is increasingly employed in the courtroom, however, there has been growing concern over issues of quality assurance and standards for conducting DNA testing. H.R. 829 will guarantee that needed quality assurance standards are developed and implemented.

This legislation directs the FBI to appoint an advisory board to develop and recommend standards for quality assurance and for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories. It authorizes funds for State and local governments to develop and improve their ability to perform DNA analysis for forensic purposes. Laboratories receiving such funds will be required to undergo external proficiency testing twice a year and comply with the standards to be issued by the FBI's advisory board.

In addition, the legislation authorizes the FBI to establish an index of DNA identification records of persons convicted of crimes and of DNA samples recovered from crime scenes and unidentified human remains. This index, containing previously analyzed samples, will allow DNA recovered from the scene of a crime to be searched against stored DNA profiles of known offenders. DNA profiles contained in the index will be required to meet quality control and privacy standards.

In conclusion, H.R. 829 will guarantee that DNA analysis will be an accurate

and reliable tool for courtroom use. I urge its adoption.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] for his excellent summation of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to promote law enforcement use of DNA to identify violent offenders, while ensuring that this technology is used with sound quality control and privacy safeguards. This is a very important new tool for law enforcement and deserves our support.

H.R. 829 is essentially identical to legislation that was reported favorably by the full committee last Congress. The language passed the House twice, once as part of the crime bill and once free-standing. It also passed the Senate, but never made it to the President.

The bill is supported by the FBI and by the association of State crime laboratory directors. The bill authorizes Federal funding for State and local governments to establish or improve DNA labs; requires the FBI to obtain outside advice from a range of experts; and authorizes the FBI is establish a national index of DNA profiles of convicted offenders, subject to minimum quality control and privacy standards. The bill requires that forensic DNA laboratories receiving Federal funds or participating in the Federal database subscribe to a regular proficiency testing program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the bill.

I thank the members of the subcommittee and the members of the staff, both Republicans and Democrats, for their aid in putting the bill together. I believe that it will have no problem in the Senate. I think that we are all going to be ahead in the important areas of criminal matters when this becomes law.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker—we hear about it every day on the news—another mugging, another brutal rape, another vicious murder. We live in the city with the highest murder rate in the Nation. Violent crime is on the increase everywhere. Yet, too often these crimes go unpunished. Well, this has got to stop. The passage of the DNA Identification Act is vital if we are to give our law enforcement officials the tools necessary to catch and convict criminals.

DNA fingerprinting, when done properly, is an amazing tool. By mapping an individual's genetic code, a criminal can be identified as certainly as with a fingerprint. What is especially impressive is the ability to take this genetic information from the smallest fragment of hair, skin, or body fluid. Just think of the enhanced ability of law enforcement to identify, catch, and convict violent offenders if this technology were in wide use.

Because it is such a new device for law enforcement, the only concern about this tool is the reliability of laboratories providing DNA analysis. By passing the DNA Identification Act, we will go far in making the use of this tool as acceptable and common in the courts as the use of fingerprints is today.

The bill requires the FBI, the leading expert on DNA identification, to assist States in improving their DNA analysis and recordkeeping. The bill also helps States acquire reliable DNA-testing equipment. At the same time, this bill protects against abuses in the use of DNA samples.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in peril from the rampant and violent crime in our streets. Congress has the duty to take action now to provide our brave law enforcement officials with the tools they need to make our streets safe. DNA fingerprinting technology is one of those tools. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 829, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. 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.

□ 1600

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.

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

There was no objection.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO THE VETERANS HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1992

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 662) to amend title 38, United States Code, and title XIX of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections relating to the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 662

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE PRICE OF DRUGS PURCHASED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8126 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 603 of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "preceding such date";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "for calendar quarters", and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "preceding the month during which the contract goes into effect"; and

(ii) by striking "increased by" and inserting "multiplied by";

(3) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

"(1) during any one-year period that follows the first year for which the contract is in effect, the contract price charged for the drug may not exceed the contract price charged during the preceding one-year period, increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (U.S. city average) during the 12-month period ending with the last month of such preceding one-year period for which Consumer Price Index data is available; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection;

"(i)(1) If the Secretary modifies a multi-year contract described in subsection (d) to include a covered drug of the manufacturer that was not available for inclusion under the contract at the time the contract went into effect, the price of the drug shall be determined as follows:

"(A) For the portion of the first contract year during which the drug is so included, the price of the drug shall be determined in accordance with subsection (a)(2), except that the reference in such subsection to 'the one-year period beginning on the date the agreement takes effect' shall be considered a reference to such portion of the first contract year.

"(B) For any subsequent contract year, the price of the drug shall be determined in accordance with subsection (d), except that each reference in such subsection to 'the first year for which the contract is in effect' shall be considered a reference to the portion of the first contract year during which the drug is included under the contract.

"(2) In this subsection, the term 'contract year' means any one-year period for which a multi-year contract described in subsection (d) is in effect.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 603 of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF BUDGET NEUTRALITY ADJUSTMENT FOR MEDICAID PRESCRIPTION DRUG REBATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1927(c)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-8(c)(1)(B)(ii)(II)), as amended by section 601(c) of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992, is amended by striking "drug;" and inserting the following: "drug, except that for the calendar quarter beginning after September 30, 1992, and before January 1, 1993, the amount of the rebate may not exceed 50 percent of such average manufacturer price;".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 601(c) of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress enacted important legislation to control skyrocketing drug costs charged to the Department of Veterans Affairs and other Federal purchasers. This legislation was the result of a very productive relationship between our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate. Chairman JAY ROCKEFELLER played a major role in getting the bill enacted into law, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] of our Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Despite its simple purpose, the law required some very complex drafting, and we have found two technical matters that need to be clarified or corrected. This bill would correct those mistakes. It would clarify the language limiting how much drug prices paid by VA could increase each year, and would more clearly address the pricing of drugs that are added to a multiyear contract.

The bill would also give the Secretary of Veterans Affairs greater flexibility in calculating the price of new drugs by allowing consideration of prices paid after the drug is first available.

Section 2 of the bill is an amendment which the committees with jurisdiction over the Medicaid Program wanted to include in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 622, which was adopted by the Senate last Thursday under a unanimous consent request.

This legislation would make technical corrections to title VI of the Veterans' Health Care Act of 1992, Public Law 102-585.

With respect to Medicaid, the Veterans' Health Care Act inadvertently eliminated a ceiling on amount of the best-price rebate which participating drug manufacturers were required to pay during the last quarter of calendar year 1992.

In order to receive Federal Medicaid matching funds for their drugs, manufacturers must agree to give rebates to the States and the Federal Government. These rebates are determined on the basis of the best price available for the drug to any domestic purchaser. During 1992, the law provides for a ceiling on the amount of the rebate that a manufacturer is required to pay on any given drug, set at 50 percent of the average manufacturer price of the drug.

Under the 1990 legislation which established the rebate program, this ceiling was to be in place through December 31, 1992. However, in the course of raising the minimum rebate percentage effective October 1, 1992, the Veterans Health Care Act inadvertently eliminated the 50-percent ceiling on that same date, leaving manufacturers with steeply discounted products without protection for the last quarter of that calendar year. Section 2 of the legislation before us today corrects this error and restores the 50-percent limit for the period October 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992.

I want to emphasize that the amendments made by this legislation are to be treated as if they were enacted at the time of, and not subsequent to, the enactment of Public Law 102-585. Thus, section 1927(a)(6)(B) of the Social Security Act, which prohibits the Secretary of HHS from taking into account any amendments enacted subsequent to the enactment of Public Law 102-585, simply does not apply to the amendments before us today. I and the other sponsors expect that the Secretary of HHS will take today's amendments into account in determining whether a master agreement between the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and a manufacturer meets the requirements of section 8126 of title 38.

This legislation has been reviewed by the Congressional Budget Office and will have no effect on Federal Medicaid outlays because CBO did not assume any savings from this error when Public Law 102-585 was scored. However, according to CBO, if we do not enact this legislation before the approval of the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution, then the CBO baseline will change to reflect the conference report baseline, and restoring the 50-percent ceiling will be scored as a cost.

I want to thank Chairman MONTGOMERY, Chairman DINGELL, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. STUMP, and their staffs for their cooperation in expediting the passage of this legislation.

I know of no opposition to this bill. It has the support of the Department of Health and Human Services. I urge my colleagues to approve Chairman MONTGOMERY's motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 662.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. It has been a pleasure working with him on this legislation. He certainly helped the veterans and helped us on our pharmaceutical prices.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 662, which contains proposed technical corrections to the VA drug pricing legislation enacted last year in Public Law 102-585.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs working with the Energy and Commerce Committee enacted Public Law 102-585 in order to reverse a trend of rising pharmaceutical prices being experienced by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Thus far, the legislation is working quite well. I am told that as a whole, the pharmaceutical industry has been very cooperative and VA is experiencing reasonable drug prices.

The bill we have before us today simply adds corrective technical language in order to avert potential problems that may arise in the future. The language is included at the request of the Department of Veterans Affairs and will not have a significantly negative effect on the pharmaceutical industry. For this reason, I know of no objection to passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], who is the ranking minority member on this subcommittee, for his support and for working this legislation through. Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the amendments affecting the Secretary of Veterans Affairs' authority would take effect as if included in Public Law 102-585. The reason I mention this is because that law gave the Secretary of Health and Human Services limited authority to disregard subsequent amendments to Public Law 102-585 in determining whether a manufacturer was in compliance with the drug price limitations found in title XIX of the Social Security Act. It is Congress' desire to require the Secretary to take the changes made by this law into account when determining whether a manufacturer is in compliance with the law, so we have made the changes effective as if they had been a part of the original law. I am not aware of any opposition to the changes we are proposing on either side of the aisle. I am also informed that the drug manufacturers are in favor of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on S. 662, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 662.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that proceedings will resume on this question, and on any others that may subsequently be postponed today, on tomorrow, Tuesday, March 30, 1993.

IDAHO LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1993

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 252) to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 252

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 "Idaho Land Exchange Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. TARGHEE NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundaries of the Targhee National Forest are adjusted as generally depicted on the map entitled "Targhee National Forest Proposed Boundary Changes" and dated March 1, 1991.

(b) Map and Legal Descriptions.—

(1) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The map described in subsection (a) and a legal description of the lands depicted on the map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Regional Office of the Intermountain Regions of the Forest Service.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") may correct clerical and typographical errors.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For the purpose of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*-9), the boundaries of the Targhee National Forest, as adjusted by this Act, shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Forest as of January 1, 1965.

SEC. 3. CLARK FORK LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, over the 12 years prior to the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the University of Idaho has utilized the Clark Fork Ranger Station within the Kaniksu National Forest as the Clark Fork Field Campus, under a Granger-Thye permit; and

(2) the University of Idaho has made substantial improvements in order to maintain and utilize the buildings as a campus facility.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) PARCEL A.—The term "Parcel A" means the approximately 35.27 acres comprising the Clark Fork Ranger Station within the Kaniksu National Forest, as depicted on the map entitled "Clark Fork Land Exchange—Parcel A" and dated July 1, 1991.

(2) PARCEL B.—The term "Parcel B" means the approximately 40 acres depicted on the map entitled "Clark Fork Land Exchange—Parcel B" and dated July 1, 1991.

(c) LAND EXCHANGES.—

(1) CONVEYANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—In exchange for the conveyance described in paragraph (2) and subject to easements that are considered necessary by the Secretary for public and administrative access and to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the State of Idaho, acting through the Regents of the University of Idaho, all right, title, and interest of the United States to Parcel A.

(2) CONVEYANCE BY THE STATE OF IDAHO.—In exchange for the conveyance described in paragraph (1) and subject to valid existing rights of record acceptable to the Secretary, the State of Idaho shall convey to the Secretary, by general warranty deed in accordance with Department of Justice title standards, all right, title, and interest to Parcel B.

(3) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The maps described in subsection (b) and the legal descriptions of the lands depicted on the maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Regional Office of the Northern Region of the Forest Service.

(B) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—The maps and legal descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors.

(d) LAND VALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the lands exchanged between the United States and the State of Idaho, as authorized by subsection (c), are not of equal value, the values shall be equalized in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The value of the improvements made by the University of Idaho on Parcel A under the Granger-Thye permit shall be excluded from consideration in a valuation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

(e) NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon acquisition of Parcel B the United States, the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest shall be adjusted to include Parcel B.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For the purpose of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*-9), the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest, as adjusted by this Act, shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Forest as of January 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 252, the Idaho Land Exchange Act, passed the Senate on March 17, 1993. The legislation authorizes two land exchanges involving national forest lands in Idaho. The bill is similar to a measure, H.R. 235, introduced by Representative LAROCCO, which was favorably reported from the Committee on Natural Resources.

The first exchange dealt with by the legislation involves the Targhee National Forest in southeastern Idaho. The Forest Service has negotiated an equal value land exchange with the State of Idaho whereby the Forest Service would give up approximately 1,900 acres in an isolated tract in exchange for approximately 1,600 acres of State lands which include inholdings, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and recreational lands adjacent to the Island Park Reservoir. The exchange would enable the State to consolidate its holdings within Harriman State Park.

S. 252 does not specifically authorize this exchange, but simply expands the boundary of the Targhee National Forest so that the Forest Service can accomplish this and other potential exchanges administratively.

The second exchange involves the Kaniksu National Forest, which is part of the Idaho Panhandle National Forest in northern Idaho. The Kaniksu includes the Clark Fork Ranger Station near Clark Fork, ID. In 1973, the Forest Service stopped using the station as an administrative site and the building fell into disrepair. In 1978, the University of Idaho received a permit from the Forest Service to use the buildings as a field campus, which continues to be the use of the site. Since 1978, the university has invested $527,000 of its own funds in capital improvements, maintenance, and caretaker/operation expenses.

The Forest Service has negotiated a land exchange with the University of Idaho whereby the Forest Service would transfer the 35 acres comprising the Clark Fork Ranger Station to the University of Idaho in exchange for 40 acres of forest land owned by the university. By discounting the $500,000 the university has invested in the building, the exchange is approximately of equal value. Because the Forest Service does not have the authority to do this type of discounting and because the lands it would be acquiring are outside the national forest boundary, legislation is needed to complete the exchange.

These provisions are noncontroversial and the administration has testified in favor of the legislation. Mr.

Speaker, I should also note that the bill is similar to a measure passed by the House in the 102d Congress on which action was not completed prior to adjournment. Favorable consideration by the House today will complete action on the measure. I know of no controversy with legislation and urge its passage by the House.

□ 1610

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 252 which was introduced by Senator LARRY CRAIG and is identical to legislation sponsored by Mr. LAROCCO. This legislation, which has been fully explained by Chairman VENTO, is identical to legislation that was not enacted last year only because of the rush to adjournment in early October.

S. 252 is necessary to allow the Forest Service to complete two land exchanges in Idaho. This legislation is supported by the entire Idaho congressional delegation. In fact, S. 252 already passed the other body earlier this month.

I would like to thank Chairman VENTO for his expeditious consideration of this bill which is noncontroversial and was worked out last year. I am optimistic that we can bring other bills that fit in the same category to the floor in the next several months.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 252.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this measure involves two parcels in Idaho that are going out of two separate forests. They are measures important to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCCO]. I know of concern to some was that we would have an unequal exchange in one case, but I think I have adequately explained that. This is not unusual where a State or others have invested considerable dollars on a public facility that happens to be on National Forest Service land. So that is the only part that I believe would raise any questions.

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

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 252, which would authorize an equal-value exchange of land and property between the U.S. Forest Service and the University of Idaho in my district. This bill would also provide for a boundary adjustment on the Targhee National Forest.

I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee, Mr. VENTO, for the prompt attention given to H.R. 235, the companion bill which I introduced on January 5. Much work was completed during the last Congress to perfect this legislation, which will benefit both the University of Idaho and the Forest Service.

The former Clark Fork Ranger Station, which the Forest Service stopped using in 1973, has been leased by the University of Idaho since 1978 and used as a field campus for teaching, research, and outreach service for north Idaho communities.

The university has spent more than $500,000 for maintenance and capital improvements, and has constructed several buildings, and upgraded the water system, roadways, and sewer and power systems.

Although the Targhee National Forest is not in my district, this boundary adjustment is noncontroversial and simply joined with the Clark Fork measure when it was introduced. Both the Clark Fork exchange and the Targhee National Forest boundary adjustment passed the House and Senate in the last days of the 102d Congress, but time ran out before final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCCO] for his work on this measure. The gentleman has done a good job and the Idaho delegation has unified on this issue.

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 gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 252.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CUSTER NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 164) to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest, and for other purposes.

The clerk read as follows:

S. 164

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

SECTION 1. SIOUX RANGER DISTRICT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate national forest lands", approved March 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 485 et seq.), and in exchange for national forest lands in Custer National Forest, the Secretary of Agriculture may accept title to any lands located within 5 miles of the exterior boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest that are not owned by the United States and that are found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes.

(b) INCORPORTION INTO CUSTER NATIONAL FOREST.—Upon acceptance of the title by the Secretary of Agriculture, lands conveyed to the United States in accordance with subsection (a) shall become part of Custer National Forest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on S. 164, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 164, which passed the Senate on March 17, 1993, is identical to a bill (H.R. 720) which was introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and favorably reported from the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 164 would give the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of the Custer National Forest the same 5-mile boundary extension authority that has been given to the rest of the national forest lands in South Dakota. This authority would allow the Forest Service to acquire lands through land exchanges within 5 miles of the exterior boundaries of the national forest and then add the lands to the national forest. Several other national forests in the West have similar authority.

The immediate result of this legislation would be to allow an exchange negotiated by the Forest Service with the Cave Hills Cattle Co., Inc., to proceed, which would add to the national forest 440 acres of riparian wildlife habitat in exchange for 800 acres of Forest Service lands with little or no water. The parcels have been appraised and this would be an equal value exchange. This legislation would also facilitate future land exchanges as well.

Mr. Speaker, identical legislation passed the House in the 102d Congress but action on the measure was not completed prior to adjournment.

The bill before the House today is noncontroversial and is supported by the administration. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 164 which is identical to H.R. 720 that was introduced by our colleague from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and was reported out of the House Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 164 would give the Sioux Ranger District of the Custer National Forest in South Dakota permanent authority to extend its boundaries 5 miles to allow for land exchanges. This is the same boundary authority that all other national forest lands currently have in South Dakota.

This legislation is identical to legislation that passed the House last year and was not enacted because of our rush to adjournment. It is supported by the entire South Dakota congressional delegation.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 164.

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

Mr. VENTO. 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 Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 164.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STOCK RAISING HOMESTEAD ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 239) to amend the Stock Raising Homestead Act to resolve certain problems regarding subsurface estates, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 239

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

SECTION 1. MINING CLAIMS ON STOCK RAISING HOMESTEAD ACT LANDS.

(a) MINERAL ENTRY UNDER THE STOCK RAISING HOMESTEAD ACT.—Section 9 of the Act of December 29, 1916, entitled "An Act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes" (43 U.S.C. 29), is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(b) EXPLORATION; LOCATION OF MINING CLAIMS; NOTICES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a) and any other provision of law to the contrary, after the effective date of this subsection no person other than the surface owner may enter lands subject to this Act to explore for, or to locate, a mining claim on such lands without—

"(i) filing a notice of intention to locate a mining claim pursuant to paragraph (2); and

"(ii) providing notice to the surface owner pursuant to paragraph (3).

"(B) Any person who has complied with the requirements referred to in subparagraph (A) may, during the authorized exploration period, in order to locate a mining claim, enter lands subject to this Act to undertake mineral activities related to exploration that cause no more than a minimal disturbance of surface resources and do not involve the use of mechanized earthmoving equipment, explosives, the construction of roads, drill pads, or the use of toxic or hazardous materials.

"(C) The authorized exploration period referred to in subparagraph (B) shall begin 30 days after notice is provided under paragraph (3) with respect to lands subject to such notice and shall end with the expiration of the 90-day period referred to in paragraph (2)(A) or any extension provided under paragraph (2).

"(2) NOTICE OF INTENTION TO LOCATE A MINING CLAIM.—Any person seeking to locate a mining claim on lands subject to this Act in order to engage in the mineral activities relating to exploration referred to under paragraph (1)(B) shall file with the Secretary of the Interior a notice of intention to locate a claim on the lands concerned. The notice shall be in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe. The notice shall contain the name and mailing address of the person filing the notice and a legal description of the lands to which the notice applies. The legal description shall be based on the public land survey or on such other description as is sufficient to permit the Secretary to record the notice on the land status records of the Secretary. Whenever any person has filed a notice under this paragraph with respect to any lands, during the 90-day period following the date of such filing, or any extension thereof pursuant to this paragraph, no other person (including the surface owner) may—

"(A) file such a notice with respect to any portions of such lands;

"(B) explore for minerals or locate a mining claim on any portion of such lands; or

"(C) file an application to acquire any interest in any portion of such lands pursuant to section 209 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1719).

If, within such 90-day period, the person who filed a notice under this paragraph files a plan of operations with the Secretary pursuant to subsection (f), such 90-day period shall be extended until the approval or disapproval of the plan by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (f).

"(3) NOTICE TO SURFACE OWNER.—Any person who has filed a notice of intention to locate a mining claim under paragraph (2) for any lands subject to this Act shall provide written notice of such filing, by registered or certified mail with return receipt, to the surface owner (as evidenced by local tax records) of the lands covered by the notice under paragraph (2). The notice shall be provided at least 30 days before entering such lands and shall contain each of the following:

"(A) A brief description of the proposed mineral activities.

"(B) A map and legal description of the lands to be subject to mineral exploration.

"(C) The name, address and phone number of the person managing such activities.

"(D) A statement of the dates on which such activities will take place.

"(4) ACREAGE LIMITATIONS.—The total acreage covered at any time by notices of intention to locate a mining claim under paragraph (2) filed by any person and by affiliates of such person may not exceed 6,400 acres of lands subject to this Act in any one State and 1,280 acres of such lands for a single surface owner. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'affiliate' means, with respect to any person, any other person which controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, such person.

"(c) CONSENT.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) and any other provision of law, after the effective date of this subsection no person may engage in the conduct of mineral activities (other than those relating to exploration referred to in subsection (b)(1)B)) on a mining claim located on lands subject to this Act without the written consent of the surface owner thereof unless the Secretary has authorized the conduct of such activities under subsection (d).

"(d) AUTHORIZED MINERAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall authorize a person to conduct mineral activities (other than those relating to exploration referred to in subsection (b)(1)(B)) on lands subject to this Act without the consent of the surface owner thereof if such person complies with the requirements of subsections (e) and (f).

"(e) BOND.—(1) Before the Secretary may authorize any person to conduct mineral activities the Secretary shall require such person to post a bond or other financial guarantee in an amount to insure the completion of reclamation pursuant to this Act. Such bond or other financial guarantee shall ensure—

"(A) payment to the surface owner, after the completion of such mineral activities and reclamation, compensation for any permanent damages to crops and tangible improvements of the surface owner that resulted from mineral activities; and

"(B) payment to the surface owner of compensation for any permanent loss of income of the surface owner due to loss or impairment of grazing, or other uses of the land by the surface owner to the extent that reclamation required by the plan of operations would not permit such uses to continue at the level existing prior to the commencement of mineral activities.

"(2) In determining the bond amount to cover permanent loss of income under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall consider, where appropriate, the potential loss of value due to the estimated permanent reduction in utilization of the land.

"(f) PLAN OR OPERATIONS.—(1) Before the Secretary may authorize any person to conduct mineral activities on lands subject to this Act, the Secretary shall require such person to submit a plan of operations. Such plan shall include procedures for—

"(A) the minimization of damages to crops and tangible improvements of the surface owner;

"(B) the minimization of disruption to grazing or other uses of the land by the surface owner; and

"(C) payment of a fee for the use of surface during mineral activities equivalent to the loss of income to the ranch operation as established pursuant to subsection (g).

"(2) The Secretary shall provide a copy of the proposed plan of operations to the surface owner at least 45 days prior to the date the Secretary makes a determination as to whether such plan complies with the require-

ments of this subsection. During such 45-day period the surface owner may submit comments and recommend modifications to the proposed plan of operations to the Secretary.

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall, within 60 days of receipt of the plan, approve the plan of operations if it complies with the requirements of this Act, including each of the following:

"(i) The proposed plan of operations is complete and accurate.

"(ii) The person submitting the proposed plan of operations has demonstrated that all other applicable Federal and State requirements have been met.

"(B) The Secretary shall notify the person submitting a plan of operations of any modifications to such plan required to bring it into compliance with the requirements of this Act. If the person submitting the plan agrees to modify such plan in a manner acceptable to the Secretary, the Secretary shall approve the plan as modified. In the event no agreement can be reached on the modifications to the plan which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will bring such plan into compliance with the requirements of this Act, then the Secretary shall disapprove the plan and notify both the surface owner and the person submitting the plan of the decision.

"(C) The 60-day period referred to in subparagraph (A) may be extended by the Secretary where additional time is required to comply with other applicable requirements of law.

"(D) The Secretary shall suspend or revoke a plan of operation whenever the Secretary determines, on the Secretary's own motion or on a motion made by the surface owner, that the person conducting mineral activities is in substantial noncompliance with the terms and conditions of an approved plan of operations and has failed to remedy a violation after notice from the Secretary within the time required by the Secretary.

"(4) Final approval of a plan of operations under this subsection shall be conditioned upon compliance with subsections (e) and (g).

"(g) FEE.—The fee referred to in subsection (f)(1) shall be—

"(1) paid to the surface owner by the person submitting the plan of operations;

"(2) paid in advance of any mineral activities or at such other time or times as may be agreed to by the surface owner and the person conducting such activities; and

"(3) established by the Secretary taking into account the acreage involved and the degree of potential disruption to existing surface uses during mineral activities (including the loss of income to the surface owner and such surface owner's operations due to the loss or impairment of existing surface uses for the duration of the mineral activities), except that such fee shall not exceed the fair market value for the surface of the land.

"(h) RECLAMATION.—Lands affected by mineral activities under a plan of operations approved pursuant to subsection (f)(3) shall be reclaimed, to the maximum extent practicable, to a condition capable of supporting the uses to which such lands were capable of supporting prior to surface disturbance. Reclamation shall proceed as contemporaneously as practicable with the conduct of mineral activities.

"(i) STATE LAW.—(1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting any reclamation, bonding, inspection, enforcement, air or water quality standard or requirement of any State law or regulation which may be applicable to mineral activities on lands subject to this Act to the extent that such law or regulation is not inconsistent with this title.

"(2) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting in any way the right of any person to enforce or protect, under applicable law, the interest of such person in water resources affected by mineral activities.

"(j) INSPECTIONS.—Should any surface owner of land subject to this Act have reason to believe that they are or may be adversely affected by mineral activities due to any violation of the terms and conditions of a plan of operations approved under subsection (f), such surface owner may request an inspection of such lands. The Secretary shall determine within 10 days of the receipt of the request whether the request states a reason to believe that a violation exists, except in the event the surface owner alleges and provides reason to believe that an imminent danger exists, the 10-day period shall be waived and the inspection conducted immediately. When an inspection is conducted under this paragraph, the Secretary shall notify the surface owner and such surface owner shall be allowed to accompany the inspector on the inspection.

"(k) DAMAGES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY.—(1) Whenever the surface owner of any land subject to this Act has suffered any permanent damages to crops or tangible improvements of the surface owner, or any permanent loss of income due to loss or impairment of grazing, or other uses of the land by the surface owner, if such damages or loss result from—

"(A) any mineral activity undertaken without the consent of the surface owner under subsection (c) or an authorization by the Secretary under subsection (d); or

"(B) the failure of the person conducting mineral activities to remedy to the satisfaction of the Secretary any substantial noncompliance with the terms and conditions of a plan under subsection (f);

the surface owner may bring an action in the appropriate United States district court for, and the court may award, double damages plus costs for willful misconduct or gross negligence.

"(2) The surface owner of any land subject to this Act may also bring an action in the appropriate United States district court for double damages plus costs for willful misconduct or gross negligence against any person undertaking any mineral activities on lands subject to this Act in violation of any requirement of subsection (b).

"(3) Any double damages plus costs awarded by the court under this subsection shall be reduced by the amount of any compensation which the surface owner has received (or is eligible to receive) pursuant to the bond or financial guarantee required under subsection (e).

"(l) PAYMENT OF FINANCIAL GUARANTEE.—The surface owner of any land subject to this Act may petition the Secretary for payment of all or any portion of a bond or other financial guarantee required under subsection (e) as compensation for any permanent damages to crops and tangible improvements of the surface owner, or any permanent loss of income due to loss or impairment of grazing, or other uses of the land by the surface owner. Pursuant to such a petition, the Secretary may use such bond or other guarantee to provide compensation to the surface owner for such damages and to insure the required reclamation.

"(m) BOND RELEASE.—The Secretary shall release the bond or other financial guarantee required under subsection (e) upon the successful completion of all requirements pursuant to a plan of operations approved under subsection (f).

"(n) CONVEYANCE TO SURFACE OWNER.—The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to simplify the procedures which must be complied with by surface owners of lands subject to this Act who apply to the Secretary to obtain title to interests in such lands owned by the United States.

"(o) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of subsections (b) through (n)—

"(1) The term 'mineral activities' means any activity for, related to or incidental to mineral exploration, mining, and beneficiation activities for any locatable mineral on a mining claim. When used with respect to this term—

"(A) the term 'exploration' means those techniques employed to locate the presence of a locatable mineral deposit and to establish its nature, position, size, shape, grade and value;

"(B) the term 'mining' means the processes employed for the extraction of a locatable mineral from the earth; and

"(C) the term 'beneficiation' means the crushing and grinding of locatable mineral ore and such processes are employed to free the mineral from the other constituents, including but not necessarily limited to, physical and chemical separation techniques.

"(2) The term 'mining claim' means a claim located under the general mining laws of the United States (which generally comprise 30 U.S.C. chapters 2, 12A, and 16, and sections 161 and 162) subject to the terms and conditions of subsections (b) through (p) of this section.

"(3) The term 'tangible improvements' includes agricultural, residential and commercial improvements, including improvements made by residential subdividers.

"(p) MINERALS COVERED.—Subsections (b) through (o) of this section apply only to minerals not subject to disposition under—

"(1) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 and following);

"(2) the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 100 and following); or

"(3) the Act of July 31, 1947, commonly known as the Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 601 and following).".

(b) TECHNICAL CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of the Act of December 29, 1916, entitled "An Act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes" (43 U.S.C. 299) is amended by inserting "(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—" before the words "That all entries made".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall issue final regulations to implement the amendments made by this Act not later than the effective date of this Act. Failure to promulgate these regulations by reason of any appeal or judicial review shall not delay the effective date as specified in paragraph (c).

SEC. 2. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON FOREIGN MINERAL INTEREST.

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Interior is directed to submit a report to the Congress within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act on the acquisition of mineral interests made after the date of enactment of this Act by foreign firms on lands subject to the Act of December 29, 1916, entitled "An Act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes" (43 U.S.C. 299).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "foreign firm" means a busi-

ness entity that conducts business operations in the United States and is 51 percent or more owned and controlled by a foreign person or entity.

□ 1620

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, the Stock Raising Homestead Act of 1916 was one of the last in a series of laws designed to encourage settlement of the West. This 77-year-old law enabled individuals to gain title to the surface of the land under certain conditions while the United States retained the potentially more valuable mineral estate in the public domain.

Throughout the Western States there are approximately 68 million acres of land on which title to the surface is held by private individuals as a result of the Stock Raising Homestead Act. The mineral estate to these lands continues to be owned by the United States and is therefore subject to the various mining laws.

Unfortunately, this split-estate arrangement has left surface owners vulnerable to other individuals who wish to use the same lands for mineral activities.

In other words, the rights of these surface owners are subordinate to the rights of individuals seeking to develop the so-called locatable minerals—such as gold, silver, or copper—of the reserved Federal mineral estate.

This right to mine can preempt the rights of the surface owner, resulting in a variety of injustices including the disruption if not outright destruction of ongoing ranching and farming operations.

I introduced the first Stock Raising Homestead Act Amendments several years ago in the 101st Congress in response to a California rancher whose land had been seriously damaged and water source polluted by a mining operation on this land. We dubbed the legislation the ranchers' rights bill because, if enacted, it would place ranchers who own stock raising homestead lands on an even playing field with those who wish to prospect for and develop hardrock minerals from those lands.

H.R. 239 seeks a balance between the rights of the surface owner, and those interested in the underlying locatable minerals, by providing a straightforward and equitable procedure for gaining access to, and undertaking mineral activities on, stock raising homestead lands.

This would be accomplished by requiring that miners give notice to the surface owner before entering the land in order to prospect or locate mining claims. If the claim holder then wants to develop and mine the claim, it would be preferable that it be done with the consent of the surface owner.

However, in the event consent is not forthcoming, this legislation would require that the claim holder have a plan of operation approved by the Secretary of the Interior, fully reclaim damaged areas, and provide compensation to the surface owner for any loss of income or damage that results.

I would note that this bill is supported by the California Cattlemen's Association, National Wildlife Federation, American Mining Congress, and the National Taxpayers Union.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 239.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to work closely in the development of this legislation with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and certainly appreciate all the help she and her staff have given to get the legislation this far.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 239, the so-called rancher's rights bill. This is a bill to amend the manner in which mining claims are developed on mineral estates reserved by the Federal Government beneath privately owned lands in the Western United States.

This bill has been several years in the making, Mr. Speaker. In the 101st Congress, I supported H.R. 737 as amended, as did the minority members of the committee and the full House adopted the bill routinely. Unfortunately, the other body stopped its progress into law.

Last Congress, the rancher's rights bill, H.R. 450, was acceptable as introduced, but unfortunately a radical substitute was adopted in committee. We defeated that substitute on the suspension calendar in July 1992, but the bill passed this body under a rule last September. In consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the Senate, we reached agreement on a substitute agreeable to all parties in the waning moments of the 102d Congress, but were unable to break the legislative logjam to get both Houses of Congress to pass the same language.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 239 is the unadulterated product of the fruitful negotiations of last year. Neither the surface owners nor mining interest groups get everything they seek. Surface owners on these split-estate type lands would, of course, prefer to have an absolute veto power over the ability of a miner to locate and develop mineral deposits underlying their lands.

Miners, in most instances, would prefer to negotiate with a private surface owner rather than the Federal Government for the permits necessary to explore and mine. This they can still do under H.R. 239, although the bill would shift the balance of these competing interests toward surface owners rights. However, the bill would not foreclose development of the reserved mineral interest of the United States, in theory or in practice.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that is the key element that makes the compromises involved acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 239 and urge its passage by the House.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. 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 California [Mr. LEHMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 239.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. 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.

CONDEMNING RELEASE BY GOVERNMENT OF MALTA OF CONVICTED TERRORIST MOHAMMED ALI REZAQ

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 118) to condemn the release by the Government of Malta of convicted terrorist Mohammed Ali Rezaq, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 118

Whereas on November 23, 1985, terrorists hijacked Egypt Air flight 648 and diverted it to Malta;

Whereas during the hijacking, 60 people were killed, including citizens of 12 countries;

Whereas one of those killed by the terrorists was Scarlett Rogenkamp of Oceanside, California, who was one of 5 women passengers, including 3 United States citizens, who were shot in the head;

Whereas after investigations, Mohammed Ali Rezaq, a suspected member of the Abu Nidal Organization, was tried and convicted in Malta on a variety of charges related to the hijacking, including the willful homicide of Scarlett Rogenkamp and others, and he was sentenced to a prison term of 25 years;

Whereas the Government of Malta assured the United States Government in September 1992 that Rezaq would remain in prison until 1996;

Whereas the United States Government immediately began exploring grounds for further prosecution of Rezaq upon his release in 1996;

Whereas the United States Government learned in February 1993 that the Government of Malta had, without notice to the United States and other interested parties, reduced Rezaq's sentence and planned to release him that month;

Whereas the United States Government and the governments of other countries whose citizens were killed in the hijacking of Egypt Air flight 648 repeatedly urged the Government of Malta to retain Rezaq in custody or make arrangements for him to be tried elsewhere;

Whereas on February 12, 1993, because of concern that Rezaq could be released, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued an arrest warrant for Rezaq, and this warrant was provided to the Government of Malta in the hope that the Government of Malta would continue to detain him;

Whereas the Government of Malta brushed aside the requests that had been made by the governments of the United States and other countries and allowed Rezaq to fly to another country on short notice; and

Whereas these actions by the Government of Malta undermine the efforts to deter international terrorists by letting them go free without serving their sentences commensurate with their crimes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved," That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the release by the Government of Malta of convicted terrorist Mohammed Ali Rezaq;

(2) believes such action seriously undermines the efforts to foster good relations between Malta and the United States and undermines the international and United States efforts to discourage and deter international terrorism;

(3) urges all governments to cooperate in transferring Rezaq either to the United States or to another concerned country in order that he may face additional criminal charges for his involvement in the Egypt Air hijacking and the murder of innocent civilians;

(4) urges all governments to abide by the rule of law and not provide safe haven to terrorists in order that terrorism will be met with the full force of justice and that terrorists will not escape being held accountable; and

(5) urges that President to review the United States relationship with Malta, including foreign assistance and economic relations.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with a request that the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the Government of Malta.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring this resolution before the House with great regret and great reluctance.

I have the highest regard for the people of Malta, and I have the highest regard for United States citizens of Maltese origin. But I am profoundly outraged by the recent action of the Government of Malta in releasing from prison a convicted terrorist, Mohammed Ali Rezaq and the Government's permitting him to leave the country, despite the fact that he was found guilty of a variety of charges in connection with the hijacking of Egypt Air Flight No. 648 in which 60 people were killed including the willful homicide of Scarlett Rogenkamp, a woman, a United States citizen, a fellow Californian, an individual whose innocence is not in question.

This convicted terrorist was sentenced to a prison term of 25 years, but the Government of Malta unexpectedly released him in February of this year, after the Government of Malta assured our Department of State that he would remain in prison at least until 1996.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this convicted terrorist got a sentence of 25 years for the blatant assassination of innocent air passengers, he should have been in prison until the year 2011. He served only 7 years, and then he was set free.

□ 1630

Our Government attempted to have Rezaq extradited so he could also stand trial here or elsewhere. U.S. officials issued an arrest warrant for him, and provided it to the Government of Malta. There was a delegation, including members of our Justice Department, our State Department, the FBI, that went to Malta and pleaded with the Government of Malta that this convicted terrorist not be let go. Our Ambassador made repeated representations to the Prime Minister and to the Foreign Minister. None of this was of any avail

Our resolution recites the background facts in this case, and then condemns the release of this terrorist by Malta, states that this action undermines our efforts to foster good relations between Malta and the United States.

Our resolution urges all governments to cooperate in sending Rezaq to the United States, or to any other country, to stand trial for his actions, urges all governments to cooperate in holding terrorists accountable, and urges the President of the United States to review our relations with Malta, including foreign assistance and economic relations.

The Department of State and the administration made some suggestions to improve the legislation before it was considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and those changes were made part of the resolution, as it stands amended. Letters have been sent by the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs to the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], supporting that legislation.

That letter states, in part:

We appreciate the expression of congressional concern and condemnation of the release of the terrorist who was convicted for the hijacking of Egyptian Air flight number 648, in which an American was murdered.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that Mohammed Ali Rezaq, this convicted murderer who shot in the head this innocent California woman, among others, is a member of the Abu Nidal organization, the most dangerous and vicious terrorist organization operating on the face of this planet.

At a time when we are still dealing with the aftermath of the terrorist bombing at the World Trade Center, it is simply unacceptable that a government that wishes to have good relations with the United States should release a convicted terrorist who was sentenced to prison, for 25 years, for the deliberate murder of innocent air passengers; that such a government should release this convicted terrorist, despite the strong pleas by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Government of Malta recognizes the horrendous mistake it has made. It brought upon itself the condemnation of the American people, and by approving this resolution, the Congress of the United States. I strongly urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 118 addresses a particularly disturbing lapse in the international effort to combat terrorism. There is no disagreement about the facts of this case. The terrorist in question, Mohammed Ali Rezaq, was personally responsible for the deaths of innocent passengers of Egyptian Air flight 548. In frustration, during the botched hijack attempt, Rezaq randomly shot and killed a number of passengers, including an American citizen. In all, some 60 innocent passengers were killed during this scentless attack.

While the United States was unhappy with the relatively lenient sentence of the Maltese court, we had assurances that Rezaq would be held at least until 1996. For the Government of Malta now to act in such a capricious manner, releasing him with almost no notice, is extraordinarily disturbing. This is not a trivial matter, and the United States needs to convey to the Government of Malta our most profound displeasure.

House Resolution 118 does just that. It makes it clear that the irresponsible

activity of the Maltese Government seriously undermines our bilateral relations.

Mr. Speaker, a recent communication sent to this Member from the Government of Malta strongly suggests that they really do not understand the depth of United States outrage. Their response to the introduction of House Resolution 118 has been to hide behind legalisms in their effort to explain away their early release of a convicted terrorist. To say, as has the Government of Malta, that Rezaq received only the same general amnesties that were given to other prisoners completely obscures the utter barbarity of the Rezaq's crime. If the Government of Malta wishes to provide amnesty for shoplifters and pickpockets, obviously that is their business. But common sense would demand that there be some distinction between a common shoplifter and an international terrorist responsible for 60 deaths.

It is simply wrong to say, as the Maltese Government does, that international concern was not voiced that Rezaq be kept in prison. It was not simply the United States that was repeatedly urging that Rezaq be kept in jail. Canada as well as several European and Middle Eastern nations—nations whose citizens Rezaq had murdered—urged the Government of Malta not to release this killer. It seems Malta does not believe that demarches and ambassadorial visits do not count as official expressions of concern.

The bottom line is that the Government of Malta knew it was releasing a terrorist, and it knew that many other nations would have grave concerns over Rezaq's release. To pretend otherwise is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, there are places for diplomatic language and there is a place to speak plainly when the representatives of the people wish to speak forthrightly against this action of the Maltese Government.

The Maltese Government expects to be viewed in a positive light and treated as a member of the Western European family of democratic nations. This Member would suggest that Malta will be judged by its actions, and at the present time we must judge Malta very harshly. Was this a case of callous disregard for Western concerns? Their members cannot believe the Maltese Government or the Maltese people have so little regard for human life that it let this mass murderer go free with a slap on the wrist. Was this a case of intimidation from terrorist organizations? Is the Maltese Government cowering in an international corner? Have we witnessed the "Maltese Flinch"?

Mr. Speaker, this Member would congratulate the chairman of the International Security Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], for crafting an excellent resolution. This resolution makes it clear that all Americans are united in the international effort to combat terrorism, and that we expect our friends and allies to do likewise.

As original cosponsor of House Resolution 118, this Member would urge, in the strongest terms, the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 118. I want to compliment both the chairman and the ranking Republican on the International Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from Nebraska, our distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEREUTER], as well as our Chairman Mr. HAMILTON for moving forward at this time with this resolution strongly condemning the Malta Government for its premature release from jail of a convicted terrorist.

This terrorist's actions, along with two others in hijacking an Egyptian Air flight in 1985, resulted in the loss of life of 60 passengers including 1 American. Several other Americans were shot in the head and fortunately survived.

United States Government's protests to the Government of Malta prior to the release went unheeded and our efforts to thwart this terrorist's premature release were all to no avail.

Now more than ever with the world facing increased levels of terrorism and violence, including here in the United States, the message needs to go forward that the United States vigorously opposes such violence and terrorism, and those who engage in such deplorable conduct deserve swift, just, and full punishment.

I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 1438, to address the problems of terrorism, both here and abroad. One specific provision of that bill terminates for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 all United States international military education and training aid to Malta as a result of their conduct in this case.

Terrorism in any form, either in this country or abroad, is not acceptable to our Government. For those governments, such as Malta, who do not live up to their responsibilities and obligations to help fight and punish international terrorism, and those who engage in such deplorable conduct, the United States Government should protest loudly and vigorously. House Resolution 118 does just that. Accordingly, I urge its adoption by our colleagues.

□ 1640

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his strong statement in support of House Resolution 118.

Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I would end by urging strong unanimous support on the part of my colleagues for House Resolution 118.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep appreciation to my two distinguished Republican colleagues, the ranking Republican member of the full committee and the ranking Republican member on the subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights, the gentleman from New York. [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Nebraska. [Mr. BEREUTER], for their most effective efforts on behalf of this legislation, and indeed all legislation relating to our common fight against terrorism. Our fight against terrorism in not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is an American issue.

I also want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that earlier today I called our chargé in Malta, we do not currently have an ambassador there, and he confirmed to me all of the facts relevant to this issue. He also indicated to me that there is at this time no sign on the part of the Maltese Government of remorse or regret.

I urge the Government of Malta to apologize publicly for this outrage because the American people and this Congress will long remember that American citizens can be killed, apparently with the murderers being released to freedom by this Government in Malta.

The Government of Malta claims, Mr. Speaker, that the extradition treaty which exists does not cover the crime of hijacking. It does not because it originated in 1922 when there were no hijackings. But that extradition treaty does cover the crime of murder, and this terrorist is guilty of murder. He should be in prison until the year 2011. And we will leave no stone unturned to find him and see to it that he pays the price for his heinous crimes.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation to express the united outrage of the American people against terrorists.

Mr. LANTOS. 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 gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 118, as amended.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 24

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. 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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 118, the resolution just considered.

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

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 clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on agreeing to the approval of the Journal and on each of the first two motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which each arose.

Votes, therefore, will be taken in the following order:

On agreeing to the Journal, de novo: H.R. 175, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 829, as amended, by the yeas and nays.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that this will be a 15-minute vote, and subsequent votes on the two motions to suspend the rules upon which proceedings were postponed will be 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 137, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—231

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hyde
Inslee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Traficant
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—137

Allard
Bachus (AL)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clay
Coble
Collins (GA)
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—62

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barton
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Clement
Conyers
Cooper
Cox
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dicks
Dornan
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Hansen
Hastings
Henry
Hunter
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kreidler
Lancaster
Lightfoot
McCollum
McDade
McKinney
Miller (FL)
Mink
Olver
Owens
Pickle
Quillen
Rangel
Ridge
Sanders
Schenk
Serrano
Sharp
Skaggs
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Sundquist
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Whitten
Williams
Woolsey
Zeliff

□ 1707

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

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, 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 each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AUTHORIZING FBI TO OBTAIN CERTAIN TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBER INFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 175.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 175, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 6, answered "present" 1, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—367

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

NAYS—6

Bishop
Hamburg
Hilliard
Johnson, E. B.
Washington
Waters

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Becerra

NOT VOTING—56

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barlow
Barton
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Clement
Cooper
Cox
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dicks
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Hansen
Hastings
Henry
Hunter
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kreidler
Lancaster
Lightfoot
Maloney
McCollum
McDade
McKinney
Miller (FL)
Mink
Olver
Owens
Pickle
Quillen
Rangel
Ridge
Sanders
Skaggs
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Unsoeld
Whitten
Williams
Zeliff

□ 1715

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.

DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 829, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 829, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 4, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—374

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Ballenger
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed

Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—4

Bishop
Hamburg
Hilliard
Watt

NOT VOTING—52

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barton
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cooper
Cox
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dicks
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Hansen
Hastings
Henry
Hunter
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kreidler
Lancaster
Lightfoot
McCollum
McDade
McKinney
Miller (FL)
Mink
Olver
Owens
Pickle
Quillen
Ridge
Sanders
Skaggs
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Unsoeld
Whitten
Williams
Zeliff

□ 1727

Mr. BISHOP changed his 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.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 221, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—155

Ackerman
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Cantwell
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dingell
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (OK)
Evans
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hughes
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kleczka
Klink
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lambert
Laughlin
Lehman
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Mann
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McDermott
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Obey
Orton
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Rush
Sangmeister
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Thurman
Tucker
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmer
Watt
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—221

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fish
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Johnson (CT)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Livingston
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Matsui
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Synar
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Weldon
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—54

Abercrombie
Andrews (NJ)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baker (LA)
Barton
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cardin
Cooper
DeLauro
Dicks
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Hansen
Hastings
Henry
Hunter
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kreidler
Lancaster
Lightfoot
McCollum
McDade
McKinney
Miller (FL)
Mink
Olver
Owens
Pelosi
Quillen
Ridge
Sanders
Skaggs
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stokes
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Unsoeld
Waxman
Whitten
Williams
Yates
Zeliff

□ 1745

Mr. SPRATT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DINGELL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent today, following legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered into, the following Members may be permitted to address the House, revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material:

Mr. MACHTLEY, today for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON, today, March 30, 31, and April 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 for 60 minutes each.

Mr. KIM, March 31 and April 1 for 5 minutes each.

Mr. TALENT, March 31 for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, today for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER, today for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, June 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, July 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 ,17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, for 60 minutes each.

Mr. MACHTLEY, March 30, 31 for 15 minutes each.

Mr. DELAY, today and on April 14 and 15 for 60 minutes each.

Mrs. BENTLEY, May 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, and 27 for 60 minutes each.

Mr. HORN, today for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, today for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT, today and March 30 and 31 and April 1 and 2 for 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered into, the following Members may be permitted to address the House, revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material:

Miss COLLINS of Michigan today for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON on April 1 for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois on April 1, 2, 4, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 for 5 minutes each day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD on April 30 for 30 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO for 60 minutes.

Mr. SYNAR on March 29 and 30 for 60 minutes each day.

Mr. LAUGHLIN on March 30 for 60 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY on March 30 for 60 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL on July 1 for 60 minutes.

Mr. MFUME on July 1 for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY on March 30 and 31 for 60 minutes each day.

Mr. OLVER on March 30 and 31 for 60 minutes each day.

Mr. GONZALEZ on April 1, 14, 15, 19, and 26 for 60 minutes each day.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro termpore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks":

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER in two instances.

Mr. SARPALIUS in two instances.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. MCNULTY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. CONDIT.

Ms. PELOSI.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry under my objection.

That is, under the Extensions of Remarks, does it require unanimous consent for those to be entered into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it does.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I see.

□ 1750

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on his reservation?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair, does that mean if an objection is heard to the extension of remarks, that the extension of remarks asked for would not appear in the RECORD? I would ask the Chair, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). That is my understanding, correct. However, no objection was heard.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

TIME TO REFORM CONGRESS SO IT CAN ACT TO AID AMERICA'S YOUTH

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families is going out of business.

Normally, temporary committees shut down when their job is done.

But according to the "Kids Count Data Book," which was released today by the Center for the Study of Social Policy and the Anne E. Casey Foundation, Congress' job on improving the lives of American kids and teens is far from done.

Kids Count documents in numbers what we in the select committee have tried to address in policy: That the deteriorating status of our Nation's teenagers has led to the increasing number of new families at risk.

High school graduation rates are down.

The number of births to single teens are up.

The number of teens who are surrounded by violence, in their homes, their communities, and schools are up.

It's time to reform Congress so that we can act for our kids. The way we are now organized, 13 of the 22 standing committees handle key issues that primarily affect our children. It's time to consolidate these issues, so that fewer committees have more power to act on behalf of our kids.

We cannot let another historic reform go by and forget families and children—again.

ALMOST HALF OF NEW FAMILIES VULNERABLE ADOLESCENTS FACE GREATER ADVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC.—The fourth annual "Kids Count Data Book: State Profiles of Child Well-Being," a state-by-state report card on the condition of America's children, found that a staggering number of new families are at risk right from the start—a consequence of the deteriorating status of the nation's teenagers. The "Data Book" was released today by the Center for the Study of Social Policy and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

The Kids Count New Family Risk Index measures the proportion of families who begin with the odds stacked against them because they face one or more of the following risks: the mother is under age 20 when she has her first baby; the mother has not completed high school when her first child is born; the parents of this first baby are not married. Of the almost 1.7 million new families started with the birth of a first baby in 1990, 45 percent were at risk for at least one of these reasons. Over half of all new families were vulnerable for one or more reasons in seven states: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico and South Carolina.

"Forty-five percent of our new families begin with one of more strikes against them; almost one-fourth, with two or more strikes; and more than one in ten begin with all three strikes," said Judith Weitz, Kids Count Coordinator at the Center for Study of Social Policy. "Each of these risks increases the chances that families will break up, be poor, or be dependent on public assistance and that their children will be neglected and fall behind in school."

The "Kids Count Data Book" devaluates the condition of children nationwide and state-by-state using ten measures of child well-being. Based on each state's national composite ranking, the following are this year's best and worst states:

Best: 1st, New Hampshire; 2nd, Minnesota; 3rd, Vermont; 4th, North Dakota; and 5th, Iowa.

Worst: 46th, New Mexico; 47th, Georgia; 48th, Alabama; 49th, Louisiana; and 50th, Mississippi.

"The alarming number of vulnerable new families is the tragic, but predictable, consequence of the deteriorating status of American teens," said Douglas W. Nelson, Executive Director of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. "Worsening high school graduation rates, increasing births to single teenagers, and widening exposure to community

violence and crime guarantee that a large number of our young adults will enter parenthood unprepared to raise their own children."

Among the report's findings:

Only 69 percent of all teenagers and 42 percent of Hispanic teens complete high school in four years. The on-time high school completion rate decreased in 37 states and the District of Columbia between 1985 and 1990. It decreased by 17 percent nationwide for Hispanic teens.

Five percent of American teens have no productive role in society—they aren't in school and don't have jobs, either in or outside of the home. Teen idleness has profound implications for delinquency, neighborhood stability, family well-being, and national productivity.

Almost 9 percent of all babies born in 1990–360,645 babies—were born to single teenagers. The rate of births to single teens increased in 44 states and the District of Columbia, between 1985 and 1990, representing a 16 percent increase nationwide.

Between 1986 and 1991, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate increased nationwide by 48 percent. Forty-four states and the District of Columbia also experienced significant increases. The arrest rate for male juveniles increased by 46 percent; for females, it increased by 57 percent.

Over 12,000 teenagers ages 15 to 19 died as a result of accident, suicide, or homicide in 1990. The teen violent death rate increased by 13 percent nationally between 1985 and 1990; increases were found in 36 states and the District of Columbia. The African-American teen violent death rate increased by 78 percent. Overall, most teens die in accidents. However, in 1990, twice as many African-American teens were murdered as were killed in an accident.

"The teens of today who are poorly educated and trained and who grow up surrounded by violence are likely to start their families before they are financially or emotionally prepared," said Weitz. "Unless we invest in children early on, we will continue to produce a lost generation of adolescents who, in turn, become parents of the next generation of children at risk."

According to Nelson, "The grim trends in this year's Data Book reflect the unmistakable failure of our human service and education systems to provide adequate supports for today's adolescents, particularly in low-income communities.

"Turning these numbers around will require a national commitment to provide more innovative, cost-effective responses to the needs of vulnerable children and youth. We need to reward and expand services that are effective and redeploy resources away from those that are not—we need to spend smarter," said Nelson. "Until policy makers and citizens take the steps and risks necessary to change the ways children and family services are oriented, delivered, evaluated, and financed, the number of new American families destined to fail will continue to increase."

The 1993 *Kids Count Data Book* was prepared by the Center for the Study of Social Policy and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation as part of a joint effort to build a national commitment to improve the lives of vulnerable children and their families. KIDS COUNT projects in 37 states also produce annual state and local profiles of the status of children and families.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of United Parcel Service, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The nation's largest philanthropy dedicated exclusively to disadvantaged children, the Foundation awards grants to projects aimed at fostering public policies and human services reforms that meet the changing needs of today's children and families.

The Center for the Study of Social Policy is a non-profit research and policy analysis organization based in Washington, DC.

BEST STATE, WORST STATE

Measure	Best	Worst
Percent low birth weight babies.	Alaska	Mississippi.
Infant mortality rate	Maine	Georgia.
Child death rate	Massachusetts	Mississippi.
Percent of all births that are to single teens.	Utah	Mississippi.
Juvenile violent crime arrest rate.	Vermont	New York.
Percent graduating from high school.	Minnesota	Florida.
Percent teens not in school and not in the labor force.	North Dakota	Louisiana.
Teen violent death rate	Rhode Island	New Mexico.
Percent children in poverty	New Hampshire	Louisiana.
Percent children in single parent families.	North Dakota	Mississippi.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 107, COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTION FOR 1993

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 107, the House committee funding resolution for 1993. While I wholeheartedly embrace the important need for effective operational streamlining within this body, I also fully subscribe to the proposition that Congress must be well-prepared to comprehensively tackle one of the toughest challenges facing our Nation now and in the near future—the spread of drug abuse and violence on the streets of America's major metropolitan areas. Unfortunately, House Resolution 107 falls somewhat short in providing the resources necessary to coherently address this pressing concern. I speak specifically of the obvious and disappointing exemption of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control from this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, although at the end of business today, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control will cease to exist, the horrendous drug epidemic and the violence which accompanies it will certainly continue to flourish unabated throughout America.

As many of the Members of this Chamber are claiming credit for an important victory in the quest for congressional reform, many residents and their children in the heart of my district, on the West Side of Chicago, will remain fearful of the narcotics trafficking taking place on their street corners and school playgrounds. But do not misunderstand me. This fear is not just in the urban low-income communities, it is in rural communities, suburban communities, and throughout our land. As the coming months go by with Congress lacking a panel which holds broad oversight of the narcotics problems in our country, more and more young lives in the United States will be cut short or ruined because of the scourge of drugs and the allure of fast money. By allowing the select committee to sunset, the House is removing the most valuable congressional channel through which many more communities could have successfully voiced their ideas as to how to best combat this distressing problem severely threatening our future generations.

So while I commend my colleagues for their recognition of the American people's desire for change, I also urge Members on both sides of the aisle to not forget that, in positive and fundamental change, there is no room for absolute and total neglect. We must remain committed to providing a comprehensive forum within this body for addressing the terrible substance abuse crisis in our country as the 103d Congress progresses.

THE DANGER OF A HIGHER DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that I and my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have is that we are facing the largest tax increase in the history of the United States that has been proposed by President Clinton. In fact, it is not just the largest tax increase in the history of the United States, it is more than double, more than double the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. In fact, the tax increase that President Clinton has proposed totals over $400 billion.

When we take that kind of money out of the collective pockets of the people of this country we hurt the economy dramatically. If we do not buy $400 billion worth of products, they do not produce $400 billion worth of products.

If the people of this country do not spend the $400 billion that they are going to pay in taxes to the Government, they do not buy $400 billion worth of products: cars, refrigerators, clothes, and other products.

If those products are not purchased, they are not going to be manufactured, because the manufacturers of cars and refrigerators and clothes and other products will not manufacture products that are not going to be sold.

When we stop producing products and we start cutting back on employment, because the assembly lines are not going to be going full tilt if they are not selling those products, that is what has always happened whenever we have had massive tax increases. Two years ago, 3 years ago, when we had the budget summit agreement of 1990, it had one of the largest tax increases in U.S. history, $184 billion.

What did that lead us to? It led us to an economic recession. We saw unemployment go up, we saw production go down. We saw us lose in the trade war with our friends across the world, and that is the same thing that is going to happen again, only it will be worse.

In addition to just having a tax increase, the kinds of tax increases Presi-

dent Clinton is talking about are very onerous ones. The Btu tax, the energy tax he is talking about, we call it the big time unemployment tax, the Btu tax is going to add about 15 cents a gallon to jet fuel.

The airline industries tell us that will put many of them out of business. They are on the borderline right now. U.S. Air recently merged with British Airways, or had a contractual deal with them.

In addition to the airlines that may go out of business because of this huge increase in jet fuels, I have had many people come to me who are farmers who tell me that the cost of agriculture is going to be huge and it is going to put a lot of them out of business.

We have had foundries come to us and tell us it is going to put the foundry industry in a very difficult situation. They are already experiencing very difficult trade problems right now from competitors overseas. Many of them will go out of business.

The trucking industry is going to pay another 10 to 15 cents a gallon for fuel, and that will be added to the cost of refrigerators and cars and clothes that are transported around this country. That means that we are going to have an inflationary pressure on those products we buy.

That is not the problem that I want to talk about tonight. The problem that we want to talk about here tonight is that with all these huge tax increases, we are going to continue to see the national debt go up and up and up and up.

President Clinton has told us he is going to cut spending, but when we look at the proposals he sent to the Congress of the United States, we find that domestic spending is going to increase by about $94 billion over the next 5 years; not go down, it is going to go up $94 billion. He is raising taxes over $400 billion and domestic spending is going to go up.

The only area he is going to be cutting is defense, and he is going to be cutting defense to the tune of about $127 billion. That will cut into the muscle and bone of our defense capability at a time when there is a lot of uncertainty in the world: in former Yugoslavia, in Russia, in the former Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the place we should be very careful about cutting, we can make cuts in defense, but we must not cut into the muscle and bone. That is the only place that President Clinton is making major cuts; huge tax increases, huge increases in domestic spending, and the only place he is going to cut is in the area of defense.

What are we going to be faced with? The projections are that the deficit, instead of going down, is going to go up over the next 4 to 5 years; maybe not as rapidly as it would have otherwise, but it is still going to go up.

In the next week we are going to be asked in this body to increase the debt ceiling by a quarter of a trillion dollars, and that is not for a very long period of time. In fact, we are going to increase the debt ceiling for 6 months by increasing the debt by $250 billion. That is intolerable.

What we need to do if we are going to be talking about any change in our debt structure is to put a cap on Government spending and to get a balanced budget amendment that will control the spending in this body and the other body, and to get a line-item veto, so that the President will be able to line out those items which are wasteful.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I really thank the gentleman from Indiana for more or less sneaking in this special order by the hair on his head, because it is obvious that some groups in the Congress do not want Members of Congress to come within these Chambers and speak their minds.

In fact, there have been comments that some Members feel that having Members come to the floor of the House and speaking embarrasses them. I guess the truth embarrasses them. That is why the gentleman has come today to talk about the debt ceiling and to try to inform the American people what is going on this week, and try to lay out the program. I appreciate him bringing a special order on the debt ceiling, because I am not sure the American people really understand what we are going to be asked to do this week.

Let me try to put it in perspective, if the gentleman will give me some time to do that. As of April 7, we have been informed that the Government of the United States can no longer borrow money in order to carry on its spending programs unless we raise the debt ceiling. We are going to be a little over $4.1 trillion in debt by April 7, in just a week, and so we are being asked to do a temporary debt ceiling increase, as the gentleman has said, to raise the debt ceiling so the Government can continue borrowing up until at least September 30, or something else may happen, something that I think is very sinister.

We have now what is called the Gephardt rule in our budget process. Basically what that means is the debt ceiling is sort of hidden into the budget. We passed the budget last week, and most people think that that is the budget for the United States. It is really a document of generalities and really is not the real spending and taxing that will go on in this House. That comes later.

Hidden into that budget, if we pass the budget, is that the debt ceiling will automatically go up permanently.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. By $250 billion.

Mr. DELAY. I would say to the gentleman, no, by over $1 trillion, because they know if we implement the Democrat plan, the Democrat tax and spend plan, that they may say the deficit is going down, but the debt, indeed, is going up by a minimum of $1 trillion over the next 4 years, under the Democrats' plan, under the Democrats' plan.

There is no deficit reduction, any meaningful deficit reduction, in their plan, and even if we pass everything that President Clinton wants us to pass the debt will still increase by $1 trillion.

We have two choices this week. One is a freestanding bill to do a temporary debt ceiling increase that will carry us through September 30, which is about actually $255 billion in more debt between now and September 30. However, if the budget is passed, and we will not know exactly how long the debt ceiling will be for, but I suspect it will be for 3 to 4 years, and there will be an additional $1 trillion of debt authorized for the spending of the United States.

□ 1800

That is unconscionable. There is no balanced budget amendment. There is no line-item veto. We have not even had spending-cut votes yet, and already they are talking about covering themselves to make sure that they can continue to borrow money and put our children and our grandchildren in debt.

Let me give a little background, if I may.

The Federal Government began with a public debt of about $78 million in 1789. Since then the Congress has attempted to control the size of the public debt by imposing ceilings on the amount of Government securities that might be outstanding at any time.

These ceilings that we are talking about are specified in the Second Liberty Bond Act of 1917. Until 1941, there were separate ceilings on various types of debt. There is now one overall ceiling. The debt ceilings were most recently increased to $4.145 trillion on November 5, 1990.

According to the latest estimates from the Treasury Department, the current debt ceiling will be reached by April 7, 1993. The Treasury Department is expected to have an April 1 auction of regular 52-week Treasury bills. Settlement from the auction would be made on April 8.

Secretary Bentsen has urged the Congress to act by March 26, to temporarily increase the debt ceiling to $4.37 trillion, an amount which is estimated to cover Government borrowing through September 30, of this year. A higher, permanent extension is expected to be passed sometime before

September 30, perhaps as part of the budget reconciliation bill.

The House-passed budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64, contains the following schedule for increasing the public debt: Fiscal year 1994, $4,715,300,000,000; fiscal year 1995, $5,076,800,000,000; fiscal year 1996, $5,428,400,000,000; fiscal year 1997, $5,776,300,000,000; and fiscal year 1998, $6,141,400,000,000.

Thus, under the policies as outlined in the Democrat budget, the public debt will increase by over $1.9 trillion, from $6.141 trillion to $4.145 trillion.

Between now and the next Presidential election—through the end of fiscal year 1996—the public debt will increase by almost $1.3 trillion.

During President Reagan's first term, the debt ceiling was increased from $935 billion to $1,824 billion. That's an increase of $889 billion.

Thus, President Clinton will increase the public debt 40 percent more than President Reagan did during his first term.

In 1978, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1981. In 1985, Congress passed a law requiring a balanced budget by 1991. In 1987, Congress passed a law to require a balanced budget by 1993. In 1990, Congress passed a law to balance the budget by 1995. None of these laws have produced the intended results, because every time we get to the real crunch of the matter, and that is spending by our Government, we write a new law.

Since 1930, the Federal budget has been balanced only eight times. The last time the budget was balanced was 1969, 24 years ago. During the years in which the budget was balanced, Federal outlays averaged 16.2 percent of gross domestic product [GDP] and receipts averaged 17.5 percent of GDP.

According to the latest estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, outlays will be 23.5 percent of GDP this year and receipts will be 18.5 percent. This means Federal outlays are 46 percent higher today than they were on average during the 8 years in which the budget was in balance.

It should also be noted that defense spending is 38 percent lower today than it was on average during the 8 years in which the budget was in balance. During those 8 years, defense spending averaged 7.6 percent of GDP. This year defense is expected to be 4.8 percent of GDP.

Nondefense spending is 120 percent higher today than it was on average during the 8 years in which the budget was in balance. During those 8 years, nondefense spending averaged 8.6 percent of GDP. This year nondefense spending is expected to be 18.8 percent of GDP.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might interrupt for just a moment, one of the things that these numbers do, I am sure, for people who are paying attention to this debate is kind of boggle the mind. But it took us over 200 years to get $1 trillion in debt, over 200 years, and in the last 10 years we have gone to over $4 trillion in debt. And according to the figures the gentleman just cited, by the year 1998 we will be at $6.1 trillion.

What does that mean to the average family? I think that is what the American people are concerned about.

I think it will be higher than that. I think it will be around $8 trillion. By the turn of the century many experts predict that it will be at $18 trillion, but let us take it at $6 or $8 trillion. Right now one of the largest expenditures in the Federal budget is interest that we pay, which takes up about 20 or 22 percent of the total budget. If we get to $6 or $8 trillion in debt, we are going to end up with probably 40 percent of all spending being spent just on interest alone. That means that we will not be able to take care of not only the military, but Social Security, welfare, the infrastructure of the country, and a lot of other things.

What happens when that occurs? First of all, the people will be clamoring for these Government services. Now the Federal Reserve Board has the right by law, without any act of Congress, to print money to pay off the debt so they do not have to pay interest. They could print $3 or $4 trillion and put it out into circulation.

What would that do to people on fixed income, people who are senior citizens on Social Security, welfare recipients or a lot of other people, those who are retired and get pensions? What it will do is that the cost of your bread will go to maybe $30 or $40 a loaf, the cost of your milk would go to $20 or $30 a quart, the cost of gasoline would be $4, $5, $6.

If you think that would not happen, look at Latin America today, look at Zaire today, look at Brazil today, look at Germany right after World War I. A lot of countries have had hyperinflation because the Government started printing money to pay off the public debt, and that is what will happen in our country, just like it has in every single country in history.

Before I yield back to my colleague, I want to tell Members that the President has proposed this year a dire emergency supplemental bill costing $16 to $19 billion to stimulate the economy and to create jobs. We call it a big-time, pork-barrel bill. They said there is no pork in it.

I just want to read to my friends who may be paying attention and my colleagues that this is just some of the things the President has in his stimulus package that are supposed to stimulate the economy. We think it just pays off a lot of big-city politicians that helped him to get elected.

Construct a new gymnasium, Auburn, AL, $460,000; miscellaneous pool repairs in Birmingham, AL, $450,000; 70,000-square-foot community center with two gyms, indoor pool and outside ball fields, $837,000 for land acquisition, $5.25 million for construction in Huntsville, AL; indoor/outdoor fields, $1,081,000 in Optimist Park in Huntsville, AL.

Historic preservation of the Orpheum Theater, $3.5 million in Phoenix; a youth park for baseball, soccer, tennis, gym, roads, utilities, lighting, $5.3 million in Jonesboro, AR.

Construct and improve civic center parking facility, $4 million, Burbank; sports park, phase I, $10 million in Fairfield, CA; Tyrrell Neighborhood Center, for construction $3 million in Hayward, CA; 27,000-square-foot community recreation center with indoor pool, $7 million in Los Angeles, CA; Hebbron Community Park, phase III, landscaping, irrigation, play equipment, picnic areas for $2.305 million in Salinas, CA; seismic upgrade and architectural design for interior of historic art museum, $6 million in San Jose, CA.

□ 1810

Community center construction, $3 million, in New London, CT; civic center auditorium, 2,000 seating for sports and cultural performances, $7 million in Boynton Beach, FL; a golf course in Daytona Beach, $500,000; a beach parking garage, $5 million, Fort Lauderdale; city administration building, a city administration building that ought to be paid for by the local taxpayers, $20 million, in Miami, FL; repair historic wall around cemetery, $2.5 million in Atlanta; gym replacement, $4.5 million, in Atlanta; develop basketball facilities, $150,000, in Saginaw, MI; fiber-optics communication system, $1.1 million, Camden, NJ; performing arts center, $15 million, Newark, NJ; a gymnasium, $700,000, Perth Amboy, NJ; basketball and tennis construction, $260,000, Teaneck, NJ; construction of one or two parking garages, $23 million, Durham, NC; and it can go on and on and on and on, billions of dollars in pork-barrel projects for special Congressmen and big-city politicians as a payoff for the election.

They are calling that a dire emergency supplemental, and they are asking America to accept a $230 some billion increase in the national debt to pay for this stuff.

Mr. DELAY. I think that is the point the gentleman makes and did make earlier, and what he finished with, I think, is very, very important here. All of those projects, all of that so-called stimulus package, is deficit spending. None of that spending, none of it, is paid for. All of it borrows money to pay for it. That is part of why we are raising the debt ceiling.

Another thing, if I could just take 2 minutes to finish my point, let me just say that, you know, it is amazing to

me how the Democrats revise history. They have bashed Reagan and Bush and bashed the last 12 years of economic history, and they try to turn everything around: the entire debt is Reagan's debt or Bush's debt, not owning up that they had a partnership in that, because the Democrats have controlled all of those 12 years, except for the Senate for a couple of years, this Congress, and they have to accept some responsibility for that.

But let us just go through it very quickly and compare what the Clinton plan proposes and what Reagan and Bush actually did. Under the policies adopted by President Bush, Federal revenues would increase by a cumulative $690 billion above the inflation-adjusted 1989 level. Clinton's proposal would increase revenues by an additional $277 billion over that.

Under the policies adopted by Bush in the 1990 budget agreement, Federal nondefense outlays would increase by a cumulative $2.4 trillion above the inflation-adjusted 1989 level. Clinton's proposals would reduce nondefense outlays by only $71 billion.

Under the policies adopted by President Bush, Federal defense outlays would decrease by a cumulative $526 billion below the inflation-adjusted 1989 level. Clinton's proposal would reduce defense outlays by an additional $112 billion, putting our security at risk.

President Clinton has said that his vision of change includes an additional $186 billion in high-priority investment. However, what he fails to mention is the fact that President Bush increased real spending on these very same investments by over $100 billion since 1989, a 43-percent increase after adjusting for inflation.

So from 1989 to 1993 in constant 1990 dollars, children's programs were up 67 percent, education and training is up 16 percent, Federal aid to States and cities is up 60 percent, infrastructure is up 32 percent, nutrition programs are up 72 percent, research and development is up 20 percent. These so-called investment programs grew at a real annual rate of more than 10 percent during the Bush administration; yet, the economy grew an average of 1 percent a year.

If Bush's $100 billion increase in investment spending failed to solve our economic malaise, what reason do we have to believe Clinton's investments will be any more effective?

The Democrats often insist that balancing the budget cannot be accomplished without making Draconian cuts in programs like Social Security. However, such claims reflect a lack of careful budget scrutiny. For example, the Heritage Foundation has put together a list of program cuts which totals over $600 billion over 5 years.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has another list of spending cuts which totals over $430 billion over 5 years. The gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Indiana, has proposed freezing spending that would save hundreds of billions of dollars over 5 years.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. $837 billion.

Mr. DELAY. $837 billion, a very worthwhile effort. Even accounting for any duplication, together these two total over $1 trillion.

The Democrat leadership insists that a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget is a copout. They claim that Congress already has the power it needs to balance the budget, and it has been said many, many times on the floor of this House that we do not need a balanced-budget amendment in order to gain control and have a little discipline in this House. That may be true. But it sure would be abundantly clear by now that in the absence of a constitutional amendment, Congress will never make those tough choices.

Congress has not only failed to balance the budget in 24 years, it has systematically passed and then ignored four separate laws requiring it to balance the budget. Since Congress has proven itself incapable of balancing the budget on its own, opposition to a constitutional amendment can only be based on a desire to avoid balancing the budget.

Here we are being asked this week to raise the debt ceiling so that this Government can go on borrowing money to take care of its spending habits, and I think that is outrageous. I hope Members of this House will vote against raising the debt ceiling, and I hope the American people will contact the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, and urge them to vote against raising the debt ceiling unless, and at least, we get a vote on a balanced budget amendment and a real line-item veto, not some sham that they are going to bring down here on the floor of the House called enhanced rescission.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I want to thank my colleague from Texas, because he has taken the lead in pointing out some of the problems we have had with the huge tax increases and spending proposals by the Clinton administration. He has been a real leader in the fight to control Government spending and waste. I really appreciate his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I am a freshman, and this will be my first debt-ceiling vote.

I have quickly found out there are many, many things up here I do not know, and there are many, many things that I am learning daily.

But one thing I am very certain of, and that is that I was not sent up here by the voters of the Third District of Arkansas to conduct business as usual, and it seems to me that there are few things more characteristic of business as usual than another routine increase in the debt ceiling.

My understanding is we have increased it 32 times in the last 10 years. I think that epitomizes this kind of business-as-usual attitude; we rubber stamp the ceiling increases, and we treat billions and billions of dollars like it was monopoly money.

And so I have a question to those who would say that we are irresponsible in this, and that is: How can we in good conscience raise the debt limit when we have just, just as the gentleman from Indiana has accurately pointed out, just added $16 billion in so-called emergency spending straight into the deficit without any consideration where that money is going to come from?

Now, I have read in the various newspapers that there are those who say it is irresponsible to hold the debt-ceiling vote hostage in exchange for a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto vote. My question would be: Is it responsible to mortgage our children's future and pile billions and billions dollars more of debt, public debt, upon their shoulders in the future? That does not seem responsible to me. Is it responsible to refuse, as we have continually done, to submit to the various States an amendment to the Constitution that would mandate a balanced budget and allow people to have their input on that through their various State legislatures? Is it responsible to vote down alternative budget proposals like that of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that would have frozen Federal spending and allowed us to deal with this deficit? That does not seem responsible to me. Is it responsible to ignore the wishes of what we acknowledge are the vast majority of the American people who want a real line-item veto and want to have the President with that kind of authority? Is is responsible to raise the debt ceiling by a quarter of a trillion dollars without even grappling with these difficult questions?

I suggest that it is not, and between now and the next Presidential election, through the end of fiscal year 1996, the public debt will increase by almost $1.3 trillion. I do not think that is deficit reduction. I do not think that is responsible.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1820

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that the figures that have been cited are very conservative. If you look back 10 years ago when we were at $1 trillion in debt, and now it is $4 trillion, nobody would have believed and nobody stated we would quadruple the national debt in the next decade.

And I predict we will not be at $6 trillion in 1998, we will be at $8 trillion or $10 trillion at the rate that we are going.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BAKER of California. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] said, we continue to spend and spend and spend. Each program continues to grow.

What we are asking for this week is to raise the debt ceiling, reach into our kids' and our grandchildren's pockets and say, "We are going to have some Government today and we are going to enjoy and you are going to pay for it."

We just increased unemployment insurance, we allowed another 26 weeks, and everyone cheered in the Nation. Did they know that their grandchildren were going to pay for it? There was not one cent appropriated to pay for that. There were no cuts in the budget to pay for that. It was just another increase right onto the bottom line, the bottom line of debt, and then they have the nerve to come up here and say that we are going to increase the debt limit.

Now, I am only a freshman from California, but the people in California are smart enough to know that the recession is caused by too large a Government taking too big a bite out of the private sector. We need to put money back into the private sector to create real jobs, put those people to work, and then we will be flooded with revenue to the Federal Government.

The opposite does not work: Government does not create wealth, debt does not create wealth; it creates an obligation that must be paid by our children.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for enumerating all the programs of this Government that continue to grow.

And I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for proposing a freeze because the only way we can force this House to prioritize its spending is to put a lid on it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. BAKER of California. To say that we will go no further than $1.5 trillion in this year's budget.

Now it is up to this body to sit down and prioritize spending and live within its means.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from California.

Let me just say, before I yield to my colleague from California, that it never ceases to amaze me that my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle and their President, President Clinton, continue to talk about increasing taxes to reduce the deficit instead of getting to the business of cutting spending. Before we should even talk about tax increases, especially after the humongous tax increase we had just 2½ years ago, we should take a meat cleaver to the Government spending and the bureaucracy in Washington. But we never talk about that; we just talk about loading more taxes on the back of the American people, more than double the largest tax increase in American history. And we continue to mortgage the future of our kids and spend right on into the future.

With that I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank my friend from Indiana and appreciate this opportunity to join with all the Members here in expressing concern about raising the debt limit. This is the first time since I came to Washington where we had a clear and clean vote on it. Typically, it is done in a convoluted fashion. You do not really have an opportunity to speak directly to this issue.

The debate limit is raised sort of in the budget process, and I oppose the budget. But, happily, this time we get to talk directly to the issue.

You know, I have discovered, Mr. Speaker, that people here in Washington talk a lot about the deficit, but they really are not that concerned about it. They make political capital out of the debt, but they are not doing anything to reduce it. I think it is just a travesty that year after year after year we have these budget summits and increase people's taxes, and all that happens is that the debt, the annual deficit and accumulated debt, get worse. I just finished reading a book called "Bankruptcy 1995." I would commend it to all of you and to the people who would take an interest in the fiscal affairs of this country because this book starkly portrays the negative trends that are in effect in this country and have been in effect for a number of years.

I would like to just illustrate what has been happening with all of this budget summit talk. I am very disappointed in the Democrats who have constantly pushed this approach, but I am also disappointed in some Republicans who have gone along with it.

Frankly, both parties have their fingerprints, to one degree or another, on this terrible problem of the annual deficit and the cumulative national debt.

I remember how disappointed I was in 1982 when much of the good done by the 1981 tax cut was undone in 1982 by something called TEFRA, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act. We were promised that there would be, in return for the sacrifice of the American people, we would get budget cuts. Indeed, we were told that for a $98 billion tax increase we would have spending cuts of $31 billion.

Now, I should say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members here and for those who may be listening, that only in Washington can a cut be an increase; kind of like "Alice in Wonderland." When we talk about budget cuts, it is something less than what the projected increase was to have been.

So it is a little disappointing because in real terms it is always an increase. I do not think there has ever been since World War II an actual baseline reduction.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield briefly, when TEFRA was brought to the floor of the U.S. House, I was just coming into the Congress, and they promised $3 of spending cuts for every $1 in tax increases, and it never materialized. In fact, we spent about $1.50 to $1.58 for every $1 in new taxes. That has been the trend since even before that.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It has been the trend, and I find it fascinating that they always order an immediate tax increase to take effect now and the spending cuts are never immediate, they are always promised, always down the road, except when we get close to where we think that road is going to lead.

Then we get a turn in the road, a new plan, and we defer the spending cuts.

Mr. EWING. If the gentleman would yield, I sometimes wonder about these new administrations and quick tax increases. Does the gentleman suppose that there is any possibility that they think the American people will forget this before the next election?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, it makes you wonder: How dumb do they think the American people are? We have been hearing tax increases advanced in the name of reducing the budget deficit for over a decade now, and it has never resulted in any improvement in the deficit. Indeed, the deficit has always gotten worse after the tax increase.

Let me just illustrate this now: In 1982, here is the blue on this chart, the projected deficit, and the red is the actual deficit. It is nearly 2 to 1 in 1982. Then we come to 1984. We did a little better this time. 1984, look again, here is the blue, the projected deficit, and here in red is the actual deficit. Now, we wouldn't you think that in one of these we might see these reversed? No, the actual always outstrips the projected, it is always worse than what was planned.

Here is 1987, when Jim Miller was the budget director, he did a pretty good job in that year; not too much red. But the fact of the matter is the red again exceeds the blue. The actual budget deficit, even after the tax increases—by the way, in 1984 we had $49 billion of tax increases, and we got all $49 billion; we had $110 billion in promised spending cuts, and we did not get a dime.

Then in 1987 we had $28 billion, relatively modest tax increase, all things considered. We had $49 billion promised in spending cuts; we got every dime of the tax increases and not one dime of spending cuts.

And then in 1989, well, this looks sort of like the 1982 projection; we got $14.2 billion in tax increases, and we got nothing in the spending cuts, $13.8 billion.

Now we will go to the big one, at least until the latest proposal, the big one in 1990. It did not take a genius to figure out that in 1990 a massive tax increase, I believe the largest single-year tax increase in U.S. history, that that would only fuel the desire for more spending. And that is exactly what it has done.

□ 1830

You can say that we have had 175 billion dollars' worth of tax increases, or will have had by the time this fiscal year is completed. That is far in excess of what the projected deficits were. In fact, the actual deficit, as you can see in 1993, is almost three times what the projected deficit was in the blue here.

For that reason, I react with dismay when once again, you know, how many of these have we gone through, this is the fifth one since 1981, beginning in 1982; so we had five of these little summits, some of them very big summits.

In every case, we violated our promise to the taxpayer to reduce spending, and in every case we kept our promise about the tax increases. So they have been very good about keeping half the promised, it is always against the taxpayer, but when we really talk about reducing spending, well, you know, that is down the road. We will get to that another day.

Now, look, once again, we are in 1993. President Clinton has come up with a plan. Here it is. Taxes, 359 billion dollars' worth of taxes, and look at the spending, $140 billion.

Here is the thing I find most insulting of all. After we go through all this, after it has been proven, really, that tax increases only fuel the amount of spending that can occur they do not reduce the deficit, they expand the deficit, after we go through all this enormous hardship for Americans, this includes an energy tax on everybody, we all know what happened.

No economist believes that in this weak recovery, and by the way, in California which I represent, it is in a severe recession, the greatest recession since the 1930's, and no one believes that you can have this kind of a massive tax increase and not damage the economy.

We are going to have after 5 years of this tax increase, we are going to have an annual budget deficit of $228½ billion, and these are using the President's figures.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Those are conservative, too.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, the President is a conservative in this. That is like, well, here some of the folks in Russia referred to, that I would disagree with, as conservatives.

I certainly do not feel we have anything in common with them.

The fact of the matter is, this is disgraceful. We are going to hike people's taxes $359 billion to end up in 5 years with an annual budget deficit of $228 billion.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman from Texas would like to comment on this, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. It is just amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is presenting just a wonderful picture of what we are about to see.

Now, if we are just conservative, and we have all seen that the rule of thumb is for every dollar of taxes that you raise, $1.58 as the gentleman from Indiana has said, we get $1.58 of spending increases. If you just take the number there, and the gentleman has already portrayed that every time we project what the deficit is going to be, it is always bigger when we do these 5-year plans. If you just take that dollar and a half, for every dollar of taxes half again as much is going to be in deficit spending, then that would be $180 billion on top of that $228 billion is what you can probably look forward to in 1998 as the real deficit, which would be almost $400 billion in deficits in 1998.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will let me interrupt, let me just say something.

Since the 1990 budget summit agreement was passed, the increase in spending as compared to taxes has escalated above the $1.58. It is at $2.70. Since 1990 when we had the budget summit agreement, for every $1 in new taxes, we have spent close to $2.70. So it has really gone up like a rocket.

I would just like to say that if that trend continues, this $6 trillion projection of debt by 1998 is way short. I think it is going to be much more like $8 or $9 trillion, maybe even higher than that.

The other thing is, as my colleague, the gentleman from California has pointed out, is that time and again the spending cuts are always in the outyears.

Now, President Clinton is no exception. He has all these tax increases, and when you put the hidden fees in there, the Social Security tax and everything else, you are closer to $400 billion in new taxes and fees; but he has all the taxes up front, and the spending cuts are in the fourth and fifth years.

Now, I would like to remind my colleagues, there are going to be two elections between now and when his spending cuts take place. You cannot bind the next duly elected Congress to the spending cuts we are talking about. So even if his plan were a viable one, which I seriously doubt, you are going to have two successive Congresses elected, and I promise you there will be major changes in not only the economic outlook, but in those projections on spending and taxes.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Are we not in the third year of the 5-year plan of the 1990 budget agreement and we are already changing it? Every time we do one of these 5-year plans, we never go past the third year.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. DELAY. So what the gentleman is saying, we are going to raise all these taxes and get the promised spending cuts in the fourth and fifth years, and it will never happen.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It will never happen, except in one area, and that is probably in the area of defense.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not think a freshman Arkansas Congressman was going to get to talk with you all going like this.

What I would like to say is that we need to talk about this in simple terms. When the people in America reach the limit on their credit cards and the bank says you cannot borrow any more money, they have to do something. They can go if they want to and try to get another credit card, but it does not get them ahead. All they do is spend to the limit of that particular credit card.

What we have got to do as a Nation is we have got to say, okay, we are at the limit and we do not want to borrow any more, for two reasons. One is that it is wrong, and, two, we are going to miss the chance of discipline and to learn the lessons of the past administrations, spending too much, the past Congresses spending too much.

I believe that the people of America want us to set the example. I have filed a bill today asking for a 25-percent decrease in the budgets of our congressional offices and our legislative budgets. If we do that, that will be a savings of $2 billion.

The important thing is we will be saying to the rest of the Nation that our credit card limit has been reached and we have got to turn and cut spending. There have got to be cuts in spending. Just like the people of America do, I want this Congress to do the same. It is only fair. It is real leadership and it is not playing the game that has been played for so long to our Nation's detriment.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am going to finish up here and turn the time back over to the gentleman from Indiana.

As the previous speakers have observed, this is the Clinton administra-

tion's estimate of the annual budget deficit after 5 years of new taxes. It is $228 billion per year.

Now, keep in mind, we looked at these charts, and the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Texas were making these points.

The blue was the projected deficit in 1992. The red, twice the projected, was the actual.

The same story here in 1989, where the red is greater, almost more than twice what the blue is, where the actual deficit was actually outstripping it, and then, of course, should we be so unfortunate as to follow the pattern in this fiscal year, here our actual deficit is three times what the projected deficit was.

So as the gentleman from Texas I believe has observed, this $228 billion could be more in the neighborhood of almost $700 billion if we follow the 1993 pattern.

Mr. Speaker, let me just observe, we have major problems in Russia right now where inflation has raised up to about 100 percent a month. There is much speculation that the old hardline Communists are going to return to govern that country. That is still the only country in the world that has the capability of annihilating this one.

We have major instabilities in what used to be Yugoslavia. If we get involved in any one of those things in a military fashion, assuming we are still capable of responding militarily at that point, you can imagine what that is going to do to the deficit. This country is ill-prepared for the times ahead. We are in a very unstable world. We do not even have the financial wherewithal to be sending troops around the world, and yet there is the high likelihood that such action may be indeed required, and it will make tremendously worse this problem.

□ 1840

Let me just observe, Mr. Speaker, that I am introducing tomorrow, with the cosponsorship of many, an amendment to balance the budget. I think it is vitally important. If we are going to have all of these tax increases and have to raise the ceiling on the debt, which I personally oppose, then I think this is the year to finally get people to come forward, and sign on and vote out a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution which has failed now in the House of Representatives by just a handful of votes, and this, of course, will require a three-fifths vote in order to pass any excess of outlays over receipts. It will require the use of actual receipts, not just estimates which can be played around with like they have been in the past. You cannot use receipts for borrowing to be applied to balance the budget, and there is one exception: In a declared war. Last one of these we had was World War II, and we did not have to balance the budget; so, we are going to try and put a real strict set of guidelines on here, but one that is flexible enough to meet the changing exigencies that may be upon this country.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to end with a quote from Thomas Jefferson, a man whose philosophy should have been followed in this country and we would not be in the mess that we are in. He asked in his inaugural address a rhetorical question: What more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Here is the answer he gave:

> A wise and frugal government which shall restrain people from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own industry and pursuits of government, and which shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread which it has earned.

When we hike the taxes by $359 billion, we are taking from the mouth of labor, namely the people who work for a living, the bread which they have earned, and families are crumbling under this weight of Government imposed tax burden. We need to begin today to defeat the resolution to raise the debt ceiling, and pass the balanced budget amendment and get serious about cutting our spending, and with that I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for this opportunity

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], my colleague, for all of the work that he has obviously done to bring this to the attention of his colleagues and to the Nation, and with that I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I would just like to speak a moment to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], my colleague, who has done an excellent job with these charts. It is certainly not strange to see them for Ross Perot has made these charts so popular, but the gentleman comes forward with great information, and I hope that the American people, or a great number of them, are listening tonight to see these charts, and to see visually the problem laid out before the people, and I congratulate him for that, and I congratulate you for the bill that you will introduce tomorrow, which I want to cosponsor because of the importance of having a sound fiscal policy, and I just want to congratulate you, and would the gentleman yield further for just a moment?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Sure.

Mr. EWING. I have just a few observations about what we are doing here tonight that I think are so important because I think the budget deficit is by far the greatest problem this country faces. Everything else that we try to address comes back to the fact that we have already spent the money and the resources that we should be putting into the problems that this country faces.

I think that the leadership of this country, including our President, the leadership of this Congress, including the Speaker, should go out into the hinterland and talk to the people because they are now aware of this problem also, and I am afraid that the leadership of the Congress and this new administration, with their policies, are totally out of step.

I am not for new taxes, but I think the American people would support taxes if every dollar of it went to reduce the deficit. They are concerned that their country might not even be able to exist and everything that they have worked for, everything that they have gained, small farmers, small businessmen, widows who have a retirement, will be wiped away by the infrugal activity of this Government. And they ought to be mad about it, and, if we go out and talk to people in our districts, as I know my colleagues have, we will find that they are very agitated about it.

Our constituent said to me the other day, "Do we have to go down with our pitchforks and our knives to get Congress to listen?" I certainly hope not, but it certainly is a sobering fact that anybody would even suggest that they would have to do that to get the attention of this Congress.

I often think that the American people, the great bulk of them, must kind of feel like a parent who observes an adult child living the fast life, spending way beyond their means, and now they want to mortgage their home, or their business, or their farm for some other frivolous expenditure, and they know that in the end it is going to mean disaster for their family, for their children, for their way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues in their efforts here tonight. We must continue to bring this to the attention of the American people.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] for his comments, and let me real quickly say that last year we brought a constitutional amendment to the floor to balance the budget, and I think seven of the sponsors of that got pressure from the leadership of this House, and they changed their vote even though they were sponsors. We would have passed the balance budget amendment last year except seven of the Democrat sponsors, because the pressure they received from the leader, the Speaker, changed their votes and did not even vote for a bill they were sponsoring, and the American people need to know that and put pressure on, on both sides of the aisle to get this balance budget amendment passed.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very plain to the people back home

that the Republicans are not going to pass the balance budget amendment. We need our colleagues on the Democrat side. Many of them support this and the reasonableness of it. We just need a good fair vote on it.

Let me just end by saying that I really appreciate my colleagues for participating in this special order tonight. We have not had an opportunity on the floor to talk about this increase in the debt ceiling. It has been kind of camouflaged, and since it has such a tremendous impact on the people of this country, it really needs to be discussed, and I appreciate all of the hard work of my colleagues in illuminating the issue. We have got to do what the American people want, and I think what the American people want, first of all, is to get at the business of cutting Government spending and Government waste. Then once that is accomplished, if we need to do other things to balance the budget, let us do it, but, first and foremost, we have got to shoot straight with the American people, and hiding things like this debt ceiling increases is not the way to do that.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement on Greek Independence Day immediately after the special order of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise today in this Chamber to honor those ancient and modern Greeks who offered the precious gift of democracy to the world.

This past week, people of Greek heritage and the Greek orthodox faith, along with freedom lovers the world over, celebrated the 172d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people rose in rebellion, igniting a 7-year struggle for independence from more than 400 years of foreign domination by the Ottoman Turks. The series of uprisings touched off on that historic day soon led to a widespread revolution that quickly attracted international support and respect.

Mr. Speaker, the Greek people sought only the right to govern themselves, to determine their own future, to firmly grasp their destinies. There are few more precious rights than this, and it is one treasured no less highly around the world than it is here today in the United States.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to the ancient Greeks, who forged the very notion of democracy. Of course, our Founding Fathers drew heavily on this concept—on the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece—in forming our Government and in drafting our Constitution and Declaration of Independence. These documents now will carry that message abroad again.

In many instances, that message will be delivered to individuals still struggling for freedom, still placing their lives on the line in their quest for democracy. It is my hope that these individuals will take inspiration not only from the ancient Greeks, but from the Greeks who rose in revolt in 1821 and persevered for 7 arduous years.

Theirs is a perfect example of the ability of mankind to overcome all obstacles—obstacles that often appear insurmountable—if the desire to succeed is strong enough. Theirs is an example that oppressed people throughout the world may look to and gain strength from in their struggle to overcome their oppressors.

The Greek war for independence was filled with remarkable events by many peoples in a common cause. The roles played by the philhellenes—friends of the Greeks—were instrumental to Europe's recognition of the importance of the struggle.

The legacy of Lord Byron remains indelibly inscribed in the history of the philhellenes. Byron's name—carved boldly into a column of the temple of Poseidon at Cape Sounion—is testimony to his brave words that awakened not only his home country of England to the plight of the Greeks, but France, Russia, and other nations, as well.

The pages of history speak as boldly of other philhellenes, too. The klephts swept down upon the invaders from their mountain strongholds. The sea captains of Hydra broke the Ottoman naval blockade of the Greek coast, and today, generations of Greek merchant seamen learn their trade appropriately at the Academy on Hydra.

It was all these people—and the Greeks themselves—this coalition if you will of like-minded individuals who saw clearly what was right and who followed the flag of freedom raised by a Greek orthodox priest that very special March day in 1821.

Mr. Speaker, in the American colonial period, during the formative years of what would be our Great Republic, no feature was more prominent than the extent to which Greek and Roman sources were cited by the Framers of the Constitution. The very basis of our Constitution derives from Aristotle and was put into practice in ancient Rome, in 18th-century England, and in the early State Constitutions, before it was given its national embodiment by the Convention of 1787.

The overriding appreciation was for Aristotle's sense of balance, since the delegates viewed the tyrant and the mob as equally dangerous. Indeed, both James Madison and John Adams emphasized what Aristotle had written in "the politics," that "the more perfect the admixture of the political elements, the more lasting will be the state."

Polybius, a leading authority on Greek city-states, also was of special interest to the framers of the Constitution. In his histories, Polybius wrote that the best governments consist of one of three forms: kingly government, aristocracy, or democracy. Our own national experiment has shown us that, in fact, the best government is one that comprises all three.

The delegates in Philadelphia, of course, noted that the Executive represented the kingly power, the Senate the aristocratic, and the House the popular power.

Through the recognition of these processes, the idea of a separation of powers, a system of checks and balances, was instituted in American Government. Thus, as Polybius foresaw and wrote:

> When one part, having Grown out of proportion to the others, aims at supremacy and tends to become too dominant * * * none of the three is absolute * * *.

It is the example of the ancient Greeks that we celebrate each March 25, that and the return of democracy to Greece on this day of glory for the Greek people. The spirit of democracy and of this day lives on in the defense of the principles for which so many of the free world's citizens have given their lives.

We in America feel a special closeness to the democratic ideal born in ancient Athens and fought for and secured by the Greeks and their allies centuries later. Only here in this Nation is this ideal defended so ardently.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the United States has come to Greece's Defense in the past. However, the Greek-speaking island of Cyprus is still torn in two after 19 years of an illegal Turkish occupation. More than 1,600 people are still missing in Cyprus since 1974 and 5 Americans are among them. Nineteen years, Mr. Speaker, is a long time to wait for the word of the whereabouts of a loved one.

Thousands of Greek-Cypriots have been displaced because of this illegal Turkish occupation. It is hard to believe that such a small and beautiful island could harbor so much hardship for its inhabitants.

I believe the United States Government can play a meaningful role in achieving a just and lasting solution to the problems on Cyprus. Therefore, today, I would like to formally ask the new administration to keep a settlement on Cyprus as a front-burner issue.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Greece itself confronts a crisis of its own today. A long-simmering crisis inflamed by the recent break up of Yugoslavia. The southern most region of Yugoslavia has decided to use the Greek name "Macedonia" to identify themselves. Mr. Speaker, the use of this Greek name to identify this region is unacceptable. Some may not appreciate the very real dangers in this, so I would like to explain them.

Over the past few months my office has been presented with material from various organizations explaining why the name Macedonia should not be used to identify this region. The American Hellenic Institute has put out a list of 25 reasons why it is not in the interests of the United States to recognize the Skopje Regime under the name of Macedonia. I would like to mention just a few of them.

The first is the usage of Macedonia as a nationality. This was an invention of Marshal Tito in 1944. Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, created a false Macedonian ethnic consciousness among his South Slavic citizens for a number of reasons, including his campaign against Greece to gain control of

Greece's province of Macedonia and the major port city of Salonika.

Second, the Balkan region seems always to have been a troubled one. During Greece's civil war, one should not forget that Tito's and Stalin's action in this region resulted in the deaths of more than 50,000 Greeks. Some 685,000 Greeks were left homeless, not to mention the 25,000 children that were kidnapped. The Skopje regime, which is still in power today, and its communist leadership were in the forefront of Tito's efforts against Greece.

The United States opposed the use of the name Macedonia by Tito in 1944, this policy should remain in effect today as well. In a circular airgram dated December 26, 1944, then Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., stated:

This Government considers talk of Macedonian "Nation," Macedonian "Fatherland," or Macedonian "National consciousness" to be unjustified demagoguery representing no ethnic nor political reality, and sees in its present revival a possible cloak for aggressive intentions against Greece.

The approved policy of this government is to oppose any revival of the Macedonian issue as related to Greece.

Mr. Speaker, since 1945, Skopje has mounted a propaganda campaign against Greece claiming all of Macedonia for the so-called Macedonian people. However, there is no such ethnic group. The people who live in this region speak a Slav dialect. Serbs say that these people are Serbs, Bulgarians say they are Bulgarians. The ancient Macedonians, Mr. Speaker, were Greek, and they spoke Greek. All historical and archaeological evidence proves this point.

The United States must not be swayed by conciliatory statements of the current president of the Skopje government, Kiro Gilgorov, former Communist Party apparatchik and Tito protege.

It should be noted that while President Gilgorov was in the United States last spring with reassurances that his government had no expansionist aims, Skopje's propaganda campaign against Greece continued.

This included commemorative bank notes depicting the famous White Tower, a Greek monument located in Salonika. Also, maps of Macedonia were published there, maps encompassing one-fourth of mainland Greece.

While the current conflict in the Balkans has brought this situation to national attention, Skopje's propaganda long precedes the breakup of Yugoslavia. In August 1992, its parliament voted to appropriate the Vergina star—a uniquely Greek symbol—as its emblem.

Mr. Speaker, this issue runs even deeper than just the historical importance of a name, though. Names can have a powerful significance—they can be used for territorial claims and interference in the internal affairs of one's neighbors. This is the fear of Greece and other nations in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1992, I brought this issue to the White House in a letter. I also signed a second, joint letter to then-President Bush. This letter was signed by more than 140 Members of this body and the Senate asking the President to maintain his policy of withholding recognition of the area until the concerns of Greece and the other nations involved are resolved.

I now urge President Clinton to maintain President Bush's policy. Recognition of the Skopje regime under the name Macedonia will prove destabilizing for the region and harmful to United States interests.

I ask my colleagues today to stand behind Greece on this very important issue. Our assistance could prove to be a peacekeeping force in this area wherein so much hardship exists.

Democracy is a goal worth the effort in ensuring its peaceful attainment. Indeed, in these very special times when democracy and freedom continue to blossom and grow around the world, we should reflect on the democratic principles offered by ancient Greece.

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate together with Greece in order to reaffirm the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. These principles are not uniquely Greek or American, but they are our promise to the world—and they form a legacy that we cherish and have a responsibility to protect and defend.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join my colleagues once again in commemorating Greek Independence Day. March 25 is the anniversary of the day when the Greek people rose up and launched the revolution that would end 400 years of oppressive Turkish occupation.

March 25 was not chosen accidentally as the day on which to launch the revolution. It was chosen because on this day at an Orthodox monastery in the rugged hills of Patras, Greece, an elderly bishop emerged carrying a sacred icon, an embroidered image of the Virgin Mother of God, which with that holy man's blessing became the banner of the Greek revolution. Therefore, this indeed is a double holiday, being the Feast of the Annunciation of the Greek Orthodox Church.

With the Greek revolution, democracy and freedom once again returned to the land that gave these ideas birth over 2000 years ago. This contribution is just one of the gifts that is the Greek legacy to our Western civilization.

I join my colleagues in extending warm greetings to the Greek people as well as Americans of Greek descent who celebrate this date. Although this day is sacred to all Greeks, it is especially important to the Greek-American community in Baltimore, where the Greek Orthodox Cathedral is named in honor of this day.

That cathedral is where my husband and I were married, and I take special pleasure in extending greetings to the members of Baltimore's Annunciation Cathedral and to its pastor, the Very Reverend Constantine Monios, and its assistant pastor, the Reverend Louis Noplos.

The Greek people have a long tradition of friendship with the United States. Although today we recall a joyous occasion, I would also take this opportunity when the world's eyes are once again on Greece to urge the administration and this Congress to pay added attention to the thorny issues with which the Greek people need and deserve our help.

First, we must renew efforts to end the tragic and illegal Turkish occupation of Cyprus. And second, the United States must make it clear to the leaders of Skopje in former Yugoslavia that the name Macedonia is Greek, and no other nation-state dare find itself masquerading under that name.

Again, congratulations to the people of Greece and Greek-Americans on the occasion of their revolution and of the rebirth of democracy in their native land.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of Greek Independence Day.

Thursday, March 25, 1993, marked the 172d anniversary of Greece's declared independence from nearly 400 years of oppression by the Ottoman Turks. In 1821, the Greeks began an 11-year struggle to regain their autonomy after centuries of foreign rule and persecution, which included loss of religious freedom and educational rights. Ultimately, Greece's liberty prevailed.

The relationship between Greece and the United States is based upon both countries' commitment to democracy. As the pioneers of "rule by the people" government, the ancient Greeks provided the foundation upon which our own Founders based our declaration of freedom. The relationship proved reciprocal when the Greeks looked to the United States as the model for rebuilding their democratic government in 1821.

The connection between Greece and the United States extends beyond history and into the present. Over 3 million Greek-Americans live in the United States, contributing positively to our society. Through the years, Greek cultural and religious contributions have enriched America's own diversity. Greek-American accomplishments include accolades in the sciences, the arts, medicine, and government. The Greek community plays a particularly vital role in the city of San Francisco's diverse population. In the past 35 years, for example, San Francisco has enjoyed the leadership of two Greek-American mayors.

As we in Congress celebrate national independence and democracy with our Greek brothers and sisters, it is appropriate to reiterate our support of an unoccupied, unified Cyprus and to commend Creek-Cypriots for their dedication to a peaceful settlement of the island's armed conflict, in spite of the continued refusal of Turkish-Cypriots to reach a resolution. It is also fitting today to emphasize our commitment to the people of Greece to continue their lives in the security of peace and freedom.

We must continue to stand by Greece as she has stood by us. Greece is one of only four countries that has united with the United States in every international world conflict since World War I. An untiring ally, the nation of Greece offers us a strategically critical naval base on the island of Crete and a trusted friendship in NATO. The United States and Greece constitute a strong partnership built and fostered upon the principles of democracy.

With much pride, we should all celebrate the enduring relationship between our two countries.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate Greek Independence Day and reflect upon the true significance of this important occasion. The United States and Greece have a richly intermingled heritage which is truly what we celebrate.

Our tradition is derived from the original Greek traditions. It is the ancient Greek's magnificent principals of democracy upon which the United States was founded and has flourished for over two centuries. Today the democracy of the United States is a beacon to the world. In 1821, when the indomitable Greek spirit overcame the rule of the Ottoman Empire, and Greece secured its long sought independence, Greece looked to America as a model on which to reestablish the democracy and freedom it cherished. Through the years the United States and Greece have enjoyed an abiding and loyal friendship.

Democracy is the most noble ideal of government in the history of civilization. It is a bright light to millions who aspire to its promises of equality and freedom. On this day we celebrate the independence of Greece and the enduring achievements of democracy. We also recognize that the United States has been enriched by Greek-Americans who have contributed enormously to all facets of our modern society.

On this the 172d anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which restored democracy to Greece, I salute our friend and ally Greece. Zeto e Hellas.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 172d anniversary of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire.

Today, I am pleased to join my colleagues to recognize March 25 as Greek Independence Day and to pay tribute to the strength and courage exhibited by the people of Greece in their countries of struggle toward that independence. Theirs was a battle that did not end with freedom from the Ottoman Empire in 1829. The Greeks would be forced to make courageous stands against both the Nazi legions in World War II and again in the late 1940's when the tide of communism was first rolled back.

The people of Greece, with their love of freedom and their undying devotion to democracy, have given all those struggling to overcome domination a great source of inspiration. Few nations have had to struggle harder or more often to preserve their liberty, and few have contributed more to modern Western civilization than Greece. I want to emphasize the fact that those of us in this Chamber now stand as Members of a body of Government founded on the very democratic ideals and principles conceived by the great Hellenic philosophers and statesmen.

In recognition of the patriotism of those who have battled to achieve and preserve Greek independence, we salute our friends in Greece and our many fine Greek-American citizens.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for taking this special order today to enable us to recognize Greek Independence Day. Since 1987, March 25 has been officially designated as Greek Independence Day. On this day, the people of the American democracy pause to honor those who gave the very concept of democracy to the world.

March 25, 1993, marks the 172d anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1821. It was on this day that the revolution began which eventually led to Greece's freedom in 1829 after nearly 400 years of rule from Constantinople.

The connection between the United States and Greece extends into antiquity to the ancient Greeks, of whom Thomas Jefferson said, "We are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness." And it was to the American Revolution that Greek Intellectuals turned centuries later, translating our Declaration of Independence into Greek and using it as their own.

In the succeeding years, the relationship between our two peoples has grown only closer. In the early 1900's, Greek immigrants came to the young United States seeking political freedom and economic opportunity.

In the 20th Century, Greece has been one of only seven countries that has fought on the side of the United States in every major conflict. It was to assist Greece in its efforts to repel the Communist onslaught after World War II that President Truman inaugurated the concept of U.S. assistance which grew into the Marshall plan. Today, Greece is a vital part of NATO and a key member of the Western alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in this special order honoring Americans of Greek descent and the nation to which they trace their roots.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support today's special order in recognition of Greek Independence Day, March 25, 1993.

This day is a celebration of the 172d anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. On this day we are reminded of our own indebtedness to Greece, for it was with the Greeks that the idea of democracy was born. As Thomas Jefferson once wrote, "* * * to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

Democracy eluded Greece and its people for nearly 400 years—from the fall of Constantinople in 1453, until Greece declared its independence in 1821, and finally gained its freedom from the Ottoman Empire nearly 10 years later.

This day is a celebration of when Greece launched its struggle for emancipation in 1821. It is a tribute to the courage, determination, and perseverance of the Greek people, and to their love of and commitment to freedom and democracy. Greek Independence Day is a symbol of the mutual respect and shared values between our two countries.

I am honored to participate in this special order. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], for calling the order, and I thank my colleagues for their involvement.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, in 1839, 154 years ago, the government of the young Greek state declared March 25 as a national holiday, celebrating independence. Tomorrow, those of the Greek Orthodox Church and of Greek heritage celebrate both religious enlightenment and independence with great love and respect.

The religious celebration is the Day of Evangelismou, or the day on which the message of Christendom was spread throughout the world. The call for Greek independence also rose on this most auspicious day. In 1821, a priest, Father Germanos, raised the flag of independence that led Greece out of 500 years of oppression by the Ottoman Empire. Nine years after this valiant action Greece became free at last from the clutches of Ottoman rule. As a Greek-American and a staunch believer in democratic principles, I recognize with great pride the 172d anniversary of this triumph for democracy.

During the arduous struggle for independence one nation—America—was steadfast in its commitment to an autonomous Greek state. The flow of democratic principles between these two nations has a long and remarkable history. Thomas Jefferson, when writing the Declaration of Independence, drew heavily upon the principles of democracy forged in ancient Greece. When Greece made its bid for independence, it turned to the United States Declaration of Independence, which was translated into Greek and adopted as the Greek Declaration of Independence. Democracy was turning home.

For many Greek-Americans it is the Greek Fourth of July, and is reflected upon with the same enthusiasm and commitment to democracy as is experienced here at home. March 25th is a day of pride for all who embrace democracy, as a means of government of the people, by the people, for the people. As a Greek-American I wish to continue the tradition of celebrating this day as an expression of my admiration for those who long ago had the courage to believe in democracy.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Greek-Americans everywhere who celebrate the 172d anniversary of Greek independence on March 25, 1993.

As you know, Greece is the birthplace of democracy—the fundamental political principle that gave birth to both our nations. Our Founding Fathers were influenced by the Greeks' philosophical ideas.

Just as the ancient Greek philosophers inspired the Founders of the United States, it was our Declaration of Independence that modern day Greeks used as the model for theirs. In the 1820's when the Greeks fought the Ottoman Empire for their independence, they were inspired by the American revolutionaries who threw off British rule in the previous century. Indeed, many volunteers from various localities in the United States sailed to Greece to participate in the revolution. After winning its independence, Greece became an ally of the United States and continued to be our partner throughout the 20th century, fighting on the side of the United States in every international conflict.

I would like to pay special tribute to the Greek-Americans in my congressional district. Many Greeks who immigrated to the United States in the early 1900's settled in my congressional district in New York City where the Greek community, in Washington Heights, was incorporated in 1931. Tsolainos Goulandris Greek Orthodox School of Saint Spyridon was established in Washington Heights in 1933. It is the center for the Greek community and runs the Greek Independence Parade, which will take place on Sunday, March 28.

Greek-Americans have been very successful not only in my congressional district, but throughout the United States. Among those who have distinguished themselves in the po-

litical arena are: U.S. Senator PAUL SARBANES of Maryland, Congresswoman OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine, Congressman GEORGE GEKAS of Pennsylvania, Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS of Florida, former Members of Congress John Brademas of Indiana, Nick Galifianakis of North Carolina, Peter Kryus of Maine, Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania, Nick Mavroules of Massachusetts, and former U.S. Senator and Presidential candidate Paul Tsongas of Massachusetts.

As we join the Greek-American community in celebrating this momentous occasion, we are honoring not just a day, but the Democratic ideals that have made both our countries great.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1993, marks the 172d anniversary of the revolution that freed the Greek people from almost 400 years of rule by the Ottoman Empire, which dominated Greece from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 until the declaration of independence in 1821.

I am pleased to support a resolution commemorating and celebrating the event sponsored by Congressmen MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, STEPHEN NEAL, JOHN PORTER, JACK REED, and ROBERT TORRICELLI, and I commend them for offering it.

The United States has long enjoyed a warm and close relationship with Greece and its citizens. Our system of government owes a heavy debt to ancient Greek philosophers, and in turn, the United States system was a model for the Greek declaration of independence in the 19th century.

I have a particularly strong appreciation for the contribution Greeks have made to the United States and to the world from the time of their independence. Perhaps the best known Greek politician in the country, Paul Tsongas, who represented my hometown of Lowell for two terms until running for the Senate in 1978, is a model for public servants at all levels of government. I join my colleagues in congratulating the Greek people on the anniversary of their independence.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I join my colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, in observing the 172d anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence. Today, we observe Greek Independence Day, a celebration commemorating both Greek and American democracy.

Two thousand years ago, the Greek philosopher Pericles proclaimed, "Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people.* * * What counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses."

These principles of justice and equality had an undeniable influence on the formation of our American democratic system. Jefferson and Mason, students of the ancient Athenian democracy of Pericles, championed one of the first human rights documents in history, the Bill of Rights. Madison and Hamilton, also students of Pericles, were instrumental in developing the Federal structure of our government.

Inspired by the United States' Declaration of Independence from Great Britain 45 years earlier, the Greeks in turn began their 11-year struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1821. Led by then-President James Monroe, many Americans supported and even participated in the Greek revolutionary war.

During World War II, American and Hellenic forces again joined together as part of the Allied effort to preserve democracy. Over 600,000 Greeks died in that war, 9 percent of the total population of Greece.

Greek freedom faced yet another threat during the struggle against dictatorial rule in the late 1960's and early 1970's. As then-chairman of the United States Committee for democracy in Greece, I was delighted when Democratic government returned to that country. However, seeing the birthplace of democracy ruled by dictators reinforced my own conviction that democracy is not an accomplishment, but an ongoing process which must be guarded constantly by the people.

America's longstanding relationship with Greece is not only reflected in our historical ties, but also in the contributions Greek-Americans have made to our society. Many skilled and prominent Greek-American civic leaders, doctors, scientists, church leaders, entertainers, and athletes have helped to shape American life.

As we join together today to celebrate the independence of the Greek people, I urge my fellow Americans to continue to work together to preserve and uphold the democratic ideals of the Greek philosophers. Let us never cease from our struggle for freedom and democracy here and abroad.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues and the Greek community to celebrate the 172d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Throughout the years, the history of the United States and the history of Greece have been intertwined. It is in ancient Greece that our democratic principles were forged. The notion that the ultimate power to govern belongs in the hands of the people is the bedrock of American political society. Thomas Jefferson himself stated, "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

In addition, our system of checks and balances can be traced to ancient Greece. The safeguards keeping one branch of government from dominating the others have helped prevent the emergence of tyranny and preserved our democracy.

In turn, it is the United States that inspired the Greeks as they valiantly struggled to free themselves from the Ottoman Empire. Since then, the two nations have fought side by side to preserve and protect these cherished freedoms. During World War II, the Greeks paid dearly to help defeat Hitler and roll back fascism.

The ideals of ancient Greece are once again demonstrating their transforming power. In my office I have a globe that is only a few years old; however, it is terribly outdated. It is outdated because people around the world have stood up and demanded freedom and democracy. Oppression is on the run in many places where it has held sway for many decades. All of these wonderful changes can be traced to the democratic principles of ancient Greece.

I am confident that the United States and Greece will continue to lead the international community as we begin this new era of freedom and prosperity. During this period of transition, it is especially important that the current borders and territorial integrity of Greece be respected. I also look forward to working with the Greek community in Michigan which has added so much to the character of the Great Lakes State.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this year's House resolution commemorating Greek Independence Day, I am very pleased to join my colleagues in honoring this day, and I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his efforts in sponsoring the resolution.

March 25 is a special day for Greeks and for all the friends of Greece around the world. On this day in 1821, the people of Greece began their successful struggle to expel the repressive Turkish regime which had occupied the Greek nation for over 400 years. Eventual Greek reunification only came after a long, hard-fought struggle, but the people of Greece made countless sacrifices because of their commitment to freedom and their love for their culture and religion which had been stifled by the Ottoman Empire for centuries.

Since that time 172 years ago, the independence of Greece has been repeatedly challenged, both by external and internal forces. But today, Greece stands proudly as a completely free and independent nation guided by the same democratic principles that were born in that land thousands of years ago.

The United States and Greece are old friends and allies. Our nations and people are bound by values, interests, and a common political heritage. The democracy we so cherish began in Greece a millennia ago. Ancient Greek ideals of freedom fueled our own struggle for independence. The success of our revolution and our young democracy helped inspire Greece's effort to forge a modern nation in 1821.

Today, millions of people around the world are also inspired by the eternal values and aspirations that we commemorate by honoring Greek independence. But from the Greek historical experience, as well as from our own, we know that it will not be an easy nor a quick transition to freedom and democracy. The Greek struggle lasted 8 long, hard years. It could take that long in many of the struggling democracies throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the United States and Greece have a special bond of friendship in the values and the history that our nations share. That bond is now a shining example to the world's fledgling democracies. I join with my colleagues once again in honoring the independence of a country, and a people, that have inspired us all.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a special day to the city of Chicago's Greek community and to all those of Greek heritage across this Nation—the commemoration of Greek Independence Day.

Once again, we celebrate the anniversary of the start of Greece's struggle for independence. After many years of domination, Greece was finally able to separate itself from its Turkish oppressors.

The Greek community is rich in tradition and has added in numerous ways to American heritage, most of all by giving us the political and philosophical foundation for our demo-

cratic government. Today, I join with my colleagues in saluting the Greek community for its courage and its many contributions that have enlightened American culture.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor the resolution, House Joint Resolution 10, which designates March 25, 1993, as Greek Independence Day: A national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy.

Greek Independence Day is not just a celebration for the people of Greece or Greek-Americans. It is a celebration for all Americans because it symbolizes the beginning of a relationship between the world's first democracy, Greece, and the world's greatest democracy, the United States of America.

As we all know, March 25, 1993, marks the 172d anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. History records the oppression and struggles of human liberty to which the Greeks were subjected during the period prior to the revolution. Over the course of modern history, Americans and Greeks fought and died together in three wars.

Throughout the United States and especially in the Sixth District of North Carolina, Greek-Americans have made large contributions to our culture and society. I have personally experienced many of the wonderful festivals and celebrations which Greek-Americans in my district celebrate annually.

As we celebrate Greek Independence Day, we affirm the bonds between our two nations. I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 10 and urge all Americans to join in activities to salute the Greek people and their contributions to world history.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in celebrating the 172d anniversary of the independence of Greece from the Ottoman Empire. This day has been billed as a "National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy" and it truly is a celebration of the bond between the two nations.

As Harvard historian Bernard Baylin makes clear in his award winning book "The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution", Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Washington, and the other Founding Fathers of the United States studied the Greek classics and were very familiar with the tenets of ancient Athenian democracy and Greek history. The Founders read from and quoted Demosthenes, Aristotle, and Polybius, and writers of political tracts before, during, and after the American Revolution often took the pseudonyms of ancient Greeks.

While American patriots of the middle and late 18th century learned classical Greek so they could acquaint themselves with the principles of democracy which had been invented and refined in Athens more than 2,000 years before, the fire of freedom and democracy which was their heritage and birthright never stopped glowing within the Greeks. In almost every generation since the fall of Constantinople on May 29, 1453, Greeks had revolted against their Turkish rulers. While these revolts were brutally repressed, the hope and vision remained.

On March 25, 1821, a band of Greeks began another revolt that was to end very differently than the struggles of their forefathers. From the beginning the War for Greek Independence was a war of the people. As the Greek-American newspaper puts it

> When sectional, political or social rivalries, incompetent leadership, personal ambitions, treachery and betrayals almost ended the national struggle, the masses of people saved their Revolution from collapsing. For eight years, the *Iaos*, the ordinary people of Greece, exhibited extraordinary courage, strength and endurance. They never surrendered to the Turks or to fear and despair.

During the Greek War for Independence—begun a mere 45 years after the American colonists declared independence in Philadelphia—the Greek freedom fighters took inspiration from an understandable source, the United States Declaration of Independence, which is reported to have been circulating freely among the Greek troops. In many ways, the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and the emergence of democracy in North America in 1776 is a continuation of the process begun in the Athenian agora at the foot of the acropolis over 2,000 years ago.

The occasion of the 172d anniversary of Greek independence is also an appropriate time to reflect on the trend toward democracy in the modern world. The past 3 years have seen the greatest expansion of freedom in history. Over one-third of the nations on earth, encompassing nearly 30 percent of the world's population, have consciously decided to alter their political systems in favor of more open and democratic forms of government. Freedom House, a New York based human rights monitoring group, now counts an all time high number of nations it designates as free. The ideals of democracy developed in Greece 2,000 years ago and the example of United States democracy based on the Greek model are directly responsible for this transformation of so many nations to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for calling this special order and I am pleased to extend my congratulations to the people of Greece and the Greek diaspora. I urge all Members to take this opportunity to reflect on the history of democracy and to also reflect on the future of democracy and America's obligation to promote government by the people the world over.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate an important event to Greeks and Americans alike, Greek Independence Day. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 10, legislation commemorating this important event.

On this day, 172 years ago, the State of Greece declared its independence from the Ottoman Empire. This date is significant to Greeks and Greek-Americans for it commemorates the anniversary of Greece's long struggle to gain freedom after 400 years of foreign Turkish domination.

But this date also has tremendous significance to the United States—for this date reminds us of the common political and cultural ties that bind our two nations. Over 2,000 years ago, the great philosophers of ancient Greece extolled the virtues of democracy and the value of the common man. Plato wrote, "Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike."

After nearly two millenniums, these Greek political ideals inspired our American forefathers to revolt against the British crown and proclaim independence in 1776. According to Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness." The Founders of our Constitution, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, wrote in the Federalist Papers that "among the confederacies of antiquity the most considerable was that of the Grecian republics * * * From the best accounts transmitted of this celebrated institution it bore a very instructive analogy to the present confederation of the American States."

The history of Greek and American political development highlights the ties that bind our two nations in a common political heritage. And the strength of these ties endure today. In fact, Greece is one of only seven countries that has consistently fought with the United States in international conflicts.

Today there are over 1 million Greek-Americans in the United States. Many of these citizens have become prominent members of society and have made notable contributions to their professions. I would like to wish all Greek-Americans and our Greek allies a happy Independence Day. The United States certainly shares in your celebration.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of designating March 25, 1993 "Greek Independence Day—A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

For the more than 3 million Greek-Americans living in the United States, the events that occurred in the land of their ancestors 172 years ago is a source of great pride. After nearly 400 years under the domination of the Ottoman Empire, the Greek people saw the beginnings of a return to national independence amid defiant cries of "eleftheria i thanatos"—"liberty or death."

America owes a great debt to the Greek people. The ancient Greeks enriched our culture in the fields of art, philosophy, science, and law. The modern theory of democracy, which we have seen triumph over communism and tyranny, has its roots in ancient Greece. In fact, the term "demokratia" was coined in the middle of the fifth century B.C. by the Greek historian Herodotus.

Today, Greek-Americans continue to play an important role in building this country. To cite but one example, Maryland Senator PAUL SARBANES, son of Greek immigrants, is one of the most respected and thoughtful Members of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative for the Third Congressional District of Maryland—an area that proudly boasts a large Greek-American community—I join in celebrating Greek Independence Day. Let us all salute the Greek people for the contributions they have made to freedom and democracy the world over.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Greek Independence Day. March 25 commemorated the anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from more than 400 years of foreign domination. I join my colleagues in this celebration and note the significant achievements of Greece and Greek-Americans and the effect

they have had upon our country and the world.

The legacy of Greek democracy has contributed greatly to our Nation's freedom. The ties that bind our two peoples are strong and lasting. The English word "democracy," of course, comes from the Greek word "demos." Yet our debt to the Greek culture goes much deeper than that, for it is the ancient Greeks that first demonstrated much of what constitutes modern-day American democracy. Americans will never forget the great impact the Greek culture has made upon our judicial system and democracy.

As a long-time supporter of Greece, I know that Greece has been a close friend and reliable ally of the United States. The United States must work to strengthen this relationship. For instance, the United States must support Greece on the contentious issue of independence for the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The issue at hand is a Balkan Republic of 1.9 million, which is petitioning for independence and insists upon calling itself Macedonia. This Republic lies on the northern border of Greece, and its own province of Macedonia. The Greek Government is willing to recognize the new Republic, whose capital is Skopje, but only if Macedonia appears nowhere in its name. We must support the Greek people on this issue. The Greek people remember all too well the civil war of 1946–49, when the Greek and Yugoslav Communists banded together in an attempt to unite the Macedonians together in Marxist Yugoslavia. Rooted in bitter history, this Macedonian issue has united Greeks and Greek-Americans like few issues in recent years.

There are sound geopolitical reasons to support Greece in this matter. For one, Greek Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis is a courageous and energetic leader who has gone out of his way to help America work for a more peaceful world.

This reform-minded leader has taken steps to work with Turkey on a just solution to the vexing Cyprus issue. He took a great political risk when he allowed America to use a key Greek naval base. When the United States State Department complained that Greece was not promptly spending American foreign aid dollars, the Prime Minister made arrangements to spend the money in a timely fashion. Under Mitsotakis, Greece has recognized Israel, and even assisted America and her allies during Operation Desert Storm. Mitsotakis has taken great risks for America, and now he needs our help. America must support Greece on the Macedonia question.

It gives me great pride to rise today to honor Greek Independence Day. I am honored to represent a very large and active Hellenic community in the Philadelphia area. I am honored to join them in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments and celebrating the anniversary of their fight for freedom. In addition, I wish to ask my fellow colleagues to join me in reaffirming strong support for Greece and protection of its national interests.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 10, I am happy to join my colleagues today in honoring Greek Independence Day. This truly is a national day of celebration for the Greek people and for the people everywhere who embrace democracy.

For thousands of years, the Greek people have played a key role in changing the global attribute toward self-government. Their philosophy continues today in leading the world toward freedom and democracy.

Our mutual admiration and respect for democracy dates back to the late 18th century when our Founding Fathers looked to ancient Greece as a model in creating the United States Declaration of Independence.

On March 25, 1821, Alexander Ypsilanti proclaimed Greece's independence, initiating an 8-year battle for freedom. His people in turn imported and translated our Declaration of Independence and studied the American experience of our own revolution to guide their nation through its pursuit of democracy. Their courage and dedication to an ancient idea of freedom, justice, and liberty for all inspired three notable Americans to join the Greek insurgents in the fight against occupation. In support of Greece, President James Monroe declared "a strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the world."

The Greek people continued their struggle against the threat of totalitarian regimes well into the 20th century. At the height of World War II, when Nazi forces appeared ready to soon overrun Europe, the Greek people fought courageously on behalf of freedom at a cost of a half a million lives. Prime Minister Winston Churchill declared: "In ancient days it was said that Greeks fight like heroes; now we must say that heroes fight like Greeks."

Greece continued to withstand many conflicts. President Harry Truman recognized Greece's commitment to democracy when it fought Yugoslavia's Communist regime under Marshall Tito inciting the 1946–49 Greek civil war. In 1952, Greece joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which offered the country protection from future political strife. Eight years later, Greece's commitment to freedom and democracy was again tested when Russia threatened to pulverize the Acropolis unless Greece abandoned the NATO alliance. Greece stood firm.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when Kuwait endured a hostile takeover of its peaceful nation, and the United States sought assistance from our allies to oust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, Greece firmly enforced the United Nations embargo against Iraq and sent troops to assist the coalition.

Mr. Speaker, today is the seventh year we reaffirm our alliance with Greece by this resolution, and it is a day to honor our common democratic principles. More importantly, however, it is a day to salute Greek-Americans for the invaluable contributions they make to our Nation and to the world.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day, a day we congratulate Greece on 172 years of independence and recognize Greek-Americans for the contributions they have made to this country.

Americans have always felt close to Greece. Thomas Jefferson himself wrote that we are indebted to the ancient Greeks "for the light which led ourselves out of * * * darkness." James Madison and Alexander Hamilton wrote in The Federalist Papers that the ancient Greek republic was the model for "the present confederation of the United States."

As much as our founders looked to ancient Greece for inspiration, so the founders of modern Greece looked to the United States as inspiration for their struggle. Greeks translated the Declaration of Independence and used it as their own declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Our ties to Greece only intensified after Greek independence in 1821. The tie was strengthened by the immigration to the United States of hundreds of thousands of Greeks in the early years of this century. In fact, 1 in every 4 Greek males between 15 and 45 left Greece for America. Ties were also strengthened by Greece's alliance with the United States in every major conflict this century.

Greek-Americans have contributed to this country in every area of endeavor. Dr. George Papanicolaou invented the Pap test for cancer and is responsible for saving the lives of tens of thousands of women. Dr. George Kotzias developed L-dopa to combat Parkinson's disease. This past year Paul Tsongas ran an intelligent and effective campaign for the Presidency. Michael Dukakis was the Democratic nominee in 1988 and was a fine Governor of Massachusetts. And now we actually have a Greek-American in the White House. George Stephanopoulos is President Clinton's Communications Director and one of his top advisers. I could, of course, go on and on about Greece and Greek-Americans and the contributions to our country and to the world.

But I'll conclude by making clear my belief that the United States-Greek alliance is a fundamental and permanent aspect of United States foreign policy. That is why I oppose United States recognition of the "Republic of Macedonia" and insist that Greek sensitivities on this issue not be ignored. I intend to continue doing everything I can to ensure that Greece remains strong and free.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join our Nation in celebrating Greek Independence Day: a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. The United States derives its strength from the fact that it is a democracy. Greece is one of the United States' closest allies, having fought on our side in every major international conflict this century. In the 1820's, when Greece fought for its own independence, the American Revolution and our democracy embodied the ideals for which the Greeks fought. This day should be recognized and remembered.

The relationship between Greece and the United States has been positive since the founding of the United States when Greek philosophy inspired the American Declaration of Independence. Plato said, "Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike." Hence, Thomas Jefferson said, "* * * to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves [American colonists] out of Gothic darkness." The United States has had a successful system of government because it was founded on a philosophy inspired by the Greeks. In addition, Greece has been inspired by the American Revolution. Greek intellectuals translated the United States Declaration of Independence and used it as their own in 1821.

We should also appreciate modern Greek and American relations. During the 1900's many immigrants to the United States were from Greece. The cultural compatibility of Greece and America has enabled those in America of Greek descent to become extremely successful. Among those today are George Stephanopoulos, President Clinton's communications director; Congresswoman OLYMPIA SNOWE; Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS; Senator PAUL SARBANES; presidential candidates Paul Tsongas and Michael Dukakis; actors Olympia Dukakis, Telly Savalas, and Alex Karras; and Dr. George Papanicolaou, who developed the Pap test for cervical cancer, to name a few.

Greece and the United States share a common bond; they have both worked hard to become democracies. America is an example of a dream of freedom to which the Greeks aspired when they fought their revolution, and Greece was a symbol to the founders of the United States. Mr. Speaker, this is a celebration of democracy, of freedom, and of the struggle of humankind to attain freedom. We cannot overlook this important day.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, here in the hall of American democracy, to honor the spirit of freedom that lies at the heart of our political system. It is the idea of democratic government, brought forth by the ancient Greeks and which today sweeps the modern world.

It is, indeed, fitting that we celebrate this magnificent concept today because this is the date that people of Greek heritage and the Greek Orthodox faith, as well as freedom-loving individuals everywhere, celebrate the symbolic rebirth of democracy: Greek Independence Day.

March 25, 1992, is the 171st anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from more than 400 years of foreign domination. It was on this historic day that the Greek people began a series of uprisings against their Turkish oppressors, uprisings that soon turned into a revolution attracting wide international support.

The Greeks' long and arduous struggle against the Ottoman empire is a perfect example of the ability of mankind to overcome all obstacles if the will to persevere is strong enough and the goal—in this case the dream of freedom—is bright enough.

America, the United States of America, is surely the truest expression of this dream today. It remains an imperfect dream, yes, but still the shining example that oppressed people throughout the world have looked to for generations; have gained strength from in their struggle to overcome their oppressors.

This dream of democracy—born so long ago in Greece—and its greatest tangible expression in our great democratic republic, Mr. Speaker, forms the common bond between our two nations. Furthermore, it is a bond that has stretched throughout history, from ancient times to the present day.

In ancient mythology, fire was brought down from Mount Olympus and offered to the Greeks as a gift—a gift that transformed their lives. Similarly, the gift of democracy was offered to the world by the ancient Greeks and it, too, was a transforming gift: In fact, it continues to transform the world with stories of heroes and remarkable events.

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate together with Greece in order to reaffirm the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. These principles are not uniquely Greek or American, but they are our promise to the world—and they form a legacy that we cherish and have a responsibility to protect and defend.

"Democracy," in the words of the American clergyman Harry Emerson Fosdick, "is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." It calls upon each and every one of us to rise above ourselves, to understand that freedom requires sacrifices both large and small and to recognize that the common man is capable of magnificently uncommon actions.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure on this day to recognize and celebrate Greek Independence Day with my colleagues. It is fitting for us, as democratically elected officials of this great country, to recognize the significance of the contributions of the Greek people in both ancient and modern times. In particular, by designating March 25, 1993, as a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy, we continue to build on the special bond that has always existed between the United States of America and Greece.

The ancient Greeks gave birth to democracy over 2,500 years ago. Their endless pursuit of equality and freedom cultivated the world's first democracy. Their ideas infuse our own constitution and our Founding Fathers relied heavily on the experience of the ancient Greeks in forming our Republic.

The relationship between Greece and the United States was further solidified when the struggle for Greek independence began 172 years ago. The American revolution, and the ideals for which it stood, was a primary model for the Greeks to follow. Both countries have learned the profound importance of the famous Greek motto "Eleftheria I Thanatos"—Liberty or Death.

Today, in our own country, Greek-Americans, imbued with this spirit, continue to play an extraordinary role at every level of public life and private enterprise.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to celebrate with Greece today on her national day. Our two nations share a unique bond—forged in the distinctive legacy of democracy.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for Greek Independence Day, which commemorates the 172nd anniversary of Greek independence.

This Sunday, through the efforts of the Federation of Hellenic Societies of Greater New York, thousands of Hellenic Americans will participate in New York City's 100th Greek Independence Day parade. The march will begin at 1 p.m. at Manhattan's 5th Avenue and 59th Street and proceed uptown to 3d Avenue and 79th Street.

His eminence Archbishop Iakovos, Primate of the Greek-Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, will be present as will many Hellenic Americans who reside in the wonderful Queens neighborhood of Astoria, which is in my congressional district. This march will serve as a powerful reminder of the courage and determination of the Greek revolutionaries who risked their lives for freedom 172 years ago.

It was on March 25, 1821—after nearly 400 years of domination by the Ottoman empire—that Archbishop Germonos and a small band of Greek patriots lifted their banner in rebellion and began a struggle for freedom that took almost 10 years to complete. Today, we pay tribute to these brave freedom fighters, who summed up their cause this way: "(We) would rather live free for 1 hour, than suffer slavery and imprisonment for 40 years."

As we commemorate the struggle for Greek independence, we also must recognize the tremendous contributions of the Greek people to western culture. Ancient Greece served as the birthplace of democracy and the cradle of Western thought. As the poet, Shelly, put it: "Our laws, our literature, our religion, our arts have their roots in Greece."

In the United States Greek-Americans have followed the rich tradition of their ancestors excelling in medicine, science, law, politics, education, and business. In the House of Representatives our Nation has been well served by a number of distinguished sons and daughters of Greece including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], who organized this special order this evening.

Those of us from New York are especially proud of a young man who used to work in this Chamber for the Majority Leader and who is now the director of communications at the White House—George Stephanopoulos.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute this evening to the hard-fought independence of Greece, and I look forward Sunday to participating with my constituents in commemorating this important day and honoring the many achievements of Greek-Americans. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support of this special order, and commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his outstanding work in bringing this commemoration to the floor. March 25, 1993, marked Greek Independence Day, commemorating over 2,500 years of democratic tradition in Greece. Many Americans simply do not realize how heavily our Founding Fathers drew upon the Greek political and philosophical experience.

March 25, 1993, also marked the 172d anniversary of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman empire. March 25th is a day to pay tribute to our Greek friends, and to pay homage to Greek and American democracy.

As we celebrate the glory of democracy today, we must take time out to think about those nations and those peoples who do not enjoy the spirit of democracy and freedom which have endured in Greece for thousands of years.

On this day we must think of the people of Cyprus and the oppression they have felt since 1972, when Turkey illegally occupied the northern third of that island nation. We can all hope and pray that Ankara will finally remove its troops from Cyprus, and that all Cypriots can live in peace and harmony, just as their brethren in Greece and the United States do.

I join my colleagues in saluting those Greek-Americans who have played such an important role in fostering relations between our two nations. Such prominent Greek-Americans as Andrew Manatos, Philip Christopher, and

Gene Rossides have done so much to build bridges between the United States and Greece, despite several different bilateral problems over the years. They should be applauded, as well. In conclusion, this special order celebrates both the United States and Greece—two nations which share a beautiful tradition of bold and vibrant democracy.

Mr. SCHUMER. I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating Greek Independence Day. This national day, celebrating Greek and American democracy, marks the 172d anniversary of the revolution which freed the people of Greece from over 400 years of foreign rule. To commemorate this significantly historical event, His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos is meeting today with House Speaker TOM FOLEY and President Clinton.

As Americans, we owe gratitude to Greece and the Greek people, whose influence on our country's birth and evolution cannot be overstated. In fact, the principles of democracy and equal justice for all, upon which this Nation was founded, have their origins in ancient Greek philosophy. Moreover, this bond of shared convictions, mutual respect, and admiration, is not only rooted in history, but continues to grow and be cultivated today.

Greece is one out of only seven nations in the world that remained allied with, and fought on the side of the United States in every major international conflict this century. In fact, over 600,000 Greek citizens, approximately 9 percent of the country's population, died fighting on the side of the Allied forces during the Second World War.

Of the very many American citizens of Greek descent with national and international prominence, I would like to call attention to a number whom I feel that we as Americans owe particular gratitude to. They include: His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America; Dr. George Papanicolaou, inventor of the Pap test for cervical cancer; former presidential candidate, Paul Tsongas; former Presidential nominee, Michael Dukakis; the Brooklyn-born soprano, Maria Callas; and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine, GEORGE GEKAS of Pennsylvania, MICHAEL BILIRAKIS of Florida as well as Senator PAUL SARBANES of Maryland.

I am confident that my colleagues will join me in expressing our sincerest gratitude to the ancient Greek society as well as all Greek-Americans. I could not agree more with the sentiment expressed by our Forefather, Thomas Jefferson, when he claimed, "to the ancient Greeks we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of the Gothic darkness."

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO B.T. COLLINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it may be possible that this evening can be shortened somewhat, regrettably because a number of Members who had intended to be here tonight and participate in this special order have been informed that it would not take place, but for many of us who were good friends and colleagues of the late B.T. Collins of Sacramento, CA, we decided to proceed knowing full well that since a memorial service has already been held for him in California it was appropriate and timely that we move forward now.

Byrant Thomas Collins, B.T. Collins, was an assemblyman from the fifth district of Sacramento. He was a good personal friend of many of us on both sides of the aisle. I think he would probably be most appropriately referred to as a maverick Republican who served as an executive secretary and chief of staff to former Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr.; at the same time served as a member of the State assembly, as a personal contribution, I think it would be said, to the Governor of California, Gov. Pete Wilson, who requested him to serve, having urged him to first file in a special election to win that seat.

□ 1850

B.T. was a unique individual, one who had many friends on both sides of the aisle, a person who dedicated his life to public service, an individual who could inspire, could amuse, and at the same time contributed a great deal to the substance of public policy. He was a graduate of Santa Clara University in Santa Clara County, CA, getting his B.S. degree in history in 1970. He later graduated with his juris doctorate degree from that same university's School of Law and became a member of the California Bar in 1974.

He really began his career in public service in 1976, when he served as deputy legislative secretary to Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr. He then proceeded to become director of a very unique program, one that continues in California with a great deal of success, the California Conservation Corps, a work ethic program employing some 2,000 women and men ages 18 to 23 in State public service conservation projects.

This program, formulated somewhat in the image of the New Deal CCC Program, became his real hallmark and was indicative of his in loco parentis role, his fatherly contribution to young people from all over the State, of all races, backgrounds, and income levels. B.T. consistently looked out for the needs of children and young people, and this was one of the first and most obvious ways he made that contribution.

From his success there he moved to be executive secretary and chief of staff to Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., from 1981 through the beginning of 1983. He then left and went into the investment banking world and served as a public finance vice president at Kidder Peabody & Co., only to return as chief deputy State treasurer of the State of California in 1989, serving for almost 2 years in that capacity. He was then appointed by Governor Wilson to serve as director of the California Youth Authority, which he did until July 1991, when he sought election to the state assembly.

To cite his accomplishments, to list the things he did in public service, is really not to fully capture B.T. Collins. Most people knew him as an individual who stood by people in the military and stood up for the defense of his country. He had enlisted prior to attending Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, OK, back in the mid-1960s. He eventually was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the artillery and stationed with the 82d Airborne Division at Santa Domingo during the 1964–65 period, during the Johnson administration.

B.T. eventually served with the 1st Air Cavalry Division, the 2d Corps, in South Vietnam, and was eventually tactical commander of a mobile guerrilla force under the 5th Special Forces Group in the 4th Group in South Vietnam in the Green Berets. He was wounded, and in effect became a double amputee.

B.T. retired as captain, serving at the Valley Forge General Hospital recovering from the wounds which he incurred during his service in Vietnam.

Many Members of this institution, many people in our State, know that he was the truly central force in bringing about a Vietnam Memorial on the grounds of the State capitol, at which time he led many others in honoring those men and women who fought and many died in Vietnam for their country. It was his personal desire to bring together the forces, the funds, from all over the State and Nation, to make that memorial a reality.

B.T. was appointed to a commission to do that by Governor Deukmejian. He carried out his duties in a most effective way and was most successful. In fact, the memorial service for B.T. was held at the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

B.T. was someone who was loved by people who knew him, whether they agreed with him or not. He was not someone who sought recognition at all times. He was rather a sensitive and humble person in many ways. But at the same time he had a flair for the dramatic. He loved to be the center of good times, and he spent a lot of his time working to try to bridge the gap between the two parties in Sacramento. He did that serving a Democratic Governor as well as serving a Republican Governor as a member of the assembly.

B.T. was clearly someone who saw the big picture, who cared about his State and Nation, was someone who was willing to tell it like it is, and did not mind the criticism that sometimes rained down upon him as a result. He understood that public service was a calling, and every time he attempted to deviate from it, he was drawn back to it.

His commitment to the process of governing was deep, and yet his inabil-

ity to stand the cant and the phoniness that sometimes accompanies public service was also just as abiding. He could not stand pretense. He was a man who was funny, sometimes profane, always honest, and always committed.

We think of him as the soldier that he was. We think of him as the friend that he was. So many people whom he barely knew initially became fast friends, people who over many years learned to look forward to the note from B.T. prior to their birthday, to the fact that he knew their children by name, the fact that he cared about them as human beings and not political chessmen on a board.

He was that kind of individual, that kind of friend to many, and that is why there are a number of Members of Congress here tonight who wish to honor him.

Mr. Speaker, I first would like to yield to my colleague who joined me in calling for this special order, a good friend from Sacramento, Congressman BOB MATSUI.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to thank the gentleman for suggesting this special order for B.T. Collins. We appreciate it very much. All of us in the State of California appreciate it very much.

I am going to be very brief, because I think the gentleman has covered the essence of B.T. and also B.T.'s career. But I find it kind of ironic, and I think the gentleman was talking about this, my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], moved to adjourn tonight. The gentleman was successful last week when he made his motion to adjourn. But I think tonight might have been the first night when all 52 members of our delegation probably voted one way, voted not to adjourn. That just shows that B.T. Collins, even in heaven, could bring all of us in the delegation together, probably for the first time, and maybe for the last time as well.

But I think the best way to describe B.T. from my perspective is what Mike Ackley, a columnist for the Sacramento Union, said 2 days after B.T. passed away. He said if all politicians were like B.T. Collins, we would have no need for Democrats. I would have to add to that, if all politicians were like B.T. Collins, we would probably not have a need for political parties, because B.T. represented the best of human beings, but also the best of government.

The only time I recall B.T. ever changing his position on an issue was during that very heated campaign he had the first time he ran for the assembly, at the request of Governor Wilson, who wanted B.T. in the legislature.

B.T. was accused of being an atheist, someone who did not believe in God. B.T. later mentioned to me that well, that was not true, and he said it publicly; that he did not know whether there was a God, so he really was an agnostic, and he thought that that might make him more acceptable to his constituency. Certainly he is somebody that all of us will miss, and certainly the State of California will miss.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would just like to add that I think what B.T. meant to most of us is that he had a deep and fundamental understanding about the irony of life, and was able to call to the attention of all of us our strengths and weaknesses, but did it in such a way that furthered each of us as human beings and made us really understand what and how important it was to be on this Earth.

□ 1900

And so all of us are going to miss B.T. Collins for all of his achievements. But more importantly, for being the kind of human being that he was to all of us.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, Congressman MATSUI, for participating at this time. I know how much his loss means to the gentleman and his many friends.

I want to yield now to a gentleman whose service in the California State Senate overlapped with Mr. Collins' service in the state assembly, a gentleman who knew him well through their Republican Party affiliation and who at one time overlapped with him in terms of representational districts, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN DOOLITTLE, of Placer County, California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California and appreciate the opportunity to participate in this special order.

B.T. Collins was truly an unusual individual. He would be classified as an example of a living legend. He would not have appreciated hearing that, probably, but I have never met anybody like him. And I think most people felt that way.

B.T., actually, I first met when he was, as has been mentioned, was Governor Brown's chief of staff. And he was a Republican, even then. Actually, B.T. opposed me, as I recall, my first three elections. But he did not know me all that well, and he eventually came around and supported me very staunchly, particularly beginning with the 1990 election, when there was a very controversial, tough issue that came up. And he jumped right to my defense.

I am not here tonight because he either opposed or supported me, simply to observe that B.T. Collins was a straight-talking man. If he told you something, you could count on it. And he was one of the few individuals I have ever known that actually, whatever he said he would do, he always did that and then some. I think that was respected very much about him.

I had the privilege of attending just a wonderful service that was quite a lengthy one, but, actually, every speaker there had something valuable to say. It went on for abut 2 hours. It was the memorial service right near the Vietnam Veterans memorial that he actually brought into being through his perseverance, an outstanding memorial that would be, if we had nothing here in Washington, I think, would make it seem to pale by comparison. I am always proud of it when I see it, and I realize it was through his efforts. Obviously, these things are a team effort, but B.T. took the lead and went to many people, and I say this personally, and solicited contributions and really made it happen.

It was so unusual to me. It is one thing to lend your name to an effort, but B.T. went well beyond that. He actually personally took charge and went down the list and called people and buttonholed them and collected those contributions.

Many times I would see him around the district, not just the Sacramento area, there, too, but he never represented, for example, Nevada County. And yet I would see him, when they had the annual Republican barbecue. B.T. Collins had driven up to the fairgrounds in Grass Valley to give a talk and share his thoughts with the people.

They loved him. And as I would watch him climb into his car, I thought how difficult, well, that is difficult, frequently going beyond your area to speak, taking time away from other priorities. But I thought, here was B.T. Collins, severely injured in the war and, frankly, I think never without pain, not that he ever showed any sign of that, but I am given to understand through the remarks that were made that he was almost in constant pain. And yet he never revealed, never complained about it, always giving.

And realizing that, I think about him climbing into his car and tired at the end of a Sunday afternoon, where he had given a speech in Nevada County, quite distant from where his focus of activities would have been.

When I think of B.T. Collins, I think of the following terms:

Heart. B.T. Collins was a man with heart. He understood people. He loved people. And he did everything he could to try and improve people's circumstances.

Loyalty. Fiercely loyal to whomever his superior officer was. I mean, I saw that loyalty clearly, first for Governor Brown and then to Tom Hayes, the State treasurer, and then to Governor Wilson. B.T. Collins sat in my office. It was Wednesday, I guess, and told me he had no interest in running for the State assembly.

And the following Tuesday, he declared. He declared because the man to whom he was loyal, whom he served, the Governor of California, asked him to run. And for B.T. Collins, anybody knows running a political campaign is a major undertaking.

He gave up a job that paid him pretty well and instead went into the political fray once again. And he did it out of a sense of loyalty, made a lot of sacrifice.

Service. B.T. Collins believed in public service. He was, I think, the premier exemplar of that. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] referenced his accomplishments in taking the CCC and really giving it form and definition and inspiring young people to want to serve in that body. He really personified the California Conservation Corps, always felt proud, I think, of that association.

I have mentioned before, B.T. Collins was a man of action. He was a good talker. Never forget his talk. But he was a man of action. And as the gentleman listed in his accomplishments, he was out there, always doing things.

In lieu of flowers, we have been invited to send contributions to the WEVE Center, Woman Escaping a Violent Environment. So even there in death, he was out there active, raising funds for the causes that he believed in.

I just want to mention briefly, I saw him various times at the Eagle Scout Courts of Honor, and it was always interesting to listen to him speak. I do not think I ever saw him speak with notes. He always just spoke straight to the audience, came right from the heart. And it was always interesting and frequently memorable, the things that he had to say.

Reference has been made to the notes and he also called people on their birthdays. In fact, I was surprised, I got a telephone call. It is just so unusual that people are able to make the time to do that kind of thing. And as irony would have it, I had gone through a file, which I was overdue in looking at, of correspondence sent to me. And I pulled out two notes from B.T. Collins to me, and I took them home to show Julie. But as fate would have it, he passed away before I had that opportunity to do that. And so when I came back from the funeral last week, I pulled those notes out and showed her, along with the program of his memorial service.

And B.T. Collins, attending the memorial service, by the way, it was really kind of the outpouring of support you would find almost for a deceased President.

I commented upon that. I have never seen, during my time at the scene there in the State Capital, an outpouring of support like we had for B.T. Collins. It was truly remarkable.

He was an outstanding individual. I think he always will have left an impression upon my mind of someone who truly, through his actions, performed the acts of Christian service.

I am very, very pleased to be here this evening to join in this special order commending B.T. Collins. I think his relatives and friends can be very proud of him and the life that he led.

And I, for one, shall have longstanding, fond memories of this fine, dedicated public servant.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the foothill counties for being here tonight and for offering those thoughts on B.T. Collins,

B.T. had a tremendous image in the State of California. Some people remember him drinking malethion, trying to dramatize the need to do something about the Medfly.

B.T. had a way of encapsulating an argument and putting it to rest. He made a tremendous amount of friends up and down the State, and many of them are here tonight.

□ 1910

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield now to my good friend, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, CA [Ms. PELOSI], for any comments she might make.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and thank him and Mr. MATSUI for calling this special order tonight. This gives us an opportunity to share some of our stories about B.T., and it also gives us time to mourn his passing.

Last Friday, as many of us were arriving home, we heard on the radio, because it was news all over California, that B.T. Collins had been taken to the hospital with a heart attack. He had gone to lunch in Sacramento to hear Gen. Colin Powell speak. There he was, B.T. Collins, the superpatriot to the end. He loved America. He was very patriotic, and he was going to hear Colin Powell, suffered shortness of breath, a heart attack, was taken to the hospital, and it was not long before the day was out that B.T. Collins was gone.

Our colleagues have very clearly described him, but if I might just add a few words from a California, a San Francisco perspective, a San Francisco Democratic perspective, B.T. descended upon us as the chief of staff to Governor Brown, Governor Jerry Brown, as has been mentioned.

When we first heard that Governor Brown was going to name a Republican as his chief of staff, we were totally up in arms and were going in to make sure that this did now happen. Two seconds in the presence of B.T. Collins and we forgot why we were going there. We were just charmed, as everyone was, by him, and we knew that he would do a great job for the State, and he would call it the way he saw it, regardless of politics.

He then went on, and he worked so hard, as others have mentioned, in his work for the California Conservation Corps. I do not mean to pass over Governor Brown so quickly. The combination in itself of B.T. Collins and Governor Brown is a story all its own and would require several special orders to fully appreciate.

His work with the California Conservation Corps, I think, was particularly important to B.T. because he loved those young people, and it was at that time that he drank, what is it, VIC?

Mr. FAZIO. Malathion.

Ms. PELOSI. When we were fighting the Med fly crisis in California, and the message was clear to not only the people who were afraid of the spray, but to his young people who might be working there, that it would not harm them. What better way for him to get the message across than to drink it himself, and appear in the paper in some ghastly expression.

B.T. came to San Francisco a number of times as part of our The Party Is Not Over group. The Party Is Not Over was a group of Democrats, Republicans, members of the press and academicians, and it was what you might call a San Francisco poor person's version of the Gridiron dinner, where we would all come together and be friends for the night and then square off for the rest of the year's activities.

Any time we wanted to have somebody really funny, very smart, very clever as a speaker, we would say, "Is B.T. available to speak that night," because any time he spoke the event was an uproarious success, and obviously one that we had many, many laughs at.

Others have talked about his service in the State Assembly. I remember when he called and said he was going to be running for State assembly. I said, "B.T., you won't have any problem." He said, "My only problem will be if they ever figure out that I gave a contribution to a left-wing San Francisco pinko Democrat like you." So that gives some flavor of how B.T. expressed himself: very candidly.

He did care very much about WEAVE, and even in life had us contributing to it. Previous speakers have mentioned his work for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Sacramento, and he is also a strong advocate for Vietnam veterans; the women's memorial, a tribute to women who were in service from Vietnam.

We all thought it was terribly sad that B.T. was involved in an accident with a hand grenade that went off prematurely, and he lost an arm and a leg literally on behalf of his country, but it never seemed to be a problem to him. In fact, it seemed to be a source of strength to him, and indeed, it made him a source of inspiration to all of us.

It is really hard to imagine that he is gone. I know he would love to think that there was a special order for him tonight, and that so many Democrats showed up, as well as Republicans, in his honor. He has many friends in San Francisco, and I know I share this experience with many of the people who have spoken about B.T. tonight.

There is not a birthday or an anniversary that could go by that a person

might want to forget, or remember, as the case may be, that one did not get a reminder from B.T. He was a faithful caller, and we knew no matter what was going on or how busy everyone was, that at least we would get a chance to talk to B.T. on our birthdays, because he never, never forgot anyone's birthday. It was a joy. This was my first birthday this week, this past week, without a call from B.T., so I appreciate the opportunity to talk about him here tonight.

I said he had many friends from San Francisco. He will be sorely missed by them for this courage, for his humor, for his brilliance, for his energy, for descending upon us the way no one else ever had. It is hard to imagine anyone else ever would.

On behalf of his many fans who are my constituents, I, too, want to extend my sympathy for myself, for my family and my constituents to B.T.'s family, and to join my colleagues in saluting this very, very special person in this special order tonight.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman for being here and participating in this evening.

B.T. was, as we all know, identified with the State capital in Sacramento. In fact, he had been working very closely with Congressman MATSUI and I to keep McClellan Air Force Base open, but as Nancy said, he had so many friends up and down the State.

One of the people who served very closely with him as chairman of the Democratic caucus in the State assembly while he worked for Governor Brown, just downstairs, is our good friend, the gentleman from Los Angeles, JULIAN DIXON. I would like to yield to him.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank both him and Mr. MATSUI for taking out this special order this evening.

We all have, certainly, fond memories of B.T. Collins, for he was an outstanding member of the State legislature and an outstanding elected official.

B.T. began his political career in 1976 when he was hired to be a legislative aide in California Gov. Edward Brown's administration. He was appointed chief of staff in October of 1981, and B.T. stayed in that position until Governor Brown left office, whereupon he pursued a career in the private sector with Kidder, Peabody & Co.

For the next 6 years, B.T. pursued a career in the private sector, but remained an active crusader for a better society.

He spearheaded the move to build the State's memorial to Vietnam war veterans and traveled the State endlessly giving speeches about the importance of education and helping young people.

In 1991 Gov. Pete Wilson named B.T. to head the California Youth Authority. Soon after, he left that post and ran in a special election for the assembly after Governor Wilson made a personal appeal to him to do so.

As an assemblyman from Carmichael, B.T. was very, very active in legislative affairs.

Brien Thomas Collins was his full name, but he was best known, as we have indicated this evening, by his initials, B.T. He was heavily involved and immersed in civic causes, and gave much of his salary each year to various philanthropic organizations. B.T. believed that living well was doing well to others. He helped raise money for Women Escaping a Violent Environment Program, and was a member of the Board of Regents of Santa Clara University.

B.T.'s military experience, that has been alluded to here this evening, began as an enlisted man in the Army. After a stint at Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, OK, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant. He joined the 82d Airborne Division, and in 1965 volunteered to go to Vietnam.

It was unfortunate, but as a Green Beret on June 20 of 1967, B.T. and his men were caught in an ambush. Collins began to toss grenades at the enemy, but picked up one whose pin had already been pulled, and the grenade exploded and blew off Collins' right arm and leg.

□ 1920

He survived, Mr. Speaker, 19 surgeries in 7 military hospitals, retiring as a captain in 1968 and vowing not to let this impediment slow him down.

We are all proud of B.T. Collins because he was a man of courage, a man of conviction, and yes, in his way, a man of charm. He had the courage to stand up not only to be a hero in an unpopular war, but the courage of his convictions to stand up to the Governor of California when he felt he was wrong, and of course, we have seen this evening much testimony to his charm. He always had a smile, always had a telephone call at your birthday, and always a man with human touch. He could roar like a lion, but he had the touch of a kitten.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank my colleagues from Los Angeles for his very sensitive and genuine remarks. I know we appreciate B.T. even more in his death when we realize how he struggled to live in the aftermath of his injuries. It made him so sensitive to veterans that he spent his entire life, I think, dedicated to others who had gone through Vietnam, who did not get the respect that he earned in other ways.

One good friend of his, a gentleman who is certainly well known for his work here in Congress, is the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, but also the former mayor of San Jose, a man who knew B.T. well, NORM MINETA.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues, Mr. FAZIO and Mr. MATSUI, for taking these special orders out to honor a very unique public servant, our old friend, B.T. Collins, of the California State Assembly.

As has already been recounted, B.T. Collins died on Friday, March 19 on the job. Known for his grueling schedule, B.T. was enroute to hear a speech by Gen. Colin Powell that evening in a Sacramento hotel. His heart gave out before he got there. General Powell may be chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but B.T. Collins had another chief to answer to that day. At least that is the way B.T. would have explained it to me.

I will always remember my friend, B.T. Collins, for being the kind of guy who tells it like it is. The guy who does not pull punches. I will always know him as the guy who will tell you the truth. Maybe that is why reporters always described him as being gruff and colorful. In this business, the truth is hard to take, harder yet to deliver, but always memorable when received. B.T. Collins was nothing if not memorable.

I remember one time when he called, as was already recounted about how he would call on your birthday, and he called on my birthday to wish me well and I said, "B.T., you got the wrong day. My birthday is November 12, and today is the 11th of November." And he said, "Mineta, you dummy, I'm here in Hong Kong. It's the 12th of November, and I'm celebrating your birthday."

One of his outrageous acts came in 1981. The big news in my district was the Medfly and the eradication efforts through the aerial spraying of malathion. People were getting hysterical about the safety of malathion.

So B.T. Collins did the kind of thing that B.T. Collins did. He drank a glass of the stuff. Before the TV cameras. It may not have proved that malathion was safe, but B.T. Collins was living proof that its dangers could be put in perspective.

Do not get the wrong impression. We are not talking about some publicity hungry politician. And I am not about to offer a toast of malathion. But we must remember that above all else, B.T. Collins was an effective public servant. Though a Republican, Collins served as Chief of Staff to Governor Jerry Brown. Before that, Collins headed the California Conservation Corps, a program that gave youth discipline and job skills. When Collins turned that program around, he attracted nationwide attention, and the CCC became a model youth program for the rest of the country. It was only in 1991 that B.T. Collins was elected to the California State Assembly. It was a long time coming for a man who devoted so much of his life to politics and public service.

In his short time in the assembly, B.T. worked tirelessly for the people of Sacramento he represented. And once

again, it was B.T. Collins' ability to put things in perspective that made him effective. He knew how to work with other legislators in order to get the job done. And when the day's final gavel fell, B.T. Collins knew where partisanship ended, and friendship began. I had the privilege of serving with B.T. on the Board of Regents for Santa Clara University.

It is the one thing we can all learn from B.T. Collins as we go about the business of representing the people. B.T. Collins knew that being a public servant was a life to be taken seriously. But he also knew when not to take life too seriously. It has become a cliché to say someone is the salt of the earth. B.T. was the salt and all the spices. He lived a life with both a sense of mission, and a sense of joy.

So, it gives me a great deal of honor to join all my colleagues in this tribute to B.T. and extend my sympathies to his family.

Mr. FAZIO. Thank you, NORM, for those very eloquent remarks.

I now yield to a gentleman who is a leader of his party in California and here in the Congress as a member of the Rules Committee, and yes, who knew B.T. Collins well in that context, from Claremont, CA, DAVID DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sacramento for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor tonight believing that I was the only person whose birthday was remembered by B.T. Collins. And I have to say that I am pleasantly surprised that Members on both sides of the aisle, and I am sure people throughout California and from around the country regularly received birthday notes and telephone calls from B.T. Collins.

It has all been said, and I am not going to go through a long description of the life of B.T. Collins other than to take a couple of moments to talk about my personal relationship with B.T. Collins. Knowing that he was a war hero, there are more than a couple of people who have sacrificed who look down on those of us who never served in the military. And I told him when I first met him that I turned 18 just as the Vietnam War was coming to an end, and I appreciated the fact that he had fought in behalf of our freedom, but I never served in the military. And he glared at me for a moment. I then informed him that my father had been a Marine Corps drill instructor, and he got a great big smile and was pleased that I had at least some affiliation with those who had fought in behalf of our country.

It has already been discussed that he drank malathion, and that was a very courageous thing that he did at that point, but he knew that it was going to cause no problem for him whatsoever. He was very committed to dealing with problem of the Mediterranean fruit fly.

My friend from Sacramento, Mr. MATSUI, talked about the fact that there was a column written in the Sacramento newspaper, and the Los Angeles Times also had a column written by George Skelton in which he closed by referring to the fact that there will not be, there probably will not be another B.T. Collins. The fact of the matter is he was a person who reached out to both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, and worked very closely with us on a wide range of issues.

No one, to my knowledge, has discussed the fact that he served as the chief of staff also for Mr. Hayes, who was the State treasurer of California. And I got to know him during that campaign period and worked closely with B.T. during that campaign period, and he was very loyal and dedicated, and that was something that impressed me at that time.

A number of Members have talked about the fact that he was able to take the California Conservation Corps and bring it to a great level, and I think that he will be remembered for that and for many other things.

He was a great friend and he will be thoroughly missed. And I thank my friends, Mr. MATSUI and Mr. FAZIO, for taking out this special order.

Mr. FAZIO. Thank you, DAVID, very much for participating in it. Everybody knew that B.T. had a great sense of humor. That last line in his authorized biography said, "He's the only person in the world to jump out of a perfectly good airplane with neither an arm nor a leg."

B.T. liked to make light of himself, and one of the people who knew him very well, and has served very closely with him when he, B.T., was serving the governor of our State, is the former majority leader of the California State Assembly, now a Member of Congress, HOWARD BERMAN.

□ 1930

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time and for taking out this special order.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite remarkable that an individual who never served in this body has this many Members from both sides of the aisle this late in the evening caring enough about him and remembering him enough to seek time.

As the gentleman mentioned, I had the pleasure of serving in the State Assembly and being floor leader when B.T. first came to work for the new governor, Jerry Brown, as his legislative liaison. We had a slight problem then; we had a governor who spoke one language and a legislature that spoke a different language, and B.T. was the only person who could translate into both languages and cut through some of the difficulty of dialog.

So much has been mentioned of his aspects of his personality. He loved to pop the bubble of liberalism, especially when dealing with liberals, to make jokes about the bleeding hearts, but in reality when you looked at what B.T. cared about and what he did and his interest, for instance, in the Civilian Conservation Corps and his putting that program on the map, you know that his heart was bleeding for a lot of the same things that attract most of us to public service.

Congresswoman PELOSI talked about his charm. But there was another side of him that was not probably that charming. I do not know, 8 or 10 months before the 1982 Senate election, if as chief of staff at that time B.T. Collins charmed his employer, the governor, that much by talking about his greasy black hair and his inability to deal in a real world of people with families and children and all of those kinds of things.

I remember one time I went rafting on the Stanislaus River with B.T. Collins. At that time there were huge fights over some of the rivers in California. My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], had views on that subject. He has other views on the same subject now. I remember those arguments about how we deal with the conflict between agriculture and the desire to protect these wild and scenic rivers, and the Stanislaus was about to be flooded under. But we took one of the last rafting trips before that happened.

As sometimes happens on those rafting trips, there are points where the river is not that rough and you can essentially jump out of the raft and be swept along with the river. Different people did it, and B.T. said, "That is something I want to do." And he proceeded to take off his prosthetic device for his arm and his prosthetic device for his leg and sort of bobbed along the river in sort of typical outrageous fashion, throwing the rest of us into a level of hysteria over what would happen to him. But he, I am sure, certainly enjoyed it.

B.T. was quite a fellow. He made quite an impact on a process where so many of us come and go and have little to be noticed by, but the outpouring of people at his service in Sacramento, the special order that you, Mr. FAZIO and Mr. MATSUI, have taken out, the other testaments to what he meant to so many of us in the political sphere, speak for themselves, and I am happy to be considered a friend and to join with the rest of you in knowing that we will miss very dearly his wit and his charm and his perceptivity.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman very much.

I think as we go along here, all of us are enjoying reminiscences of B.T. You know, it cannot be a sad occasion when you think about the man and all the good times people had together with him.

I now yield to a new Member of this institution who served with him in the California State Assembly, XAVIER BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues, Mr. FAZIO and Mr. MATSUI, for making this time available to us to remember a man who was a friend to many of us.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today with deep sadness to address this House in honor and remembrance of California Assemblyman B.T. Collins. We have all suffered a loss, not only in California, but I believe those who did not even know him will suffer the loss of a true and longstanding servant of the people.

But knowing B.T., he would insist that the remainder of my remarks, rather than express sadness, be more personal and uplifting. After all, B.T. Collins was a man who left instructions, not only left instructions, but also money, in his will for a party to be thrown in his honor upon his passing.

Last year I had the great pleasure of serving with B.T. Collins in the California State Legislature. After winning his election, it was a special election in 1991, many of us in the assembly expected B.T.'s arrival on the floor of the State assembly to be loud and boisterous. He was outspoken, and his reputation preceded him as a one-time chief of staff to Gov. Jerry Brown, but to our surprise, B.T.'s microphone on the floor of the assembly remained silent throughout his term.

B.T. described this self-avowed silence as his personal contribution to lowering air pollution. Although silent, B.T.'s presence on the floor was certainly strongly felt. He would often sit at his desk in the back of the chamber diligently reading the analyses of bills or perhaps looking over constituent mail and also listening to the debate around him.

I believe his silence and watchful ways spoke loudly and clearly about the need to focus on critical actions and, instead, not focus on self-serving discourse.

B.T., I think, was a man of action. Prior to his tenure in the State assembly, he served California in a variety of capacities, many of which have been mentioned already.

I know that he was a director of the California Conservation Corps, a program which many of us love and cherish. He was chief deputy State treasurer, and, of course, he was the chief of the California Youth Authority, a position which he held with honor, and also trying to do the most he could for children and youth that, in some ways, had run astray.

However, these impressive titles and job responsibilities convey only part of B.T. Collins' true dedication to serving his community.

The Vietnam Veterans' Memorial in Sacramento's Capitol Park and the soon-to-be-built Children's Center at a local women's shelter in Sacramento will be the lasting institutions that speak to B.T.'s commitment to helping others.

B.T. always remembered the importance of the individual. He was known, as many of us who have testified today can speak, for personally phoning a wide range of people on their birthdays. But let me mention that his consideration reached beyond just his colleagues or those of influence. One of my staff people for the last 2 years in a row was astounded when Assemblyman Collins called her with birthday greetings. This is a woman who had never met B.T. Collins and, to his passing, never met him.

The last time I spoke to B.T. was also on my birthday. The fact that he took time daily to recognize birthdays is evidence, I believe, of B.T.'s unique and caring ways.

Any thought of B.T. Collins is naturally accompanied by warmth and smiles. Fellow lawmakers would do well to pick up where Assemblyman Collins left off. California will truly miss you, B.T. Collins.

Mr. FAZIO. Thank you, XAVIER, for your contribution.

I got a number of notes from B.T. over the years. I always maintained that they were unreadable because he could not write very well with his other hand. So I always called him and would say, "B.T., I got a note from you. Will you tell me what it said?"

I now yield to a good friend, who was a close personal friend of B.T.'s, a gentleman who served in Sacramento coterminous with his service, RICK LEHMAN.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to thank my colleagues for having this special order tonight.

I do not think anyone is ever prepared to speak on the occasion of a friend's death, but I think the most important statements really come from the heart. I feel a lot in my heart today and have ever since the news came on the radio when I was in my car that B.T. had been stricken.

I first met B.T. 16 years ago when I was elected to the State assembly at the age of 28. We became good friends, because I did not always get along that well with the Governor of California, even though we were in the same party. We were from different places, I guess.

B.T., one of his first jobs was to bridge the gap between the Governor and me, or at least try to get my vote on key initiatives that the Governor had. He would come into my office, sit down, throw his hook on my desk and make a wisecrack about what the Governor needed, and I would make a statement about the Governor and what he needed, and then in the bottom line, you always felt that all other things being equal, you would do it for B.T., because he made you feel good about it, and he had a way with people, I think, that served the Governor very well.

I do not think Jerry Brown would have been successful in any of his endeavors as Governor had it not been for B.T. working with the legislature, as HOWARD BERMAN indicated earlier. He spoke our language, and he spoke our language all day, and he spoke our language all night.

I will never forget the many times after hours with B.T. when we would sometimes run into the Governor, as well, at various places in Sacramento in the old days, and his humor was absolutely unparalleled.

But he was always well focused, and he had a deep sense of who he was, what life was about, that unquestionably came from his own experience. He never asked for pity. He never asked for any favors. He never asked for any sympathy. He did not think he deserved any. He wanted to be treated as a regular human being, and he certainly was.

Sometimes he would make his fellow Vietnam vets very angry when they would want programs or special considerations.

□ 1940

He would tell me we are not entitled to anything more than any other American was, that they had the privilege to serve their country.

That did not always sit well with him, but it put some levity into some of the arguments, and all of them enormously respected him.

Our friendship grew even to the point where B.T. was bipartisan as someone mentioned earlier. I will never forget he flew to Fresno one time to a fundraiser for me. That was when I first ran for Congress. I know he did so for many other Democrats and Republicans as well. People were his friends; they were not political relationships. And there was nothing that he sought to gain from that relationship but to be a friend and to share experiences. And that is obviously why he had so many friends.

Many people were surprised when he took the job at the Conservation Corps. We knew B.T. could work for somebody and we knew that he could be superb in that role, but a lot of us had our doubts about whether or not he could run an organization and be an administrator.

He quickly changed that. He was a very excellent administrator, very effective and beloved director of the Conservation Corps in California. People remember him as the guy who drank malathion; but I think when history is written he will be remembered as a person who made all of those kids feel like they were somebody and gave them an opportunity to change their lives, gave them dignity. He cared deeply about each individual and what he was doing

there. In a lot of ways I think that work was probably the most rewarding work of his life where he really made a difference for people. He had a chance to use all of the skills he developed in all the various roles that he had.

And I think it is only fitting that later on in his all-too-short life he got to be a legislator, to be his own man, not to work for anybody, not to necessarily have to do anything for anyone in particular but to have the chance to carry out his own dreams, get out there in the arena and not just represent people but to use all of the experience he had to try to make our State a better place.

There probably will not be a day that goes by for a long time that I shall not think about B.T. Again, on a personal note, I will never forget when my father died, not just the call that I got then but the letters and the calls that I got after that to make sure that everything was all right. Even though we had not seen each other for over a year, he cared so much about people that he had come to know and he felt for people when they were in pain, and he could feel my pain at that time from across the years and across the continent.

I will always love him for that as well as for the care that he gave me at that time and in ways I never got to express to him personally as well.

But, B.T., I will miss you, and I will see you down the road. Thank you.

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] has said, just two points. One, the Governor would not have been successful were it not for B.T. Collins. I have to describe that in 1982 the Committee on Ways and Means was taking a tour across the country to talk about the Reagan economic program. Ben Bowler, who was the staff director of the Human Resources Subcommittee at the time, called up and got a hold of B.T., who was the chief of staff, because he wanted the Governor to be at a dinner for the Committee on Ways and Means members the night of the hearing.

Ken described the conversation to me. He said, first of all, he asked, "Who was this guy, B.T. Collins?" He said, "You guys really got a strange group of people over there, because we could not get the Governor." We told him, "We have this date that we would like the Governor." And he said, "Don't worry, the Governor will be there. And Ken said, 'Well, would you check the calendar,' and B.T. said, 'Don't worry, if I say the Governor is going to be there, the Governor will be there.'" That is when Ken said, "Bob, no wonder your State is all screwed up." It was hilarious.

The Governor was there that night, believe it or not.

What Rick said about B.T. making phone calls, I would not want you to think that this was something where B.T. had a Rolodex and made telephone calls to us on our birthdays. But what happened to Rick happened to me when my father passed away. B.T. called as soon as he found out, he wanted to make sure I was OK. He was at the funeral.

He wrote a note afterward and at the same time he made a phone call afterwards. I will tell you, I do not know where the guy got all his energy, the time, and compassion. It certainly was there. I think many of us were touched by B.T. in his life, in many ways, and we will be touched even in his absence at this time.

I yield back to my friend from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I would like to pick up on the gentleman's comments. I know the poignant remarks the gentleman made, the personal remarks that RICK LEHMAN made, and I think they are echoed by Congressman MATSUI and others.

When my daughter had an extended illness, B.T. would be on the phone periodically checking on her condition. He truly cared about all those people that he got to know.

He never married, but he had many, many, many women who would have given their eye teeth to spend time with him over any part of their lives because he was such a compassionate and decent and loving individual. That is why I guess there are so many members of the delegation who felt constrained to come to the floor tonight and join in this special order. I know GARY CONDIT and RICHARD POMBO and BILL BAKER had intended to speak but were confused by the on-again, off-again nature of our decision to go forward tonight, given the conflict we had earlier over whether or not we would stay in session. I want all members of the delegation to be able to submit material.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to conclude by thanking my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] and all of our colleagues who have joined me and who have spoken on this very extraordinary individual. We will not have anyone like him again, not just from our area but perhaps from our State and perhaps our Nation. All of us have been enriched by our time on this Earth with him.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we mark the passing of B.T. Collins of California.

B.T. represented the best qualities of our people. He was courageous and committed, charming and witty. And, he had a unique ability to verbally crystalize an issue, and to inspire, or provoke, those who listened.

B.T. brought to his public life humor, boldness, and dignity. In difficult times he always followed his heart.

Too often, elected officials take stands based on polls and the popular view of the moment, as defined by the media. B.T. took positions because he believed in them.

B.T. Collins will always be remembered for exposing the myth of the dangers of malathion spraying during California's med-fly crisis. But the best example he set was the sacrifice and commitment to duty and country he demonstrated in Vietnam.

We will all miss B.T. His loss is one we can ill afford.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of my good friend, assemblyman B.T. Collins, who passed away a week ago Saturday.

B.T. was one of the most memorable men I have met in public life. He was truly a legend in his own time.

I first met B.T. when he headed the California Conservation Corps. He always said that job offered low pay, long hours, and miserable working conditions. He took on the challenge because he believed deeply in helping youngsters to become successful and productive members of society.

I once toured a CCC facility in Paradise. I was very impressed with the program, and with the leadership B.T. provided to the entire effort.

Later B.T. served as former Gov. Jerry Brown's chief of staff. Although B.T. was a loyal Republican, his commitment to service brought him into the Brown administration. He had a positive impact in that job.

B.T. had a tremendous ability to inspire others, and he was one of the best after dinner speakers I have ever heard. A disabled Vietnam veteran, B.T. drew strength from his own difficult experiences and spoke about them without bitterness. He was grateful to have been able to step up to the plate and participate in the great events of his time. I've never forgotten a speech he gave in Chico on that theme. It was yet another example of his strong patriotism.

B.T.'s generosity was well known. He would travel anywhere, anytime on behalf of his friends. He served as master of ceremonies at countless fundraising dinners, including mine, and I sincerely appreciated his friendship. There was no better example of being a friend than B.T. Collins.

We will all miss B.T., and we want to thank him for his friendship, and his remarkable achievements in an all-too-brief life. He lived life to the fullest, and we will miss him greatly.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LANCASTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of medical tests.

Ms. DELAURO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.

Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of personal reasons.

Ms. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Joint Resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to designate May 3, 1993, through May 9, 1993, as "Public Service Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of April 25 through May 2, 1993, and April 10 through 17, 1994, as "Jewish Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1993 as "Civil War History Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution designating the week beginning June 6, 1993, and June 5, 1994, "Lyme Disease Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 49. 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.

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1993, and April 9, 1994, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 904. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 30, 1993, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

964. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting recommendations for base closures and realignments, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c) (104 Stat. 1811); to the Committee on Armed Services.

965. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting recommendations for base closures and realignments, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c) (104 Stat. 1811); to the Committee on Armed Services.

966. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, Department of Energy, transmitting notification that the fiscal year 1992 research activities report will be forthcoming in June, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 3141(c) (1), (2) (103 Stat. 1680); to the Committee on Armed Services.

967. A letter from the Principal Deputy for the Assistant Secretary for Production and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the operations of the National Defense Stockpile for the period October 1991 through September 1992, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

968. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 10-15, "District of Columbia Water and Sewer Operations Temporary Amendment Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, sec. 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

969. A letter from the Acting Chairman, State Energy Advisory Board, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on the activities of the Board, pursuant to Public Law 101-440, section 5 (104 Stat. 1010); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

970. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 01-92, concerning a proposed agreement with the Swedish Defense Materiel Administration, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

971. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Turkey (Transmittal No. DTC-12-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

972. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-15-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

973. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

974. A letter from the International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

975. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

976. A letter from the Washington Representative, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 1992 Annual Report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 37; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

977. A letter the Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a copy of their report to Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

978. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report titled, "Suspended Light Rail System Technology Pilot Project," pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 3030; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

979. Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Federal equal opportunity recruitment program for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3905(d)(2); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

980. Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting results of the study and evaluation of the Department of Education's system of internal accounting controls over the Federal Family Education Loan Program as September 30, 1992; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Education and Labor.

981. Chairman, Railroad Retirement Account to pay benefits in each of the next succeeding 5 years, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1430. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit (Rept. 103-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 239. A bill to amend the Stock Raising Homestead Act to resolve certain problems regarding subsurface estates, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 103-44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 829. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of

1968 to authorize funds received by States and units of local government to be expended to improve the quality and availability of DNA records; to authorize the establishment of a DNA identification index; and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 103-45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 175. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Federal Bureau of investigation to obtain certain telephone subscriber information (Rept. 103-46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON BILLS INITIALLY REFERRED UNDER TIME LIMITATIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X, the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

[Submitted March 26, 1993]

The Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of H.R. 235; H.R. 235 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of March 25, 1993]

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 235. A bill to provide for certain land exchanges in the State of Idaho; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than March 26, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause (1)(a), rule X (Rept. 103-42, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1502. A bill to direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to conduct a yield and cost study of timber management investment opportunities on Federal timberlands in California, Oregon, and Washington, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 1503. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 respecting the participation in or attendance of operators at interviews conducted in connection with an investigation of an accident; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOUCHER: (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HENRY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WISE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, AND Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1504. A bill to encourage the modernization of the Nation's telecommunications infrastructure, to promote competition in the cable television industry and to permit telephone companies to provide video programming; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 1505. A bill to require a 25-percent reduction in appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1506. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the residency requirement for U.S. attorneys and assistant U.S. attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 1507. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to provide for the reduction of the agricultural program debt of, and for donations of grain to, the independent states of the former Soviet Union in exchange for certain actions on their part, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1508. A bill to provide for the reformation of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 1509. A bill to provide for full statutory wage adjustments for prevailing rate employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 1510. A bill to amend the Family Support Act of 1988 to ensure that priority is given to certain community development corporations in approving applications to conduct demonstration projects to expand the number of job opportunities available to certain low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 to promote and expand the export of agricultural commodities and products to foreign countries, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SARPALIUS:

H.R. 1512. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal provisions establishing a national maximum speed limit; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. BYRNE, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1513. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 10th and Main Streets in Richmond, VA, as the "Lewis F. Powell, Jr. United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed congressionally approved amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1515. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain public lands in Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution designating the week beginning January 2, 1994, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution providing for the United States to assume a strong leadership role in implementing the decisions made at the Earth Summit by developing a national strategy to implement Agenda 21 and other Earth Summit agreements through domestic policy and foreign policy, by cooperating with all countries to identify and initiate further agreements to protect the global environment, and by supporting and participating in the high-level United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. KING):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution regarding broadcasting by Radio Free Europe to the former Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

67. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to Federal mandated programs and their costs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

68. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to legislation related to mining; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

69. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to the Federal Magnetic Elevated Train System Pilot Project; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. PICKETT introduced a bill (H.R. 1516) for the relief of Earl B. Chappell, Jr.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Ms. LONG, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 18: Mr. SWETT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SABO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 34: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FISH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 35: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 70: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 88: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 127: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KLUG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 133: Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GORDON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 142: Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 146: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 147: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 159: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 163: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 166: Mr. SANTORUM and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 199: Mrs. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT.

H.R. 297: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 304: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 324: Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 349: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 359: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 373: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 388: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 410: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 429: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 522: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MEEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PAXON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 569: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 662: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 692: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 710: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. STUDDS, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 739: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 786: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 790: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 818: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 823: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 887: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 895: Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 896: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 899: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 911: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 921: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 928: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KLINK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 947: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 961: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 975: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 996: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 999: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 1032: Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 1120: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1121: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 1122: Mr. POMBO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1123: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1124: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1125: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1126: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1127: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1128: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 1129: Mr. POMBO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 1130: Mr. POMBO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1156: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1158: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1171: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1188: Mr. OWENS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1237: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YATES, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1238: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WELDON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1245: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1275: Mr. STUMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1292: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1389: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1392: Mr. GOSS and Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H.R. 1407: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. FINGERHUT.

H.R. 1421: Mrs. MINK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1428: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1490: Mr. HERGER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.J. Res. 124: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. MINK.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. EWING, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. VENTO, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 152: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LEVY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. SOLOMON and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. MFUME.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. BRYANT.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEVY, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEVY, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. DARDEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, MR. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. COMBEST.

H. Res. 54: Mr. KLUG, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. EWING.

H. Res. 117: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DANNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H. Res. 127: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Res. 134: Mr. GOSS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H. Res. 139: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BALLENGER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

24. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the County Council, Kauai, HI, relative to supporting H.R. 935; which was referred jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Science, Space, and Technology.

SENATE—*Monday, March 29, 1993*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BOB GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.—Psalm 127:1.

Almighty God our Heavenly Father, the psalmist brings us face to face with the tragic limitations of the best that legislation can do—the futility of the finest human effort. All the statistics concerning crime, dysfunctional families, divorce, violence, drugs, teenage pregnancy, and suicide are growing. At the same time, leadership is doing everything in its power to stop regression.

Help us to see, Father, that this is the price a secular society pays when it rules God out of its life. Without God—without an infinite and eternal reference point—the animalism in humanity grows, and the world becomes a jungle. Without God, all the symptoms of paganism are manifest—cheapness of human life, violence, child sacrifice, hedonism, greed, lust, moral and ethical anarchy.

Gracious, patient God, our Founding Fathers were no better, no wiser than this generation, but they took God seriously. They prayed to Him, depended on Him, sought His will. Restore in us their faith.

We pray in the name of the holy Son of God. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BOB GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, there will now be a period for morning business during which Senators will be permitted to speak until 12:30 p.m., at which time the Senate will return to consideration of the pending bill, the supplemental appropriations bill, which includes the President's economic investment and stimulus program.

I have been advised that our Republican colleagues will be holding a caucus from 1 to 1:45 p.m. and have requested that the Senate stand in recess during that period of time. Of course, we will be pleased, as always, to accommodate that request. So the Senate will stand in recess from 1 until 1:45 and then at 1:45 will return to consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I wish now to repeat what I have said on many, many occasions over the past 2 weeks. The Senate is scheduled to begin the Easter recess at the close of business on this Friday, April 2. Prior to that time, we must complete action on the pending measure, on the conference report on the budget resolution, and on the debt limit extension. We will be required to remain in session until those measures are completed. If, through diligence and good fortune, we are able to complete action on those measures prior to Friday, why, of course, we will discontinue our session at that time.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues to try to complete action on those important measures as soon as possible. Votes may occur at any time from 12:30 p.m. today on throughout the week until we complete action on these measures. There are no restrictions with respect to when votes may occur once we resume action on the supplemental appropriations bill at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL REFORMS IN RUSSIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this morning we have all watched very closely and read about the events unfolding in Moscow. We have observed with a great deal of concern the struggle for control over policies and direction of economic and political reform in Russia and in other states of the old Soviet Union.

It seems to me that this is a time when we in the Congress should work together on a bipartisan basis with the President to define policies and programs to help encourage the reformers in the Soviet Union and also to help ensure the success of economic and democratic reform in Russia.

Obviously, this is a problem that is too big for the United States to solve by itself, even with massive direct financial assistance, credits and other programs that we have discussed in recent months. In the final analysis, it is really up to the people of Russia and the Russian leadership to decide what their future will be. But our future is directly tied to the events that are occurring in Russia today. So I do not think we should sit back and passively observe the events without trying to be a constructive and positive force for multinational assistance to support the reformers in Russia.

We need to speak with one voice at this time, and I encourage all in the Senate to try to set aside partisan considerations at a time when we are trying to develop a program for active assistance to the reformers in Russia.

I am optimistic that there are some things that we can do that will be very helpful. Encouraging the International Monetary Fund, for example, to be more aggressive and to be more generous in designing an assistance package for Russia would be a very meaningful first step. The $84 billion debt that now hangs over the Russian economy needs to be refinanced. They are going to have to find some way to buy the goods to address their emergency and long-term investment needs.

As a part of this assistance package, there should be a fund for loans to entrepreneurs, both for those in the Russian Republic and for those seeking to do business in the Russian Republic. The goal would be to encourage entre-

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

preneurial activity and to help private businesses create jobs for workers that provide stable sources of income. Rather than subsidizing the state-owned industries and businesses which the opponents of reform want to do in Russia, we should try to use our influence to encourage private entrepreneurial and business activity that will assure economic growth. That is what is needed.

That will send a very clear signal to both the reformers and the people of Russia that they are not in this by themselves and that they are not being abandoned to the forces of opposition within Russia at this very perilous time in their transition.

There are training programs, Mr. President, that I think we could expand in order to teach Russian managers the precepts, the practices, and the benefits of private enterprise. We have some exchange programs that are already underway and are designed to deal with some sectors of the economy. We had a delegation from Russia visit my State of Mississippi recently to learn how private enterprise farming and agribusiness enterprises work. They saw how to modify their system to take advantage of proven practices in our system that have led to such a high standard of living for so many of our citizens.

I think we can use our experience and know-how, in a way that will help teach—not in a dominating way but in a helpful way—those in the old Soviet Union, in Russia, and in the other states who want to succeed in the modernization of their economy and their political system. We have to be involved. We should not just look the other way.

Their future is certainly at stake, but ours is, too. We would hate to see a reversal of the democratic reforms that have taken place and the return to a hostile militarism in the former Soviet Union. That is certainly not a happy thought.

So I hope in the days ahead, Mr. President, that we will work in a cooperative way here—Republicans and Democrats—with the President to define and promote programs that will help encourage reform, help give reform a better chance of succeeding than it would have without our assistance.

I think that is very important right now. I think our influence will be felt not only within Russia and the other States of the former Soviet Union, but in Eastern Europe, where they are struggling with democratic and free-market reforms, and it will also help encourage and bolster the resolve of other influential democracies around the world to be more generous and to become more involved in helping to assure effective multinational cooperative assistance for Russia and the democratic reformers there.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, our world faces change at a rapid pace. Although the cold war no longer threatens our very existence, the chilling after-effects still linger. In the last half-century, new technologies and other scientific discoveries have exceeded our expectations. One of the greatest scientific achievements of this century is the amazing discovery and progressive development of nuclear science. Nuclear science can yield enormous benefits for humanity. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of a post-cold-war world and the endless advance of technology have combined to increase the threat of nuclear proliferation.

I rise today to address the implications of nuclear proliferation and to commend Zachery Davis and his colleagues at the Congressional Research Service for their extensive research on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation of nuclear material.

A few years ago, I asked the Congressional Research Service, known as CRS, to conduct comprehensive research on the problematic consequences of nuclear disarmament in accordance with international reduction treaties. I also asked CRS to publish the research findings in an issue brief. Since then, CRS has published many informative issue briefs on nuclear disarmament that my staff and I find very useful.

On the subject of disarmament, Churchill's fable said it best:

> Once upon a time all the animals in the zoo decided that they would disarm, and they arranged to have a conference to arrange the matter. So the Rhinoceros said when he opened the proceedings that the use of teeth was barbarous and horrible and ought to be strictly prohibited by general consent. Horns, which were mainly defensive weapons, would, of course, have to be allowed. The Buffalo, the Stag, the Porcupine, and even the little Hedgehog all said they would vote with the Rhino, but the Lion and the Tiger took a different view. They defended teeth and even claws, which they described as honourable weapons of immemorial antiquity.
>
> The Panther, the Leopard, the Puma, and the whole tribe of small cats all supported the Lion and the Tiger. Then the Bear spoke. He proposed that both teeth and horns should be banned and never used again for fighting by any animal. It would be quite enough if animals were allowed to give each other a good hug when they quarreled. No one could object to that. It was so fraternal, and that would be a great step toward peace. However, all the other animals were very offended, with the Deer and the Turkey falling into a perfect panic.
>
> The discussion got so hot and angry, and all those animals began thinking so much about horns and teeth and hugging when they argued about peaceful intentions that had brought them together that they began to look at one another in a very nasty way. Luckily the keepers were able to calm them down and persuade them to go back quietly to their cages, and they began to feel quite friendly with one another again.

Like the peaceful existence of the animals in Churchill's fable, the cold war has subsided. Bipolarism no longer exists. The process of full-scale disarmament is underway. The greatest scientific minds are no longer being directed toward the annihilation of the human race.

Recently, the United States experienced a possible terrorist attack—the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York City. The facts of the explosion still are being unearthed among the twisted steel and concrete ruble. The explosion was of conventional nonnuclear compounds. However, imagine for a moment that the terrorists had access to nuclear material. If the terrorists had obtained or constructed a device, need I elaborate on the catastrophic outcome?

The optimist would argue that terrorists would never be able to obtain or operate nuclear material. A recent CRS report, "Swords Into Energy: Nuclear Weapons Materials After the Cold War," concluded otherwise. According to the CRS, small quantities of nuclear materials have disappeared from arsenals within the former Soviet Union. It is believed these and other nuclear materials have reached the black market. Since the Soviet Union's collapse, several arrests have been made in Europe in connection with nuclear technology. So far, the material confiscated has not been suitable for nuclear-grade explosives.

A CRS Issue Brief, "Nuclear Weapons: Dismantlement and Disposal of Retired U.S. and CIS Inventories," suggests several methods of disposal of nuclear material in accordance with the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks [START] Treaty. Some of the recommendations are highly controversial and may be improbable solutions. But the fact of the matter is that there is an urgent need for a plausible and responsible solution to this frightening nuclear dilemma. Time is of the essence.

It is somewhat reassuring to know that U.S. nuclear material can be traced. There are viable safeguards to prevent our nuclear material from falling into the wrong hands. Such a vital system does not exist in the former Soviet Union.

To assure the same degree of accountability in nuclear disarmament in the former Soviet Union, the United

States should continue its assistance in Russia's nuclear dismantlement. Without strong international cooperation to maintain a safeguarded nuclear arsenal, the risk of retired nuclear materials being used as a viable terrorist threat is much greater.

On September 29, 1992, I gave a speech regarding possible options for disposal of current nuclear stockpiles. Included in my speech was the CRS report entitled "Nuclear Material From Dismantled Warheads: What To Do With It and How To Verify Its Disposal." Since that time, CRS has continued its extensive research on this vital subject. I commend Zachery Davis and his colleagues at CRS for their exemplary work.

Hopefully, the international community will continue to coordinate successful efforts to prevent nuclear material from proliferating to hostile governments or terrorists. Time is short, and further inattention to the issue will only increase potential risks. Nuclear nonproliferation should be of the highest priority on the international agenda.

Mr. President, I speak as ranking member of the Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Organization Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. We all have to think very seriously about what would happen if a small amount of nuclear material were in the hands of the type of terrorists who bombed the World Trade Center in New York.

We also have to follow the events in Russia very closely. Last year, I made a trip to several of the CIS States, including Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and others, and many of those still possess some nuclear materials. I know there are plans for destroying our missile silos, at least in western South Dakota.

The Russians supposedly are destroying their nuclear silos. But there is still a great deal of nuclear material in this world now controlled by smaller countries with unstable governments. Those governments desperately need hard currency. They desperately need money. And we are unsure exactly who is in control of that nuclear material in many of those countries.

I know that this is not an easy problem, but some of the steps that the Clinton administration and the Congress are taking in regard to Russia are related to controlling this nuclear material. Several of our colleagues in the Senate have done a good job. But it is a very sobering thought—had these materials been carried in a suitcase—as to what would have happened at the World Trade Center had those terrorists had nuclear materials.

TRIBUTE TO BOB KASTEN

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to our colleague, the distinguished former senior Senator from Wisconsin, Bob Kasten. I am honored to be able to follow Senator Kasten as the ranking member of the Senate Small Business Committee, a committee on which he served during his entire tenure in the Senate.

Bob Kasten was known throughout Wisconsin as "Mr. Small Business." His reputation as a tireless worker and advocate for small business in the Senate earned him that well-deserved title. Senator Kasten was a small businessman. He helped run his family's shoe business in Theinsville and Campbellsport, WI. The family business gave him the firsthand, real life experience of meeting a payroll, keeping the balance sheets in the black, and dealing with Federal taxes, regulations, and paperwork. The insights Senator Kasten gained in his family business would later shape his entire legislative agenda in the U.S. Senate. He was a staunch advocate for small business, economic growth, and job creation.

Mr. President, a great example of Senator Kasten's commitment to protect small business from Government overregulation came with the successful repeal of the outrageous tax regulation known as section 89. As my colleagues may remember, section 89 of the Internal Revenue Code was a backdoor scheme to tax fringe benefits. It required small businesses to prove—at their expense—that their employee health benefit plans did not favor one group of workers over another. Businesses that failed to comply would be taxed. Compliance with section 89 would have been so complicated and so expensive for small businesses that many would have been forced to lay off employees—or drop their health insurance plans altogether.

Senator Kasten diligently offered a total of eight amendments throughout the spring and summer of 1989 to repeal section 89. Finally, in August, he succeeded with an appropriations amendment to prohibit the IRS from using funds to issue regulations and enforce section 89. Senator Kasten was not finished. On November 7, 1989, legislation to repeal section 89 passed the Senate and was signed into law by President Bush the next day. While many legislators wanted to compromise or back down, Senator Kasten held firm to his pledge to repeal the entire law. In a letter to Senator Kasten, John Motley, vice president of government relations for the National Federation of Independent Business, wrote:

> You were the one who pushed the fight (on section 89) forward, who kept the issue before the Senate and the one who worked the hardest to make repeal a reality. You and your terrific staff did what so many said was impossible.

Senator Kasten demonstrated his commitment to small business in other ways, as well. Senator Kasten was the principal Republican sponsor of a proposal to cut payroll taxes. He believed that high levels of payroll taxes are a barrier to job creation because they raise labor costs for small business. Senator Kasten was a proponent of simplifying the payroll tax deposit system; extending the minimum wage exemption for small business; and stopping efforts to undo regulatory exemptions that have protected the smallest employers and farmers from programmed OSHA safety inspections.

Bob Kasten also supported efforts to assist small businesses in complying with the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. He also worked tirelessly to strengthen the hand of the President to stop burdensome bureaucratic rules and intrusive redtape in order to achieve a goal of 5 percent annual reduction in the Federal paperwork burden.

In order to expand economic opportunities for minorities and the disadvantaged, Senator Kasten led the fight for Federal urban and rural enterprise zones. In conjunction with the chairman of the Small Business Committee, Senator BUMPERS, Senator Kasten also worked to create and expand the Federal Microloans Program. His efforts were instrumental in delivering four Microloans Programs for Wisconsin to provide much-needed capital for new and existing small businesses.

With the American economy supporting 70 percent of the world's lawyers and many small businesses diverting their resources from the creation and production of goods to costly, needless self-defense measures, Senator Kasten believes, as do I and many of my colleagues, that our product liability laws need reform.

Senator Kasten was a tireless advocate for improving our current product liability laws and the U.S. legal system in general. I was proud to work closely with him in that effort. From his first day in the Senate, Senator Kasten worked tirelessly to convince Congress to fix this out-of-control system through his Product Liability Fairness Act. Year after year, Senator Kasten was successful in getting his legislation passed out of the Commerce Committee, but the trial lawyers and their advocates in the Senate were able to thwart his efforts on the Senate floor.

Finally, Mr. President, Senator Kasten was recognized as a leader in the fight to revitalize our economy through progrowth tax reforms. As one of the principal authors of the so-called Kemp-Kasten tax reform bill, he was instrumental in the Tax Code revolution of the mid-1980's. In the late 1980's, he led the effort to restore the capital gains deferential to spark entrepreneurship.

Senator Kasten's efforts on behalf of small business were recognized by entrepreneurs in Wisconsin and across the country. He is one of only a handful of Senators to receive the National

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 25

Federation of Independent Business' Guardian of Small Business Award and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Spirit of Enterprise Award for his pro-small-business voting record in every year he served in the Senate. And in 1992, NFIB gave Senator Kasten a special Small Business Legislator of the Decade Award in recognition of his overall leadership on behalf of the small business community.

Again, Mr. President, on behalf of America's small business community, let me reiterate our deep appreciation for Bob Kasten's 12 years of faithful service to small business in this distinguished body. It is a great pleasure and privilege for me to stand here today and publicly thank Senator Bob Kasten for his efforts. I am sure all of my colleagues will agree when I say it is our hope that Senator Kasten left this body with a deep feeling of satisfaction for a job well done. We miss him.

EFFECTS OF TAX PROPOSALS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate that I held the first of a series of meetings and hearings on small business in Sioux Falls, SD, last Saturday morning. I reported to the small businessmen and women what effects the Clinton tax proposal might have on small business. As the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I listened to their concerns and answered their questions. We had a panel discussion on small business, on the tax increases included in Clinton's package, the investment tax credit and the energy tax increases. I am very concerned that small business is being asked to pay for President Clinton's spending increases. Small business tax rates will go up to 42.5 percent while the rates for large corporations will be 36 percent. Small business cannot pass on the additional costs energy tax. It is true that it appears there will be some benefit from the investment tax credit. I think the tax policy of this body regarding small business should be carefully scrutinized because small business creates most of the new jobs and the new technology in our society, and under Clinton's plan, small business has been hit hardest, at least in my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD summaries of statements and excerpts of statements from small businessmen who were responding to the current economic conditions on small business as it affects South Dakota and our Nation.

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

OFFICE OF SENATOR LARRY PRESSLER
CONSTITUENT CALL

Call from: Bill Ferguson, Rt. 2, Box 71, Witten, SD 57584.

Mr. Ferguson called to say he saw Senator Pressler on C-SPAN this morning and has a few comments.

During the debate on Senator Pressler's Small Business Tax Fairness Amendment to the Budget Resolution, Senator Sasser, who was arguing against Senator Pressler and small business, made an incorrect statement.

Senator Sasser said that all business costs are deductible before taxes, and that is wrong. The costs of day to day operations are deductible, but the principal payments on loans are not. Principal payments, especially on land, can be large and are a necessary expense of owning a small business or farm. Mr. Ferguson would like Larry to correct Senator Sasser's remarks.

Mr. Ferguson also wanted Larry to know that the Administration's plan would have a devastating impact on farming and small businesses operations such as his. Mr. Ferguson was appreciative of Senator Pressler's efforts on behalf of small businesses and family farms.

Rapid City, SD.

DEAR SENATOR PRESSLER: Thank you for the invitation to the Small Business Seminar in Sioux Falls on the 27th.

I am glad you continue to try to reduce the amount of Federally mandated regulations and paperwork. I waste a lot of time on it.

Sincerely,

ALAN SEWELL,
President, The Little Print Shop.

CHAMBERLAIN, SD,
March 12, 1993.

SENATOR PRESSLER: Stop Spending First. Thanks.

ROBERT G. KEINER.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt—run up by the U.S. Congress—stood at $4,222,072,198,199.65 as of the close of business on Thursday, March 25.

Anybody remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution is bound to know that no President can spend a dime of the taxpayers' money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. Therefore, no Member of Congress, House or Senate, can pass the buck as to the responsibility for this long-term and shameful display of irresponsibility. The dead cat lies on the doorstep of the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers $286,022,000,000 merely to pay the interest on reckless Federal spending, approved by Congress—spending of the taxpayers' money over and above what the Federal Government has collected in taxes and other income. This has been what is called deficit spending—but it's really a form of thievery. Averaged out, this astounding interest paid on the Federal debt amounts to $5.5 billion every week, or $785 million every day—just to pay, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, the interest on the existing Federal debt.

Looking at it on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $16,437.31—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. The interest payments on this massive debt, average out to be $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America. Or, looking at it still another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone, mind you—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

Does this prompt you to wonder what America's economic stability would be like today if, for the past five or six decades, there had been a Congress with the courage and the integrity to maintain a balanced Federal budget? The arithmetic speaks for itself.

A TRIBUTE J. CALEB BOGGS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise and report to the Senate with great sadness the death of former Delaware Governor, Representative and Senator J. Caleb Boggs, who passed away Friday night in Christiana Hospital, near Wilmington.

Cale, as he was known, was a public servant, a lawyer, a family man—and Delaware's friend. He was my friend. When I first came to Washington in the 1960's as Delaware's Member of the House of Representatives, and when I joined the Senate in 1971, Senator Boggs was generous with his time and with his advice. He was there to answer my questions, to listen, and to lend a helping hand to the new kid on the block.

Cale Boggs was Delaware's consummate politician. He did it all. Governor Boggs served for 8 years, from 1953 until 1961. He was the First State's Representative from 1947 until 1953; and he was Senator for two terms, from 1961 until 1973.

Cale Boggs was a true Delawarean, born in Cheswold, whose family's Delaware roots date back to pre-Civil War days. He graduated from the University of Delaware and then received a law degree from Georgetown University. Cale later served with distinction in World War II and in the Delaware National Guard. After his career as Governor and in Washington, Cale returned to his law practice in Wilmington, and remained there until he retired.

Delaware has lost a great man. We have lost a man who loved his State with a passion; who knew most people by their first names, regardless of their age, race, or color; and, who considered every Delawarean his friend. He will be missed by me—and more than 600,000 other Delawareans.

I ask that obituaries pertaining to his death appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal, Mar. 28, 1993]

MR. DELAWARE: DIAMOND STATE'S GLOW IS DIMMER TODAY WITH CALE BOGGS' DEATH

J. Caleb Boggs, Mr. Delaware, died Friday night after a lengthy, often painful, illness.

He was a man who loved his native state and its people. He was a generous man who gave constantly and expected nothing in return. He was an unassuming man who never seemed to allow high office to rob him of the ordinary pleasures of life.

Will Rogers used to say he "never met a man he didn't like." Well, we've never met a person who didn't like Cale Boggs. From the Green Acres suburb in north Wilmington where he lived to Selbyville on the Maryland border, everyone loved Cale. And why not? He never put on the airs of a big-time politician—though he was as big and important as they come. Whether as governor or just Cale Boggs, attorney, his hand was out in greeting accompanied by a warm "Hi, good to see you." It wasn't false. It was warm and true, like the man.

Over the years, Cale Boggs held just about every important office a person could hold in Delaware: governor, U.S. senator, U.S. representative, judge. He was a Republican through and through, but counted oh, so many Democrats, among his close friends.

J. Caleb Boggs was as comfortable and confident on a soybean filed as he was in a law office conference room. He slowed his pace only recently when his body gave him no choice.

Cale Boggs was born in rural Cheswold in Kent County—the very heart of Delaware. In so many ways, Cale Boggs represented the heart of our state: quiet, strong, life-enriching.

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal, Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909–1993—FORMER DELAWARE GOVERNOR, U.S. SENATOR DIES

(By Nan Clements)

CHRISTIANA.—J. Caleb Boggs, who returned all the love Delawareans gave him, died Friday night in Christiana Hospital, almost a year to the day after the April 1 death of his beloved wife, Bess.

The former governor and U.S. senator, who had suffered from cancer, diabetes and other serious ailments for several years, was 83.

"Cale was such a wonderful person that it's hard to understand why he had to suffer such a terrible death," said former Gov. Sherman W. Tribbitt, a longtime close personal friend.

"He suffered too much, for too long," said his daughter, Marilu Boggs.

The Cheswold-born Republican, whose family's Delaware roots pre-dated the Civil War, was one of the First State's biggest boosters.

"I think it's a great little state * * * [with] high-class, first-class people," he said in a 1991 interview.

He was qualified to make the judgment—he probably knew more Delawareans than anyone in the state's history. Because he knew so many, his governorship and his political campaigns were intensely personal.

"He went to every event regular people cared about," said U.S. Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., D-Del. "And he still went to those events after his political career ended, until his health got too bad."

Fellow politicians spoke of his remarkable memory, which served him well to the end.

"He seemed to know everyone," said U.S. Rep. Michael N. Castle, R-Del. "It might take him a minute or two to place you, but once he did, you were locked into place."

Mr. Boggs thought nothing of marching across the street, stopping traffic if necessary, to greet a friend—and he considered nearly everyone his friend. Virtually no one called him "Mr. Boggs"—the man with a bright twinkle in his eye was "Cale" or "Governor" or "Senator."

He and his chauffeur, the late Walter Nedwick—who became a close hunting and fishing companion—logged more than 500,000 miles on Delaware roads while Mr. Boggs was governor.

His personal contacts stood him in good stead in 1954, during his first term as governor, when the U.S. Supreme Court, as part of the landmark Brown vs. Board of Education decision, ordered the desegregation of Delaware schools.

"I had to take a position on that * * * and I had to go up and down the state because I knew people felt differently than I did, and I wanted them to understand all the aspects [of integration] as I saw it," he said of his support for the decision. "I felt close to the people, I needed the benefit of their counsel and advice. * * *"

Fellow politicians thought he'd killed any chance at re-election, but he fooled the naysayers and won a second term. Then he moved on to the U.S. Senate.

Former Democratic Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, whose two terms bracketed Mr. Boggs' stint in the state's highest office, considered him something of a state treasure.

"Caleb served Delaware on all levels," Carvel said two years ago. "Caleb is much beloved in Delaware, and he deserved every attention the state can give him."

Mr. Boggs considered the naming of the J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building in Wilmington the highlight of his life—and his joy showed vividly on his face in a picture taken that day.

His life began in Kent County on May 15, 1909. He was educated in public schools, then went to the University of Delaware. He graduated in 1931, the same year he married Elizabeth "Bess" Muir of Carbondale, Pa.

Then he went to Georgetown University, where he received his law degree in 1937.

Mr. Boggs joined the Delaware National Guard in 1926. During World War II, he served with the 6th Armored Division fighting in Normandy, the Rhineland, the Ardennes and central Europe. He earned five Campaign Stars, the Legion of Merit, the Croix de Guerre with palm and the Bronze Star with cluster.

After being deactivated as a colonel, he was appointed a brigadier general with the Delaware National Guard. He retired from military service in 1963.

After the war, Mr. Boggs intended returning to his law practice, but Delaware Republicans "came looking for someone to run for Congress" and launched his public service career.

Before that career ended, he had served eight years as governor, from 1953 to 1961, and represented Delaware in both the U.S. House of Representatives (1947–53) and Senate (1961–73).

Even in high office, Mr. Boggs never set himself above others. Delaware then had no governor's mansion and the Bogges lived in an apartment complex north of Wilmington. Later, when he was elected to the Senate, the family moved to the house they occupied for about 30 years, his last address, at 1203 Grinnell Road in Green Acres, a suburb north of Wilmington.

He retired from the Wilmington law firm of Bayard, Handelman & Murdoch about 10 years ago.

He was a New Castle County Family Court judge in 1946 and chairman of the National Governors Conference in 1959. Other official positions included an honorary membership in the Japanese Diet (1965); membership in the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress (1965–66), the White House Conference on International Cooperation (1965) and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (1964–66).

[From the Wilmington (DE) News-Journal, Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909–1993—FORMER DELAWARE GOVERNOR, U.S. SENATOR DIES AT AGE 83

He also served as Senate member of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (1971–72) and was a member of the board of visitors for the U.S. Military Academy at West Point (1965), the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis (1966 and 1972) and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs (1970).

One of his primary interests was Kappa Alpha, the social fraternity he joined while a student at the University of Delaware. He held every high national office in the fraternity, which honored him several years ago with a significant contribution in his name to the national Kappa Alpha Scholarship Fund.

Mr. Boggs was a trustee of Goldey-Beacom College for more than 25 years. The business school made him an honorary life trustee and awarded him an honorary doctorate. He also received honorary doctorates from Delaware State College, Bethany (W.Va.) College and the University of Delaware.

His directorships included RLC Corp., Rollins Environmental Services Inc., Beneficial National Bank, Artisana Savings Bank, Delaware Safety Council, Blood Bank of Delaware, Greater Wilmington Development Council, Delaware Automobile Club, the Delaware Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation and the Salvation Army Regional Advisory Board.

Mr. Boggs was a member of the American and Delaware Bar Associations, the Sons of the American Revolution, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kiwanis Club, Ducks Unlimited, the Delaware Grange, the National Lawyers Club in Washington, the U.S. Capitol Hill Club and Former Members of Congress.

Surviving, besides his daughter, Marilu of Green Acres, is a son, J. Caleb Boggs Jr. of Wilmington; a brother, Calvin Boggs of Cheswold; and two grandchildren.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Friday in Cheswold Methodist Church, where friends may call an hour earlier. He will be buried beside his wife in Old Presbyterian Church Cemetery, Dover.

Friends who wish to attend the funeral by bus would call the president's office at Goldey-Beacom College, 998-8814, before noon Wednesday.

The family suggests donations to Cheswold Methodist Church, the Delaware Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation, or the Wilmington Endowment Fund of the Salvation Army.

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal, Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909–1993—"DELAWARE HAS LOST A GIANT"

"I long to end my public career with the reputation he had * * * No one ever questioned Cale Boggs' integrity, honesty and decency."—Joseph R. Biden Jr., Democratic senator.

"Cale was the greatest patriarch the Delaware Republican Party has ever had. I admired his feel for people. * * * He was an incredible human being in relating to others."—Michael N. Castle, Republican representative.

"Cale was a great, conscientious fellow who never lost his composure. I don't have

enough words to describe what a wonderful man he was."—Sherman W. Tribbitt, former Democratic governor.

"I've never seen a man so unselfish. * * * He gave himself to serving the state and the people."—John W. Rollins, Boggs' lieutenant governor.

"With the death of J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware has lost a giant. When I sought his counsel, he always told me I was doing just fine."—Gov. Carper.

"I remember a letter from Roy Wilkins (president of the national NAACP), urging us to support Cale Boggs for re-election. Cale was our friend, and one of my favorite persons."—Littleton P. Mitchell, former NAACP leader.

"He was one of the most beautiful people I ever met * * * He made me feel really good about myself, that I had something special to offer."—Richard A. Strunk, fellow Kiwanian and Legionnaire.

"We were longtime friends and political opponents. I'm going to miss Cale—there aren't many Cale Boggses around this state, or anywhere else."—Elbert N. Carvel, former Democratic governor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

The time for morning business has expired.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume consideration of the pending measure under the order.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the regular order.

The Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1335.

The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Byrd amendment No. 271, to reduce funds for the information systems of the Internal Revenue Service, to delete funding for the General Services Administration Building Fund, and to clarify that none of the funds may be used for low priority programs, projects or activities.

(2) Byrd amendment No. 272 (to amendment No. 271), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to speak as in morning business. How long, may I ask my friend, does he think he would like to speak?

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished President pro tempore. I expect to speak not in excess of 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator may use more if he needs it.

Mr. SPECTER. Then I expect to speak not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania may address the Senate as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes, after which I again be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate, under the previous order, will recess from 1 o'clock to 1:45 to allow the Republican conference to meet.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was a request for a recess from 1 o'clock to 1:45. However, the order has not been entered.

Mr. BYRD. It has not been entered.

I am informed that the majority leader still wants that order entered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hour of 1 p.m. today to the hour of 1:45 p.m. this day to allow for the Republican conference and that, upon reaching the hour of 1:45 p.m. today, the Senate resume consideration of the now-pending measure; provided further that my remarks which will continue in the afternoon not show an interruption in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and ordered further that upon the Senate's resumption of the pending measure at 1:45 p.m. today, I again be recognized and that my speech not be counted as a second speech.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m., whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DORGAN].

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate is now into its third day of consideration of H.R. 1335, the economic stimulus appropriations bill. The pending Byrd amendment is a substitute for the substitute for the committee-reported substitute. It contains the President's proposal with the following exceptions:

First, the formulas for the $1 billion distribution to the States of the summer jobs program in the pending substitute is in accordance with the existing formula contained in the Joint Training Partnership Act. The President requested, and the House bill contained a legislative change in that formula. The Senate Labor Committee, chaired by the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] requested that the Senate Appropriations Committee amend the House bill so that these summer job funds would be distributed to the States according to the current formulas contained in the JTPA.

Second, during earlier Senate action on the committee-reported substitute, the Senate adopted the Byrd-Hatfield amendment. This amendment is also contained in the pending Byrd substitute. It is intended to provide the administration with sufficient authority to ensure that some of the funds in the act cannot be used for low-priority, wasteful programs or projects. The President and OMB Director Panetta have assured us that no such projects or programs were intended to be funded, and I am certain that is the case. However, Senator HATFIELD and I included in our amendment the authority for the Secretary of HUD to publish criteria in the Federal Register to ensure that only worthwhile requests will qualify for CDBG funds.

Senator HOLLINGS, at the meeting of the full committee, when the full committee reported the bill and the committee substitute therefor, expressed a great concern about this subject matter.

He provided language to be included in the statement, and this bill further assures that that language will be followed. Without this authority, the administration may not have been able to refuse funding for questionable programs or projects.

Third, the pending Byrd substitute reduces funding for the IRS from $148,397,000 to $43,600,000; and deletes funding of $4,696,000 for the GSA Federal Building Fund. These changes were made at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator DECONCINI.

Other than these changes, Mr. President, the pending substitute contains the President's proposals as passed by the House.

Mr. President, this measure contains the funding requested by the President for the first priority of his economic plan. Along with long-term investment and deficit reduction, President Clinton identified immediate job creation

as a critical component of economic recovery.

During his campaign across America, he saw, firsthand, the devastating effects of the recession on millions of unemployed and underemployed men and women. He campaigned on a promise of change and he recognized that before we embark on the long and painful road toward budget balance, we must first put people back to work. Before undertaking the major surgery that will be required under the House and Senate-passed budget resolution to reduce the deficit some $500 billion over the coming 5 years, the President has asked us to enact the job-creating stimulus contained in the pending measure. The American people, as I stated in my remarks last Thursday, agree with the President, by large majorities in several recent surveys, namely that creating jobs should be our first priority.

On last Thursday, I also explained the details of the package—$4 billion to continue unemployment benefits for 1.8 million unemployed workers who will otherwise lose their benefits by the first week in April; $3 billion to fully fund the Federal-aid housing program and put thousands of people to work this summer on authorized highway projects that are ready to go; $2.5 billion for community development projects that will get underway immediately upon enactment of this bill; $1 billion for summer jobs for an additional 683,000 disadvantaged youth; about $1.2 billion for mass transit, airport, and rail projects that will increase capacity, improve safety, and decrease congestion in our public transportation systems; SBA loan authority for an additional $2.6 billion to enable the Small Business Administration to continue making loans to small businesses—without these funds we are told that SBA will cease making loans in May; $236 million to make repairs and to better maintain our Veterans' hospitals and cemeteries; $1.9 billion for Pell grants for low-income students; $500 million for Head Start; $300 million to immunize more of our children against disease; $845 million for State and local communities to construct wastewater treatment facilities—we are told that the backlog, nationwide, for such sewage treatment facilities is in excess of $100 billion; additional EDA grants of $74 million—of which $15 million is to be targeted to assist victims of Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki and $15 million is to go to assist communities impacted by military base closures and defense cutbacks; and $735 million for a one-time $500 million expansion of summer school programs for educationally disadvantaged children and a one-time $235 million adjustment for local school districts whose funds are being drastically cut back due to the 1990 census.

These are the President's recommendations to put Americans to work now, as well as to meet the health and educational needs of the disadvantaged and to continue unemployment benefits for 1.8 million unemployed workers whose benefits will expire next week unless we enact the President's economic stimulus plan.

Mr. President, there has been criticism of this package by a number of Senators. Those criticisms generally fall into four categories: First, this package will generate a small number of jobs; second, the cost of the package should be offset so that we won't increase the deficit; third, we should defer certain portions of the package until after we have enacted the reconciliation bill so that we can be certain that the deficit will be reduced by approximately $500 billion over the next 5 years; and finally, a General Accounting Office report has been cited which states that a similar 1983 stimulus package was not very successful.

Now I will respond, as best I can, to each of these general criticisms:

First, as to the criticism that this package will provide but few jobs, that there will be little job creation as a result of the President's economic stimulus package, which I prefer to call a jobs bill—several Senators have stated that this package, according to the President's own figures, will generate only 219,000 jobs. I have not been able to confirm that figure, but let us assume that it is correct. However, I say to my colleagues, there is an important distinction between the jobs estimated by the Clinton administration for this package compared to job estimates used by previous administrations. This President chose not to count the number of jobs that will be created indirectly throughout the economy as a result of this bill. In the past, for example, we have been told by the Department of Transportation that approximately 42,000 total jobs—both direct jobs and ripple-effect jobs—are created by $1 billion of highway spending. This President chose to count only approximately 20,000 jobs per $1 billion of highway spending. That is less than one-half the number of jobs that the previous administration would have counted. Therefore, if we accepted or assumed the figure of 219,000 jobs that Senators who have criticized the package have said will be created, we could easily justify at least double that number of jobs by using the criteria of the previous administration.

But, Mr. President, we should not accept the figure of 219,000 jobs in the first place. According to data provided by OMB, the President's package will create 683,000 jobs this summer for disadvantaged youth. From that one program, we will put 683,000 14- to 21-year-olds to work this summer in communities across the Nation who otherwise would have no jobs. We all recognize that these are temporary jobs for the summer only, but they are vitally important for disadvantaged youth. Furthermore, if Senators wish to know how many jobs are estimated by the administration to be created, they can find that information on page 3 of House Document 103-50, entitled "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Request * * * Communication from the President of the United States." Page 3 contains a letter from OMB Director Panetta. The fourth paragraph of that letter reads, in part, as follows: "The supplemental requests, together with the tax stimulus proposals, will create an estimated 500,000 new jobs by the end of 1994." So, even using the conservative methodology of the President in estimating the number of jobs that will be created by this bill and the tax stimulus, we will get 500,000 jobs. If we count the ripple effects on the economy—much like tossing a pebble in the water and watching the ripples go on and on and on and on until they reach the banks of the pool—if we count the ripple effects on the economy, that number would be over 1 million jobs.

Furthermore, if we use the logic of those who have downplayed this number of jobs, perhaps we should appropriate a much larger number of dollars. The needs are certainly there to justify a stimulus package—as was stated during the campaign and after the campaign—the needs are there to justify a stimulus package of $50 to $60 billion. That is the level that was talked about by a number of respected economists as being a prudent stimulus package.

During the debate on the fiscal year 1993 budget, the Appropriations Committee conducted hearings, hearings in the full committee, and economists appearing before my committee stated very clearly the need for that kind of stimulus and some said even higher.

But, the President recognized, and the Appropriations Committee has agreed, that the $16.3 billion contained in this stimulus supplemental, this emergency stimulus supplemental, is a good effort when one considers the need to cut the deficit in the coming years.

Alternatively, would those who have downplayed the number of jobs that will be created by the President's stimulus package recommend that we do nothing? Well, Mr. President, we had an election last November and the President made his intentions very clear. The people voted to elect this President and his economic program—a first priority of which is to enact this jobs stimulus package. The American people still, by large margins, support enactment of a job-creating stimulus package.

Mr. President, I see my friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi, on the floor. Does he wish to address the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not. I was here to listen to the remarks of the Senator. I appreciate very much his inquiry.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, the stimulus bill should be offset. This is the number two criticism. There were four general criticisms that we gleaned from the debate last week, and I have enumerated those four. Just now I am attempting to take a swat at the second one, the second one being that the stimulus bill should be offset.

The second area, as I have indicated, of criticism about this package is that its cost should be offset in order to avoid an increase in the deficit. The President has directly responded that such offsets would cancel out the benefits. It does not take a mathematical genius to figure that out. If one intends to spend $16.3 billion from one pocket to create jobs, and yet he takes away $16.3 billion in spending from his other pocket, he has no net increase—he robs Peter's pocket to pay Paul's pocket—no stimulus at all. The one pocket wipes out the other, the effect of the other.

In addition, as I have explained in previously delivered remarks, and as the chairman of the Budget Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. SASSER, has confirmed, the Senate-passed budget resolution included the 1994 through 1998 cost of this stimulus package in it and will still reduce the deficit by $502 billion over the next 5 years. That is nearly $30 billion greater deficit reduction than requested by the President. To pay for the cost of this bill, on top of the $502 billion in deficit reduction, would not only cancel the job-creating benefits of this package, it would also bring the Nation perilously close to a triple-dip recession. We would bear full responsibility for such a third relapse and for the increase in the deficit that would surely result. We would have even higher unemployment, higher record numbers of people with no choice but to go on food stamps, AFDC, and Medicaid. Is that what the American people want?

The third general criticism that has been expressed toward the pending jobs package: defer portions of this package until after enactment of reconciliation.

Mr. President, if we defer the obligation of these funds until after enactment of reconciliation, we may never see these funds at all. The reconciliation conferees, as was so well explained by the Senator from Oklahoma during his very well delivered and lengthy remarks last Thursday, often do not meet the deficit reduction targets called for in their reconciliation instructions. The Budget Committees cannot insist that the Finance Committee, on which both Senators BOREN and BREAUX serve, meet the deficit reduction target that is called for in the Senate-passed budget resolution. That would be most unfortunate, and I certainly urge both Senators BOREN and BREAUX to do their level best to achieve the deficit reduction target assigned to the Finance Committee; nevertheless, we cannot be sure, as Senator BOREN has said, that the target will be reached.

As proof of this possible result, I have firsthand experience. For fiscal year 1990, the Finance and Ways and Means Committees could not come up with the necessary revenues and mandatory spending cuts to meet their reconciliation target. So what happened? The Appropriations Committee was asked to contribute. Even though the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1990 stayed within their caps—and, I might add, have always kept their part of deficit reduction targets every year, and must do so or suffer across-the-board cuts called sequesters—even though we had stayed within the fiscal year 1990 caps, we appropriators were called upon to take a further cut in order to make up for the shortfall by the Finance and Ways and Means Committees in meeting their deficit reduction target. So, we did that—I suggest there is a job to be done and we will do this—so we did it. We took an across-the-board cut of $3.7 billion in budget authority and $2.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1990 to make up for the reconciliation shortfall. That cut not only affected discretionary spending for fiscal year 1990, it also cut the baseline for each year thereafter. So, the cuts in fiscal year 1990 carried over and will result in lower baselines totaling almost $25 billion in budget authority and $23.4 billion in outlays over the 6-year period, fiscal years 1990–95.

So when I suggest the appropriators will take an across-the-board cut of $3.7 billion in budget authority and $2.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1990, that was not the end of it, Mr. President.

As it extended through the subsequent years, the fiscal year 1990 cuts carried over and, as I say, instead of $3.7 billion in budget authority and $2.5 billion in outlays, what the Appropriations Committees have given up as result of lower baselines is almost $25 billion in budget authority and $23.4 billion in outlays over that 6-year period. This meant that, on top of the drastic cuts below inflation suffered by discretionary programs during the decade of the 1980's, we locked in place these further cuts below baseline because the reconciliation conferees could not meet their deficit reduction targets.

This is a real danger in the upcoming reconciliation conference. That is another reason why I oppose any delay or fencing of any of the funds in this stimulus package. History has shown, and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has warned us that the reconciliation conference may not achieve the level of deficit reduction that the conference will be called upon to make.

The Appropriations Committee will meet its deficit reduction target. It always has met its deficit reduction target, and it will meet its deficit reduction target, not because there are not going to be pressures to exceed the caps placed on discretionary spending, and not because the Appropriations Committee is more virtuous than other committees, but because we will have across-the-board cuts if we do not meet our targets. So, I urge Senators not to jeopardize portions of this stimulus package until after enactment of reconciliation. Do not do it. To do so will jeopardize the delayed funds. It will create a tempting source for the reconciliation conferees to tax in meeting their own targets. We should, instead, insist that the reconciliation bill meet its target from sources within the jurisdiction of those committees and not, once again, look to discretionary spending to bail them out, because we are not going to bail them out.

The fourth general criticism went to the GAO report stating that the GAO report says that the 1983 stimulus did not work well. Finally, the criticism has been raised by Senators BOREN, BREAUX, and HATFIELD that, according to GAO, the 1983 jobs bill was not very successful, the funds were not obligated long after they were appropriated and, therefore, we should not enact this stimulus bill at all.

In response, Mr. President, with all due respect, this is not the Reagan administration. President Clinton believes in a responsive and efficient Federal role in solving the Nation's economic woes.

He has studied the Federal bureaucracy and decided it should tighten its belt; that we should reorganize the Federal Government to avoid duplication; we should eliminate programs that do not work; we should wean ourselves from programs that consume our resources and, instead, put our resources into public investments that can help increase economic growth and secure a future for the coming generations. As part of that program, the President has studied which programs will do the most good in this limited stimulus package and he and his Cabinet have assured us that the funds in this bill can be spent quickly and efficiently on worthwhile investments. I should like to read the relevant portions of the testimony given by members of President Clinton's Cabinet before the House Appropriations Committee in support of this economic stimulus package:

First, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Cisneros stated, in part:

> I have met with the mayors, I have met with the county officials, I have met with

the governors and told them just how critical it is that they pick projects that are not going to be waiting a long time for engineering or design permits. * * * I would predict that the vast majority of these funds, and indeed I have made this commitment to the President, would result in dirt flying and people at work by this summer.

Second, Secretary Espy of the Department of Agriculture made these comments with regard to rural water and sewer grants:

I will do everything within my power to obligate the funds as quickly as possible. The fact that the funding will go to projects that have been planned for some time should expedite the spent-out once the projects are approved. As you know, the word is already spreading that additional funds will be available for this fiscal year, so communities will be ready to move as soon as funds are available.

Third, Labor Secretary Reich, when talking about the summer jobs program, stated:

* * * the primary reason that money was not spent in previous summers is that the program got off to such a late start. I believe that last year it wasn't until late June that mayors even knew that they would have funds for this particular program. * * * We have talked with the mayors, we have talked with the cities, administrators and we have received assurance that with enough time, they can do an extraordinary good job providing the jobs for kids, but also providing academic enrichment, the kind of tutoring programs we have also been urging. * * * April 1st would allow six weeks of planning, which is adequate.

Fourth, energy Secretary O'Leary, in reviewing proposals for R&D funds and lab funds, said:

We are capable, available and stand ready to obligate them all, and that was really—that is the point of the decision to recommend both the supplemental and the reprogramming.

Fifth, Mr. Dickey, the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army on Corps of Engineers Infrastructure Projects stated:

In putting together this program, we of course limit ourselves to authorized work and work that can be gotten under way quite quickly. The projects all meet our normal budgetary criteria, which means they are engineeringly sound, they are economically sound, they are environmentally sound; and they address high-priority outputs, including navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and environmental protection.

Mr. President, I am prepared to speak quite at length this afternoon, but I see some other Senators wishing to address the Senate. If they will indulge me for just a few minutes, then I will seek to yield the floor to them while retaining my rights to the floor.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is a complete substitute to a complete substitute to a complete committee substitute for the House bill. The House bill is open to further amendment. The committee substitute is open to amendment.

But, in the final analysis, the adoption of the pending substitute for the substitute for the substitute would have the effect of wiping out any amendments that had been adopted theretofore, either to the bill or to the committee substitute.

Now, why did I do this? Why did I set up this so-called tree? There are some other trees that can be planted and nurtured and brought to full strength.

I have sought to protect the President's package. I believe in it. He believes in it. He had previously indicated to me by letter that that package—that stimulus package, that emergency stimulus package, that emergency jobs package—was needed and he was not willing to encourage the amendment of it by fencing off a portion of it or by requiring offsets.

So, therefore, the President, having informed me as to where he wanted to stand—he did this by request last Tuesday, I believe it was—I took him at his word; he wrote me a letter—and that is precisely what I have attempted to do; namely, protect the package as he wants it and, hopefully, get it passed in that form.

Now, there has been a little bit of crying in the beer about my having taken this approach.

But I have encouraged Senators, or tried to encourage Senators, to offer amendments—offer amendments to the bill, offer amendments to the committee substitute.

A Senator on the Republican side of the aisle indicated that it would not be meaningful to offer amendments in this kind of parliamentary situation.

I have indicated that one should not be faint of heart; that he should be courageous, like Caesar. When he was crossing the water on a boat during a storm and the pilot felt that the boat should turn back, Caesar arose and made himself known. He said, "Fear not. Brave the tempest. You carry with you Caesar and Caesar's fortunes."

Well, I sought to encourage Senators, by referring to Caesar, to go ahead and offer their amendments. Because if the Senate will not adopt the amendments, then they have nothing to complain about. Though the tree is closed up, they have nothing to complain about, because the Senate would not have adopted their amendments anyhow. That makes sense, it seems to me.

But, as I say, one of my good friends on the Republican side said it would not be very meaningful to offer amendments at this point, because we could not get them adopted; we could not get them added to the bill.

Now, I should say, as I said a little earlier, there are other trees. As I indicated on Friday, I believe it was, there is another way or other ways—where there is a will, there is a way—to still get amendments adopted.

One of the ways in which this could be done would be by way of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back. And there is an even better way, which I will not tell anyone about right now. There is a better way, a better way than that.

But I will reveal that much. I will reveal that much, Mr. President. With a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith the following, we can work just about anything that needs to be worked into this package.

So, there is a way wide open, if Senators would simply offer their amendments and let us see how many votes there are for their amendments. Then it might be time to ask whether or not the amendment could be included—may be included in this package. If the Senate votes up an amendment, if the Senate adopts an amendment, then that indicates that there is some justification for including the amendment. Perhaps the justification will not be strong enough, but it may very well be strong enough.

So, I say again to Senators on the other side of the aisle: Take heart. The rule book on procedure, the book on "Senate Procedure," provides ways around even this tree that has presently been erected here.

And, as I say, there are even better ways. At least I can think of one or two better ways. But I will not go into that now.

But it is sufficient to say at this point that Senators should not lose heart. If they have amendments, call them up. Let us get a vote on them.

Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont momentarily, but I had promised, first, to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM].

Mr. GRAMM. I hoped to get 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. He was on the floor and on his feet. May I, before yielding to the Senator from Texas, inquire of the distinguished Senator from Vermont what his wishes are?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wishes were to be recognized not to amend the package. I kind of like it the way it is. But as the Senator from West Virginia had already told the Senator from Texas he would yield to him, obviously I do not want to interfere with that.

I know that he will ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Texas without losing his own right to regain the floor. I wonder if he might be willing to, in propounding that request, include that he might be able to yield under the same circumstances to me, subsequent to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. LEAHY. Ten minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] for the purpose only of his making a statement. And I understand in talking with him that that is the only purpose he seeks. I ask further

unanimous consent that following the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] that I be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] for not to exceed 10 minutes for the purpose only of treating my friends on this side the same as I defer to my friends on the other side—I note he has already stated that his purpose is the purpose only of making a statement—after which I be recognized again.

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

Mr. BYRD. And that my speech not be counted as a second speech. I do not mean to leave the impression that I am filibustering, but I simply want to have my guard up.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank our dear colleague from West Virginia for yielding. I don't know if the oarsmen were comforted when they were reminded that it was the life of the great Caesar that hung on their efforts. But I think it was a good reminder to give them, and I would just remind my colleagues that it is the life of America that hangs on our efforts and that is why this debate is so very important.

One of the things I will have an opportunity someday, I hope, to share with my grandchildren, is a discussion of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and his great command of the rules of the Senate. I know he believes very strongly in this bill and I know he is very sincere in that belief. But I am strongly opposed to this bill and I believe that I am equally sincere in that opposition. I would like to begin today to explain to my colleagues and to the American people why I oppose this bill.

First of all, I think we have to remember that just last week we claimed to have adopted a dramatic budget. We claimed to have made dramatic changes in our Government. We claimed to have taken dramatic action to reduce the deficit. Time will tell if any of these things are true, but at least we claimed to have done something about the fiscal problems of the Nation. And all over the country, over the weekend, our Members who are Democrats—both in the Senate and the House—and our President talked about action on the deficit.

What a dramatic paradox it is, that we stand on the floor of the Senate today, debating a measure that raises the deficit by $16 billion. What is even more interesting is there is a clause in this bill that designates all the spending as an emergency, so that despite the fact that we spend $16 billion it does not count as deficit spending. Despite the fact that the deficit goes up by $16 billion, by this little trick of legislative language this bill does not count as additional deficit.

We have a spending limit that is part of the law of the land, adopted in 1990, and without this parliamentary gimmick this bill would be subject to a 60-vote point of order because it violates that law of the land. But following a weekend where many of our colleagues touted the fact that we had done something about the deficit, we find ourselves here today not to lower the deficit, but to raise it. We are here to increase spending by another $16 billion before any spending cut is made, before any change in permanent policy is made.

I was on a television program on Thursday and I was asked by some Wall Street people: Well, what difference does $16 billion make? We are looking at a huge Federal debt, we are looking at a huge Federal deficit, why are you complaining so much about another $16 billion?

Let me try to put it in an analogy. On Thursday we went on the wagon. On Thursday we passed a budget that said we were going to give up the devil's brew. It is true that we already drank an ocean; it is true that this is simply a small glass. But here it is—today is Monday, we have been on the wagon since Thursday when we adopted this much-touted budget, and yet as our thirst has grown, our first action is to take this glass of whiskey and—gulp.

I say to my colleague, how serious were we on Thursday in talking about deficit reduction when we are talking about raising the deficit by $16 billion today and we are not counting it as spending and we are not counting it as deficit, because to do those things is a violation of the law of the land.

I think that we expose to the world that we were not very serious on Thursday and that we are not very serious on Monday about deficit reduction. We have, from the administration, a letter, from OMB Director Panetta, that tells us that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded.

Let me, first of all, thank our distinguished chairman and ranking member for an amendment that they introduced on Thursday which protects us against some of these projects. I think people might be somewhat surprised—maybe amused, maybe amazed—that we found it necessary to adopt an amendment that prohibited funds provided in this emergency economic growth bill that is supposed to rebuild the American economy from being spent on such projects. The amendment says: None of the funds in this act may be used to assist a golf course or a cemetery project; none of the funds may be used for white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River. I do not know whether you can support white water canoeing facilities on some other river, but you cannot do it on the Ocoee River.

We said in this amendment that none of these funds can be used for fisheries atlases, nor can they be used to study the sicklefin chub. Now, whether we can study the humpback chub, I do not know. But our chairman and our ranking member have protected us from these things.

But let me go over a list of what we are not protected from. In a list of ready-to-go projects where the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD said to our cities: Put together your projects that are ready to go under the community development block grants because we are about to give you $2.5 billion to spend. And when that list was put together, let me just read to you from "States," going A through C. Listen to these projects. These are the projects that are supposedly going to rebuild America; that we are told are going to make us a great and powerful and rich country; that are going to make us competitive again and that will fuel the engines of industry and agriculture:

A new gym; pathways in various parks; building phase I of a sports park; graffiti abatement; build a parking garage; build a bike path; build a senior citizens center; build a youth sports complex; build an amphitheater and softball field; build three bike paths; expand and restore senior citizens center; build bike paths; staffing for projects; graffiti removal; outreach programs; mall renovation; construct a bike path; a boathouse restoration; build a soccer field; build a community park; fund an art ark; recreation buildings; youth shelters. And the list goes on and on and on.

Madam President, it seems to me that our problem here is that we are not talking about a jobs bill, we are not talking about an economic stimulus package; we are talking about a political stimulus package. We are talking about all the old projects that all the cities have that they have decided not to fund with their own money because they were not high enough in their level of priority and now we are going to come in and borrow $16 billion and we are going to fund those projects.

We have an estimate by the OMB Director that this bill will create 219,000 jobs. That is not taking into account the negative impact of borrowing all this money. But I just ask my colleagues to note, even if it did not affect the economy to take this $16 billion that we are going to borrow away from the uses it would have gone to—to build new homes, new farms, new factories, to generate real jobs—according to the OMB figures, we are paying $89,041 for every job we are creating.

I ask my colleagues, is it worth $89,041 a job to create jobs that pay a quarter or a third that amount? I answer my question by saying I do not think so. In fact, I think what this

shows, once again, is that Government is not an instrument for economic growth. Government is not an effective engine for promoting prosperity.

Now, what is the debate about? People are going to be confused, I guess, for the rest of the day—and I hope not the next couple days, but I am fearful they are—about why people keep on talking here and what is going on. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia has offered a series of amendments that guarantee that if any other Member offers an amendment to the underlying bill, that whether that amendment is adopted or is not adopted, that when the vote comes on the amendments of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, that if they are adopted that none of those other amendments will stand; they will all fall.

My own opinion is that if we are going to vote, we ought to vote for real. I had hoped that we would have an opportunity to have genuine bipartisan input. I think we ought to vote, for example, on the emergency designation in this bill. I do not know that I could win on the amendment. I would like to see it voted on, but I would like to see it voted on for real so if it is adopted, it is going to become part of the bill. If we are going to take out golf courses and cemeteries and white water canoeing, maybe we ought to take out swimming pools and parking garages and bike paths and jogging paths. Maybe we ought to set very high standards for spending this money. I would like to have an opportunity to vote on those things.

Basically, what people are saying on my side of the aisle is this: Let us have votes that are meaningful. I learned my rules not from reading these big, thick green and red books, but by watching and listening to Senator BYRD. And I know that we could offer a motion to recommit, but I also know that Senator BYRD has already figured that out and that he could, with second-degree amendments, take over that tree as well. In fact, I discovered long ago that I am not smart enough and I cannot get recognition quick enough—I just notice that people in the chair always see our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee before they see me—I am not smart enough nor am I quick enough to figure out how to get around Senator BYRD in terms of parliamentary procedure.

But I have also learned one little lesson from no other source than Senator BYRD which is: When you take all the rules of the Senate and you take all these amendment trees—and this is on one piece of paper as to where we are; people cannot see it but it is a bunch of fancy boxes and circles—that the one thing I know about the Senate rules is that when the Senate rules were established, they were meant to impose order in a system, but they also were meant to protect the rights of the minority. And if the minority is determined, if the minority is unwilling to relent, then ultimately the rules work for them.

I believe, in this case, that the minority is determined; that the minority is not willing to relent. I am hopeful that we can sit down and negotiate out a procedure to have real votes on these amendments. I think that there are a certain number of amendments that people feel strongly about, and I think our objective will be served better if we come up with a procedure whereby people on this side of the aisle can offer amendments, and amendments that will be part of the bill if they are adopted, rather than simply going through an exercise where we go through a long debate and we get excited and the amendment is adopted, but then when the final vote is taken, those amendments fall away.

So I thank our dear chairman from West Virginia for allowing me to intervene during his speech and to make these points. I thank him very much for yielding the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will note we will hear a lot of talk about the stimulus package; how we would like to change this little piece, we would like to change that little piece, and so on. Invariably, the people who are standing up here, Madam President, are the people who do not want the stimulus package at all, they do not want the President to succeed in stimulating our economy. And they are the people who voted for a number of things that got us into the problem we are in right now.

What I am concerned about when I look at any stimulus package is the question of how it is going to affect rural States. I represent one of the most rural States in this country.

I know there is no future in rural America if there are no jobs. And if we want jobs for our children and our children's children, then we are going to have to invest in rural America. That is why, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry—the committee responsible for rural development—I rise in support of the President's economic stimulus package.

I have heard media reports that Members of Congress from rural areas are not interested in this bill, that some feel it is just an urban bill. Madam President, that is simply not the case. In fact, over $2.6 billion of these funds will go to build water systems and rural housing and investment in rural communities. These investments will assist rural communities in attracting and retaining industries and jobs.

Madam President, too often when we talk about improving the economy in this country, we speak only of urban America. Too often when we talk about creating jobs, we talk only of urban America. We want the qualities of rural life: the low crime, the neighborliness, the helpfulness of each other, the honesty, integrity, the work ethics that we so often see in rural America, but our focus is on urban America. It should not be an either/or. The fact is that rural America exists. It does not have the votes of urban America, but it certainly has so many of the problems, especially joblessness and poverty.

I am glad we have a President who understands rural America and who has sent us legislation which shows he believes in rural America. In fact, the President's bill funds some of the same programs that were funded in the Rural Jobs and Investment Act of 1993. That was a bill I wrote, and it was cosponsored by 15 of my colleagues in this body. The bill was based on the premise that we have to provide the capital that new and expanding businesses need to create jobs and revitalize rural America. We have to invest in our infrastructure to attract businesses and investment. We have to make rural America more competitive in the future.

Rural America has suffered from a decade of neglect. I see it in my own State where the gains of the 1970's in combating rural unemployment and population loss were turned around in the 1980's, and as a result, because of the neglect of rural America, in 1992, 1 in 10 rural Americans was unemployed; 1 out of 4 rural children lived in poverty. Rural children in the 1980's were neglected in education, hungry, without adequate medical care, and lived with a very, very dim future ahead of them.

While economic reports show improvement in our economy, large layoffs continue. In fact, the adjusted unemployment rate number remains at over 10 percent.

Now, many of those Americans are back to work but in part-time jobs. That is nothing new for rural communities. Persistent unemployment is a serious problem for our rural areas.

In my own State of Vermont, we see that in February unemployment numbers again increased. In 10 out of our 12 labor markets, unemployment was higher than in February 1992 when the recession was just ending. While some economists concluded this latest increase represents new found optimism that there are jobs to be found, we are really not out of the woods until these people find work. The bill the distinguished chairman from West Virginia has before the Senate is designed to create jobs and do it quickly.

Declining population is an alarming problem for rural America as well.

Nearly half of all rural counties lost population during the mid-1980's—nearly half. That is one of the saddest statistics we have heard about rural America since the dust bowl days. Too often the best and brightest of our young people leave rural America, not because they want to but because they have to. There is no future in rural America if our children are forced to move away in search of economic opportunity.

Our children are our future. What future do we have if we drive them out of rural America?

During the 1980's, while we spent billions of taxpayers' dollars in defense and savings and loan bailouts and foreign aid, the needs of rural America were too often ignored.

President Clinton recognizes the importance of investing in our future. This bill is a clear massage that rural America will be a partner in our Nation's economic future, as it should be. Let us not forget rural America. When we have Presidential campaigns as well as senatorial campaigns, we all love the photographs and the campaign stops in rural America. We see hard-working people and the beautiful scenery. It evokes some kind of Norman Rockwell sense of well-being, but, Madam President, there is not well-being in rural America because it has been ignored. It has been ignored. But it is not ignored in this stimulus package. It has not been ignored by President Clinton. So many of the root values of this Nation are embodied in rural America.

Speaking as a Senator from rural America, I would hate to think that because of mistakes made by our Federal Government, the great promise of those values is diminished or lost.

Some have questioned the need for the stimulus package in light of the slight improvements reported in our economy. We need only look at the rural conditions. I just presented to see the need. We need to turn this around. I believe we can.

Some say passage of this bill constitutes having dessert before our vegetables. I say this bill simply means jobs for rural Americans. If you have jobs, you have promise. If you have promise, these young people who now leave rural America will stay, holding to the values that their parents and their parents' parents have instilled in them and instilled in rural America. The future of rural America should bring promises of knowing each other, the promises of a low crime rate, the promises of an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, promises of helping each other when you are in need.

I think of my own home in Vermont. I drive down a couple miles of dirt road to get to it. The thing I look forward to the most every week is the idea of getting back to my home, where I know everybody, where I am apt to come home and find a window repaired that had been broken in a storm, probably some cookies left on the table by the neighbor who repaired it. They know they can just walk in there and they know I would do the same for them, the way I was brought up, the way all of us in rural America were brought up.

But it also concerns me when I see the son or daughter of those same neighbors wondering if they will have to move from rural America to an urban center for the promise of their own future. They wonder if perhaps they will have to move to a place where they will not have the quality of life and where they will not feel as secure in their homes or have the same sense of responsibility to their neighbors. That it is a choice made not because they want to, but a choice forced on them.

So I hope that we will keep rural America also in mind when we vote on this package. The distinguished chairman comes from one of the most beautiful rural States in this country. I know that he has that in mind. I know from my own discussions with President Clinton when I talked to him, coming from a small rural State—I say thank God he does—for those of us who also live in small rural States, we have somebody who does care. There is talk about whether we are funding canoe launchings or something. Baloney. This package provides funds that, in my home State are desperately needed. The bill means $1,255,000 for Vermont's rural housing program, $1,603,000 for Vermont's rural water and waste disposal loan program, $4 million for Vermont's EPA construction grants and State revolving loan fund. These are good things.

Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding his time to me. I am proud to stand with him on the floor on this package as we have stood on the floor before on similar things. I wish him well. I am ready to vote on the package. I do not have any amendments, I tell my distinguished chairman. I am back here from Vermont.

I am ready to vote. I am ready to move this forward. I am ready to start creating jobs in rural America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for his fine statement. I am sure that he is ready to vote on the package. I am equally sure, even if he had not assured me, that he has no amendments thereto. But if he had, he would be entitled to call them up, and have a vote on them.

I again thank him for his service to his State and for his statement today.

May I ask my very able colleague on the other side of the aisle, Senator HATFIELD, if he wishes to make any statement at this point?

Madam President, I understand that consultations are going on with respect to the Boren-Breaux amendment, and have been going on over the weekend. I shall await the outcome of those consultations.

Madam President, we continue to hear the refrain with respect to meaningful amendments, beginning to hear that under the present parliamentary situation meaningful amendments cannot be called up, meaningful votes cannot be had.

Let me remind Senators about the situation that obtained here last Wednesday evening and last Thursday morning. When the time, the 50 hours, ran out on the budget resolution, Senators had the right to call up amendments but without any debate on these amendments to go to a vote.

I remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that time after time they called up amendments without debate, had votes on those amendments, and knowing full well that with the kind of momentum that was behind that bill and while they could indeed get votes the likelihood of the amendments being adopted was not very great. But they did not hesitate nevertheless to call up their amendments. They called up amendment after amendment after amendment, it got a vote, and it went down in almost all cases. And we proceeded to the next amendment.

So we were here until around midnight, give or take a little bit, on Wednesday night. And we came back, voting on amendments, sight unseen, like a pig in the poke, not knowing what is in the amendment. As long as that situation obtained, Senators on the other side of the aisle were quite willing to call up those amendments even though it was in almost all cases a futile exercise.

They probably succeeded in calling up some amendments that put Democrats on record. And that was all. That was about all it did. The amendments died. The amendments were rejected.

So I do not understand what was meaningful about all of that unless it was meaningful just to get Democrats on record, and voting on amendments on which there was no debate, on which no debate occurred, just getting the Democrats on record.

So I searched the RECORD and found the following amendments. Let me just cite the amendments that were called up on that occasion and voted on. In almost all instances they were voted down.

I believe the first amendment that was called up following the expiration of time on the budget resolution was amendment No. 190 called up at 9:26 p.m. on March 24. That was an amendment that was offered by Mr. BURNS reducing the revenues of the Finance

Committee report of $2.2 billion over 5 years. And so on and so on. Mr. SASSER moved to table that amendment. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 54 to 44.

The next amendment was amendment No. 197 by Mr. CRAIG and it was called up at 9:48 p.m. The amendment by Mr. CRAIG was tabled by motion offered by Mr. SASSER by a vote of 69 to 29. I do not know how meaningful that was. But that was not a very impressive vote for the amendment, 69 to 29. By 69 to 29 it was tabled.

Then there was an amendment called up by Mr. DURENBERGER, amendment No. 222. And Mr. SASSER moved to table the Durenberger amendment. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 55 to 43. There was a majority of 12 votes with two Senators not voting. That vote occurred at 10:05 p.m.

Then at 10:22 p.m., a vote occurred on amendment No. 234. This was an amendment referred to as the Stevens-Kassebaum-Lugar amendment, and Senator SASSER moved to table that amendment. That amendment was tabled by a vote of 54 to 44.

At 10:40 p.m., on last Wednesday, a vote started on a motion to table by Mr. SASSER on an amendment offered by Mr. MURKOWSKI and others. That amendment was rejected by a vote of 52 to 46.

At 10:57 p.m., a vote began on an amendment offered by Mr. WARNER, Senator SASSER having moved to table the amendment. The vote was 50 to 48 to table.

At 11:17 p.m., a vote occurred on an amendment numbered 233, an amendment by Mr. MCCAIN and others, Senator SASSER having moved to table the amendment. The vote was 54–44 to table the amendment. At 11:34 p.m., a vote occurred on a Sasser motion to table the Thurmond amendment. The vote to table was agreed to 55–42. At 11:59 p.m., 1 minute before midnight, Senator SASSER moved to table an amendment by Senator KASSEBAUM, and the motion was agreed to 51–47.

Therefore, Madam President, on last Wednesday, after all time had expired on the budget resolution, nine amendments were called up by my friends on the other side of the aisle, and all of the nine amendments were tabled. Were they meaningful amendments? They were all rejected. They might have been meaningful amendments had they been agreed to, but they were all rejected. And Senators pretty well knew, I think, what was going to happen and know what the outcomes would be. Certainly, after one or two of these amendments had been rejected and it kept on and on and on, it was obvious that it was not going to be a very good evening for those offering amendments, even though no debate was to be had on the amendments.

The distinguished majority leader pointed out the fact that all time had expired on the resolution itself, and the only thing to do under those circumstances, since we were all flying blind in the fog, not knowing what was in the amendments, flying into the darkness, was just to vote to table the amendments. Everybody understood that.

But, nevertheless, the amendments continued to come. Then on the following morning, it being Thursday, at 9:31 a.m., Senator BRADLEY and Senator HOLLINGS had an amendment which expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should be granted line-item veto authority over items of appropriation and tax expenditures that, first, provided that each item of appropriations for tax expenditures is enrolled separately for presentation to the President; and, second, expired at the conclusion of the 103d Congress.

I voted for the Bradley-Hollings amendment. It was agreed to 73–24. But, Madam President, while there was a vote on the amendment, in a real sense it was not meaningful. In the first place, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, which meant that it had no legal binding authority. It was simply a sense-of-the-Senate taken on a given amendment at a given hour on a given day, without debate. And I saw in Roll Call this morning, the fine little paper that is printed here at the Capitol, buzzing about my having voted for line-item veto.

Well, let not those enthusiasts for line-item veto or enhanced rescissions gain heart. I have not changed my viewpoint one bit. But I voted for the amendment because, in the first place, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. But more importantly, it sent a shot across the bow of committees other than the Appropriations Committee. It was the sense of the Senate, according to the amendment by Mr. BRADLEY and Mr. HOLLINGS, that if there is going to be line-item veto authority, it should extend also to tax expenditures.

In other words, in view of the fact—and it is a fact—that the Appropriations Committee continues to be the target of those who talk about the budget deficits, while the Appropriations Committee is not contributing to the deficit, the Appropriations Committee continues to work within the caps and hews to the mark that was laid at the budget summit in 1990. The Appropriations Committee is not the culprit; but all these line-item veto amendments, enhanced rescission amendments, and expedited rescission amendments, continue to be directed at the appropriations.

Well, Mr. BRADLEY and Mr. HOLLINGS expanded the concept between the two tax-writing committees so the tax expenditures would be included if there is going to be line-item veto or enhanced rescissions. So I thought it might be a good idea to send a little shot across the bow that if the Congress ever takes on this business of adopting a line-item veto or enhanced rescissions, it might just go beyond the Appropriations Committee, to Finance, Ways and Means, and other authorizing committees that are responsible for programs that result in back door spending.

As to providing that each item of appropriations or tax expenditure be enrolled separately for presentation to the President, I think that would be unconstitutional and have so said in the past, and I have not changed my viewpoint on that.

But then at 9:55 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Brown amendment, and the Senate tabled the amendment by a vote of 53 to 46. At 10:13 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Kempthorne amendment, and that was tabled by a vote of 56 to 43. At 10:31 a.m., a motion by Mr. SASSER to table the Cohen-Campbell amendment was defeated by a vote of 65 to 34. Again, that was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment dealing with line-item veto authority over items of appropriations and tax expenditures. The Senate rejected the tabling motion, and that amendment was subsequently agreed to by voice vote.

I voted to table that amendment. That was one amendment that was not tabled. As I say, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment and has no binding effect.

At 10:51 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table an amendment by Mr. GRAMM, and the tabling motion prevailed by a vote of 54 to 45.

At 11:09 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Bond amendment No. 253. The tabling motion was agreed to by a vote of 57 to 42.

An amendment, No. 250, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was agreed to. That amendment was agreed to by voice.

At 11:29 a.m., Senator SASSER moved to table the Murkowski amendment, and the Senate tabled the amendment by a vote of 61 to 38.

At 11:48 a.m., the Senate voted to table an amendment by Mr. CRAIG, the tabling motion having been offered by Mr. SASSER. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 57 to 41.

Madam President, we see that amendments were offered in a situation there by our friends on the other side of the aisle when about all that was meaningful about the exercise was that the Republicans were able to put the Democrats on record on eight amendments on Thursday morning and nine amendments, I think it was, on Wednesday night.

Therefore, I say to my friends again who have amendments, offer them. Amendments can be offered now to the bill and can be offered to the committee substitute.

Walter Malone wrote a bit of verse that I would offer here because I think

it is pertinent to what I have been suggesting, namely, that Senators take heart, offer their amendments.

They do me wrong who say I come no more
When once I knock and fail to find you in.
For every day I stand outside your door,
And bid you wake, and rise to fight and win.

Wail not for precious chances passed away,
Weep not for golden ages on the wane!
Each night I burn the records of the day;
At sunrise every soul is born again.

So the opportunity is here and Senators should not hide behind the excuse that there is no opportunity to offer an amendment. Offer the amendment. Let us see whether or not the votes are here to support those amendments.

And if the amendments are adopted, then it will be time to discuss whether or not they should go in the bill.

As I have said just a little earlier today, rule XXII provides for a motion to recommit. If Senators will turn to rule XXII, they will find several preferential motions there and the very bottom preferential motion is a motion to amend the amendment. That is the amendment stage. Then just above that is the committal stage or the recommittal stage. So the motion to recommit has preference. It has precedence over a motion to amend.

So while there are amendments before the Senate today, a certain hierarchy of amendments, the motion to recommit has preference over amendments. There is that opportunity. If Senators really have amendments that their dedication and purpose lead them to want to have in this bill, let them prove by a vote on the Senate floor that the amendment or amendments have the support of the Senate. Otherwise, they are just crying over their beer, weeping over spilt milk. That is rule XXII. All Senators are familiar with the rule.

Incidentally, talking about rules of the Senate, during a heated argument back in the 1920's, one Senator said to a colleague "Go to hell," and the astonished Senator questioned the Chair as to whether or not that remark could be said with propriety. Vice President Coolidge, who was presiding and who had been leafing through a book, looked up and said, "I have just been looking at the rules manual, and you do not have to go."

I would suggest, therefore, that Senators study the rules manual a little more, and I will continue to try to keep up on it as well.

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Republican leader has said some few days ago that upon the adoption of the budget resolution we were going to see some real bullets, that we had just been fighting with paper bullets up to that point, and from now on it was going to be a fight with real bullets.

My amendment is a real bullet. It is the only real bullet that I have noted zinging down this aisle and up to the desk. No other real bullets. But these amendments that have been offered are real bullets. I have been wearing my flak jacket every day expecting the real bullets to start flying. But there have not been any that I know of. There have been some very light artillery echoes over on this side of the Chamber and some sniper fire, very light sniper fire, over on the right. No hand grenades. Numidian cavalry. No Balearic slingers.

Last Friday, I say to my friend from Montana, last Friday, there was artillery, a heavy artillery regiment, that suddenly came onto the field, set up positions over here on my right. And from the menacing and fierce visages of the group, I came to the conclusion that I might be in some dire peril all of the sudden.

But, they just came to get the yeas and nays on my amendment. So when that little popgun went off—it was just a paper bullet—they disappeared in the bushes just as rapidly as they had earlier emerged out of nowhere.

Mr. President, I welcome those live bullets whenever they start flying. I have urged Senators to start using those heavy artillery pieces. Let us have some live bullets. Let us have some amendments. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona would like to shoot a live bullet. The way is open to call up an amendment.

Otherwise, let me proceed now with these charts.

While I am speaking to the package, I know that there are those who are continuing to try to work out the Boren-Breaux amendment, and I would be delighted to hear from them as to what has happened.

Let me briefly go through this package once again.

H.R. 1335, the economic stimulus supplemental, the major provisions thereof are as follows:

Extended unemployment benefits, $4 billion.

Mr. President, the Department of Labor says it will exhaust its ability to pay benefits to 1.8 million jobless people in early April, absent this appropriation.

Now, do Senators want to stay here and not offer their amendments and not get a final resolution of this matter in time for those workers to know that they are going to be able to continue to receive unemployment benefits?

I have heard some say that they would be willing to stay all week next week. They are so determined that they will oppose this package, they will stay around here all week next week.

I wonder if the Senator from Montana has heard such a rumor; that there are Senators who are determined to oppose this package to the extent they would stay here all next week. I have heard that.

Mr. President, I have never been concerned about such proposals or suggestions. I am going to be here, anyhow. I certainly do not want to see other Senators discommoded, but, more importantly, I do not want to see those 1.8 million workers out there—1.8 million jobless people—do without their benefits.

So if Senators want to hold up this bill for the rest of this week and next week, well, let those Senators who are holding up the bill take the blame for the jobless benefits not being appropriated.

May I inquire of the Senator from Montana if he wishes to speak?

Mr. BURNS. I thank the chairman, but I am not desiring to speak.

I have a colleague that wants some time on the floor.

Might I inquire of my colleague from Arizona how much time he would need?

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would be glad to wait until the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is finished with his remarks, and be glad to be patient.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would be very happy to yield the floor to the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak. It is not my desire to hold the floor all afternoon. I simply thought, inasmuch as we have no Senators who, apparently, want to call up their amendments to this bill, that I would continue to try to educate the viewers, who are out there watching through that electronic eye, and try to inform them as to what is in this bill, so that if there are Senators who are determined not to let this bill pass, then the people out there will know whom to blame for the gridlock.

Now, the next item in this bill is Federal-aid highways, $2,976,250,000. This provides full funding of ISTEA, funds concentrated on ready-to-go projects, creating 58,000 direct jobs in 1993 and 1994. ISTEA is the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

The next item is mass transit capital grants, $736,490,000; airport grants, $250 million; Amtrak capital grants $187,844,000. These funds will be spent on fast-spending transportation projects, to improve safety—what is more important than safety?—and would create 13,875 direct and indirect jobs in 1993 and 1994.

The community development block grants, $2.536 billion, would provide communities the grants for improving neighborhood facilities and services, creating 60,000 direct jobs.

The SBA loan guarantees, $2,575,558,000.

Due to the credit crunch, SBA loans have increased dramatically. Current SBA credit will run out in May, shutting down the SBA loan program. This will create 12,000 direct jobs in 1993 and 1994.

The Pell grant unfunded shortfall is funded in this bill. The dollar amount

is $2,023,730,000. It would eliminate a shortfall in funding for 4.4 million students for 1993–94 and prior academic years.

There is a billion dollars in this package for summer youth employment. This would create an additional 683,000 summer jobs for the disadvantaged youth in the Nation, raising the total to 1.4 million jobs for the summer of 1993.

There is $892,261,000 in the bill for sewage treatment construction. This would enable States to capitalize their loan funds for sewage treatment construction. Nationwide needs are estimated at more than $100 billion. This would create 50,000 direct jobs. That is EPA sewage treatment construction.

Head Start, $500 million. This summer Head Start program will enroll 350,000 children and create 50,000 direct jobs.

There are $470 million in the bill for waste and waste disposal loans and grants. These funds are for rural communities with populations under 10,000 to improve the safety, to provide basic services, and promote economic development.

For the Department of Veterans Affairs, this package contains $235,557,000. It will double the VA's funding for maintenance and construction projects at VA hospitals and cemeteries, creating 4,700 direct jobs.

For the National Science Foundation, $270,662,000. These funds would be for research and facilities to create 2,400 direct jobs at the National Science Foundation.

Economic Development grants, $93,900,000. This money would fund ready-to-go infrastructure projects by States and local governments as well as assist victims of Hurricanes Iniki and Andrew. So, here is money in this package to assist the victims of those two hurricanes.

Mr. President, I am not going to hold the floor to speak longer because I do not want to discommode other Senators who have something they wish to say. But it is my suggestion that amendments be offered and let us have votes on them and see if they are meaningful votes. My colleagues on the right here seem to be rather downcast and morose.

Mr. BURNS. It is Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Oh, it is Monday. It is Monday. That is true. If Senators will momentarily allow me?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I will be happy to yield as long as he wishes—10 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, 45 or whatever?

Mr. President, I am informed that Senator MCCAIN does not wish to address the Senate at the moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor and that no motions to table the amendment—the amendments, any of the amendments—no motion to commit be made until after I am again recognized.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor with the understanding that now there be no motions to table the amendments in the tree and that no motion to recommit would be made until I am again recognized. I hope to hear something during the afternoon about the progress on the amendment by Mr. BREAUX and by Mr. BOREN. I also would expect to hear if the Republicans have any amendments that they want to call up, and they are serious amendments. I would suggest that they indicate the number of amendments they have and what the titles of the amendments are, what the amendments would do, and perhaps we can work out something where the Republicans will be able to call up a few amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and I shall not object to the unanimous consent that was just put forward by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that request has already been agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. I thought the Senator had a second one?

Mr. BYRD. I did not have a second one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was just restating it.

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I think it might be well to explain, if we could, the parliamentary situation as we face it. It is my understanding that there is a parliamentary situation such that, if amendments were proposed and voted in the affirmative by this body, that following that, when there is a vote on the substitute of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, then those previous amendments that are voted on would no longer be operative.

Is that a correct depiction of the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The adoption of a substitute amendment would wipe out anything that happens previously.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair, because I am sure there are people around America who may be wondering what the U.S. Senate has been doing for the last several days. It had the privilege of listening to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose eloquent historical fashion it is to provide us with a lot of information, but the fact is that his urging the Republicans to bring forward amendments is a bit disingenuous in light of the parliamentary situation.

It is well acknowledged that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate, is the most knowledgeable Parliamentarian in this body. I say that with the utmost respect. The reality is that he has placed this side of the aisle in a parliamentary situation that basically renders meaningless any amendments that we may propose and may be voted on in the affirmative, given the reality that his substitute will most likely, in fact almost certainly, be adopted by this body, which would then render any amendments that were brought forward for the approval of the Senate, any of those that were passed, basically irrelevant—certainly inoperative.

So I believe the situation that we in the minority here are faced with is that, if we propose amendments and they are voted on, they will be meaningless. I believe now the situation renders the minority to be in a position where we are faced, frankly, with one option and that option is to extend debate until such time as we are given our rights to have meaningful amendments brought up for a vote.

It still requires—Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Parliamentarian would correct me if I am wrong—it still requires 60 votes to cut off debate to bring up final passage.

Most of us here are not as knowledgeable as to parliamentary procedures as is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But I can assure him that—I cannot speak for all 43 on this side; only the Republican leader speaks for all 43 of us—but speaking for this Member, it is my sincere and devout hope that we will exercise our right to keep at least 41 Members from cutting off debate until such time as we are allowed the right to bring forward amendments, meaningful amendments that will be voted on either up or down, depending on the will of this body, and they would not be rendered meaningless by a vote on a substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask for what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. For a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman——

Mr. BYRD. For a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I preface the question by saying, as I said the other day and last Thursday I believe it was or Friday, I said that I like to think this Senator is a reasonable man and if the Republicans have amendments that they want to call up, I suggested that they call them up.

Now, would the Senator be in a position to ask his leader to let the Senator from West Virginia know what Senators, what amendments he has that Senators would like to call up? Perhaps we can reach an agreement on calling up a limited number of amendments. I do not want to agree to calling up amendments ad infinitum, as was the situation we were in last Wednesday night and Thursday morning. But if the Republicans have some amendments—6, 8, 10, whatever it is—that they wish to call up and get votes on, I will be agreeable to making it possible for those amendments to be meaningful, if the Senate will agree to them, if the Senate adopts those amendments.

I indicated earlier today that the way is open for a motion to recommit with instructions, and Senators can get amendments agreed to in that way, if the Senate will adopt the amendments. But I stand here today not knowing what amendments are going to be offered or whether any amendments are going to be offered. I want to see this package voted on. If the votes are here to amend it, then that is another matter.

Would the Senator be able to indicate or have the Republican leader come to the floor and indicate what amendments he has in mind? What Senators want to offer amendments? I have been in the Senate a long, long time. I try to be a reasonable Senator. And I am probably as strong as anyone here in wanting to protect the rights of the minority.

But I do not know what amendments we are talking about. I do not know how many amendments we are talking about. I do not want to get into a situation in which I give up my rights—I have exercised my rights according to the rules—and I do not want to give up my rights and say, "Well, we'll just vote on any old amendment sight unseen."

Would the Senator try to accommodate this Senator and the Senate by bringing that matter to a head in the fashion that I have suggested? Nobody has come to me—the Republican leader has not been here—to say he has some amendments, 6 or 8 or 10 he would like to have votes on.

I have a motion to recommit available to offer at some point or any point, and as the manager of the bill I certainly would exercise that right to move to recommit. But I want to know, I want to have some understanding how many amendments the other side wants to call up. Nobody has approached me on that point.

I have heard some vague—I am not talking about the Senator from Arizona—but I have heard some vague rumors and whisperings and warnings Senators might be prepared to stay all week, all next week. Well, that does not bother me one bit. If Senators want to filibuster $4 billion for retirement benefits in this package all next week, that is up to them. It does not bother me.

But I want to be cognizant of the desires of Senators to call up meaningful amendments. Let me see; let me see what the amendments are. Let me see. If there are half a dozen or 10 or 12, let me see what they are so that I know how many there are and maybe perhaps we can get an agreement on a time agreement on a number of amendments.

I do not want to vex the Senator. I will not impose on him further.

Mr. President, I have been in this position right here at this desk for many years, and I have always tried to work out reasonable solutions to problems when they arise. I have had a great deal of experience in that and have always tried to be conscious of the rights of the other Senators and am still conscious of the rights. But I have also wanted to protect this President's package from mutilation, and I have taken him at his word as to what he wants in the package, and I have sought to protect that.

I exercise my rights. Nobody can accuse me of having done something that I do not have a right to do and that the rule book does not allow. So I am very experienced standing right here at this desk, and any threats to filibuster do not bother me at all. They do not bother me a bit. We ought to stay here next week. We ought to stay here the following week if it requires us to get the work done. This is our post of duty. This is our place of duty. Let us stay.

Now, if the Republican leader or anybody else wants to come out here and indicate what they have in mind, I will sit down and talk with them, but there is nobody here to talk with me now. I have yielded the floor, and I have indicated that I am ready to hear what my friends on the other side have.

So if they think that I can understand these long-range wireless messages, under the present circumstances I cannot. Let them come and tell me what they have. The Republican leader and I are good friends. I will be glad to listen to what he wants by way of amendments. Perhaps, as I say, we can work out something. I can offer a motion to recommit, report back forthwith and we have an agreement beforehand how many amendments would be called up. I do not know of any on this side, if Mr. BOREN, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. KOHL do not call up theirs. But I would like to find out what happens on their amendment first before I agree to anything. I would like to know what is going to happen on their amendment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. My question is: Will he continue to carry his very warm friendship for me in the future, as he has in the past, under the circumstances, and forgive me if I have committed any trespasses and love me as a friend and fellow American, as he always has? Mr. President, that is my question. I would like to get an answer.

[Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank very much my friend from West Virginia. Before I answer that question, can I say, the Senator from California is waiting to speak. I will be about 10 minutes and then I will be through. I know she has been waiting to speak. I will not take too much time.

Obviously, I would like to say, Mr. President, that our friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman and President pro tempore who has been so active for so many years, would never lose the friendship and the respect and affection in which we hold him. I will say that from time to time there is a certain degree of frustration, but that, of course, is due to the normal give and take of the parliamentary process. And as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said many times, those of us who are not happy with the parliamentary procedures, that we should learn those procedures ourselves. I have learned a great deal from the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who has, over the last 7 years now, taught me a great deal. And we have had very spirited debate on issues such as the line-item veto and others. He will always have my love and respect, no matter what the circumstances are, even in the heat of battle.

I say again, Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia described very well the parliamentary situation and his control over the parliamentary situation and his assertion of his parliamentary rights, and I understand those rights and I understand the present situation.

My response is that I know the Republican leader is very interested in moving forward, as all of us are, and I am sure, although I cannot speak specifically for Senator DOLE, he wants to move forward with this process, and I know he would like to sit down with the Senator from West Virginia under any circumstances, especially these, so that we can work out a compromise and move forward.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I believe we have only one recourse, those in the minority, and that is to exercise our rights, and our rights are that if we can maintain 41 votes, then we will be able to prevent the passage of this legislation. And the reason why I believe—and I cannot speak, as I say, for the Republican leader—we will maintain at least 41 votes is that we are not being given the opportunity—even though the Senator from West Virginia is exercising his rights, his exercising of those rights is preventing the Republican side from being able to pro-

pose meaningful amendments to a $16 billion package.

Although $16 billion is not a great deal of money to some, it is to others—$16.26 billion in new spending. So I believe this impasse should be broken and, as happens quite frequently in this body, we will move forward. I would like to point out that there are many of us who feel as if this kind of spending is certainly not necessary at this time, at least the majority of it.

I should like to make a few comments about the line-item veto, which the Senator from West Virginia discussed a few minutes ago.

Mr. President, there was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which was passed, and was passed overwhelmingly, that stated support for a line-item veto plus a line item, if that is what one would want to call it, for lack of better words, that would close tax loopholes, would give the President of the United States authority to close tax loopholes.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia was quoted in the press and again on the floor as saying the vote was meaningless because it was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I have a different view of sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. I believe sense-of-the-Senate-resolutions are exactly what the words say, and that is what the Senate intends to do. I intend at the earliest opportunity to see if that was, indeed, the sense-of-the-Senate as 70-some Members of this body voted, or was it, frankly, in all candor, a bit of hypocrisy. I do not see how you can vote for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, meaning that is what the Senate intends to do, and then when it comes around to the real vote, vote against it.

So I know that I and others will intend to try to get a non-sense-of-the-Senate resolution passed that, indeed, puts that sense-of-the-Senate resolution into law. I am pleased to note that as far as I know the President of the United States still supports a line-item veto, and I hope we could hear from the White House at a fairly early time.

Mr. President, again, in response to the question of my friend from West Virginia, yes, we continue to love and respect him, but we also do believe that it is time to move forward. We do believe that we should be able to assert our rights, which means prevention of the passage of this bill in return for the ability by us to have our amendments considered and voted up or down, amendments that are meaningful and amendments that will not be literally wiped out by the passage of the substitute amendment which is the matter pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should also like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon, who has shown enormous patience over the last few days and has attempted, along with the Senator from West Virginia, to move forward so that we can get this done. I do not need to remind my colleagues that we also have a debt limit extension of some kind that is facing this body, and I understand the sentiment of the Senator from West Virginia that we could stay next week and the week after, and that probably is our primary duty.

But I have also noticed that when recesses are scheduled in this body, there is a certain reluctance to remain here during those recesses. In fact, as I say, I am only going on my seventh year but perhaps my friend from West Virginia and my friend from Oregon can remember a time when a recess was scheduled and we did not go into that recess. I am sure it may have happened in the 34 years' experience of the Senator from West Virginia, but not in my recent experience. I hope we can move forward, and relay this message, as I know has already been done, to Senator DOLE in hopes we can propose some amendments with the assurance of the Senator from West Virginia they would have meaningful consideration.

I thank my friend from West Virginia and I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER.]

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair for recognizing me, and I thank the Senator from Arizona for his kind assistance in helping to make sure I did receive recognition in due course.

I want to say to the Senator from West Virginia how much I admire him for what he has been doing these last several days, on his feet hour after hour, trying to move the President's economic package forward, using the rules that are there to be used so that we can move the President's economic package forward. I hope in perhaps the next 10 or 15 minutes I can speak as clearly as I can on behalf of that goal, as forcefully as I can on behalf of that goal, and as convincingly as I can on behalf of that goal—of moving this President's stimulus package forward.

Mr. President, we must feel a sense of urgency. As the Senator from West Virginia has repeated throughout the last several legislative days, unemployment benefits are running out. We are still in a jobs recession. We have seen the President act very quickly to put his plan together and this stimulus package is part of that plan.

We have seen the House of Representatives, a body in which I served very proudly for 10 years, act on that package. Yes, there was acrimony and debate. Yes, there was. But in the end they moved the package forward, so all eyes are on the Senate.

We were sent here to do a job, and what could be more important than getting this economy moving?

So I want to see the stimulus package pass not just because I want to give this President a chance, which I do—not just because the stimulus package is an integral part of a larger economic program, which it is—not just because the stimulus package together with the budget resolution will give us the momentum for change, which it will, but because this stimulus package and everything in it is needed by America, is needed by the people of America.

There are those on the other side of the aisle who say we do not need this package. It is unnecessary. They do not like this package. They will use the rules to stop us from voting on this package.

So I ask the question and will endeavor to answer the question: Why is this stimulus package needed by America and by the American people?

I think there are three reasons, Mr. President. One, we need jobs in America—jobs; two, we need investments in America—investments; and three, we need deficit reduction in America. We need jobs, we need investment, and we need deficit reduction.

So you might wonder, Mr. President, how does a stimulus program bring about deficit reduction? I think that is a very fine question, but it has a ready answer; that is, when our people are working, our deficit goes down. According to OMB, Leon Panetta, a man that I served with in the Congress who was the chairman of the Budget Committee, believes this stimulus package will create 500,000 new jobs. I know there are other numbers around, but I am going to use Mr. Panetta's numbers because he has always been, in my opinion, conservative in his numbers.

So there you have it—500,000 people taken off the unemployment lines. And that is good. And they will be working. They will be paying taxes. They will not be drawing down on Federal benefits. So the deficit will go down. Specifically, we know every 1 percent increase in unemployment adds between $30 to $50 billion to the deficit. So when you create jobs, you lower the deficit.

I want to talk about my home State, California. We expect 50,000 new jobs created from this stimulus package. And we are suffering with 1.57 million people unemployed in California. We have been battered. We have been bruised—1.57 million people unemployed in California. This recession hit us hard. And it hit us late. And we are having trouble rebounding. Construction is down. State spending is down. Our State government is very strapped. Aerospace is down. And now we have a chairman, Mr. President, of the Base Closure Commission who wants to hit us even harder, he wants to add more bases that will be closed in California.

And we will fight—the senior Senator from California, DIANNE FEINSTEIN and I, will fight that with fairness. We are ready to take a fair hit but not an unfair hit. But with or without the base closures, we are hurting in California. And this stimulus package will help.

But the cynics and the critics, many of whom are on the other side of the

aisle, will come up to me and they will say, "Senator, what good are 50,000 jobs to a State as large as California with 30 million people? What is the point? Why not forget about it and just see what happens?" I call those people, what some of my colleagues have dubbed the "guardians of gridlock," the "trickle-down guys," it will all "get well." We tried that for 12 years and we are paying the price.

But let me talk about 50,000 workers getting jobs, getting important jobs—building highways, teaching summer school, building houses, starting small businesses, helping local government, paving roads, community policing.

So now you have these 50,000 people who are unemployed working and they get paid. And that helps others. It helps thousands of children and family members and community.

So it is not just 50,000 people who are helped, Mr. President. It is probably more like 100,000 people helped. And it is not just 500,000 people helped in America when you figure out all the people that rely on these workers. It is more like a million people helped.

So jobs lead to deficit reduction, they lead to families who can be at peace because they know that they have a paycheck coming in.

So the 500,000 new jobs that Mr. Panetta says will be created should be enough reason to support this package.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that right now the unemployment rate is higher in America than what it was when the recession started.

My colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, calls this a jobs recession, and indeed that is what it is. This stimulus program is going to help us get past this jobs recession.

My concluding argument for this stimulus program, Mr. President, is the issue of investment. That is the third leg of this package—deficit reduction, jobs, and investment. We must begin to invest in the civilian side of our economy or we will never be able to compete in a global economy. Our competitors are spending far more than we are now on infrastructure.

For example, in 1989, the gross public investment as a percentage of GDP for Japan was 5 percent. That is the percentage that they invested in public investment. For Italy, it was 3.4 percent; for France, it was 3.2 percent; but in America, we only spent 1.6 percent of GDP for those same investments. No wonder we are falling behind.

How can we compete if our highways and our bridges are falling down and are in disrepair? How can we compete when our children are not getting the healthy start they need, and the Head Start that they need? How can we compete when our young people cannot go to college? How can we compete when our world-class cities are going broke from the AIDS crisis?

I have letters from all over this country, almost every State in the Union, from local governments and State governments saying they are hurting by this AIDS crisis. They need our help. That help is in this stimulus package.

How can we compete when we waste energy? How can we compete when too many of our people spend as much as one-half of their income each month to pay the rent?

This stimulus package in a start of a long-term investment strategy which is going to lift us up and make us strong.

Sure, we can find things wrong with it. I can find things wrong with it. Mr. President, you can, my colleagues all can. We would each write it differently, spend a little more here, a little less there. But we have one President and he ran on this agenda. He said he was going to give this Nation a short-term stimulus and long-term deficit reduction. We owe it to him and the country and the voters of this country to move this package along.

My friends, we are very late in this package. We are not just 5 days late as my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, has been discussing. We are 12 years late, Mr. President, with this package—12 years late because it was 12 years ago the Republican administrations began leading us away from these investments and we fell behind.

For the life of me, I do not understand why there are those today who want to take this package and delay it. The whole country is looking on the U.S. Senate, the best debating body in the land. We have to mount a common body of action. The President acted. The House of Representatives acted. And we must act.

We voted for the budget resolution. There were those who said it would never be done. We did it. Now let us vote for the follow on piece, the stimulus piece. It is essential that we do it. We will start investments, we will create jobs, we will lift up our people, and soon be able to say that this U.S. Senate with all the various personalities in it, all the various ideologies in it, were able to put that aside, and for a couple of shining, bright moments, because this is going to be a very long administration, came together and we gave this President a chance.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

THE KIDS COUNT REPORT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, today the Annie Casey Foundation in my home State of Connecticut, and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, which is a nationally recognized study group, released their annual profile of American children, Kids Count.

It will not come as a great surprise to many people that the report paints a disturbing portrait of the conditions of American children, as we enter 1993.

As we now know from a variety of sources, all over America children and their families are in crisis. Whether they be rich or poor, black or white, inner-city or in our rural areas, the children of our Nation are living lives of desperation, and it is not quiet desperation.

The particulars of the study are very alarming. Between 1986 and 1991, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate rose by 48 percent in the United States of America. Although young males are seven times more likely than their female counterparts to be arrested for these types of crime, the female youth arrest rate has increased by an astounding 56 percent in that same period of time.

The teen violent death rate has also increased in those 4 or 5 years by 13 percent. Here in the District of Columbia, the rate went up 363 percent from 1985 to 1990.

Other areas examined in this study, which has great credibility, are equally disturbing. From 1985 to 1990, there was a 16 percent increase in births to single mothers and a 9 percent increase in the number of children living in single-parent homes.

The percentage of high school graduates declined by 4 percent. Five percent of the American teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19 are not in school, not in the labor force, not in the military, and are not homemakers.

Who are these missing American youth and what is their potential for a productive life?

My home State of Connecticut ranks sixth best, Madam President, overall, among the 50 States and the District of Columbia. But there is little solace in that news, for in the State of Connecticut, this means that there are still over 25,000 children who are not living with a parent; 6.8 percent of Connecticut's youth have no health insurance; and Connecticut ranked 38th overall in its juvenile violent crime arrest rate.

But, Madam President, we all know that statistics give us only a vague sense of the crisis at hand. The real story is that of the individual children behind those numbers—children who live lives of despair, children who now sit in the classrooms of America hungry and ill-clothed, and children who did not even go to school today, but whose absence was never questioned or even noticed.

Madam President, let me just point out—I have said this before on other

days here—by 3 o'clock, east coast time, every single day, some 2,000 children in this country drop out of school and never, ever go back. So by 3 o'clock this afternoon, our educational system, roughly, loses 2,000 more kids in this country, somewhere between 1,400 and 2,000.

I might point out, for those who say, "Well, that does not seem like a very big number," if you start thinking of that 5 days a week, 4 weeks a month, and for an entire year, it really mounts up.

But it also puts us substantially behind what is occurring in our major competitive nations, where the dropout rates are less than 1 percent of the equivalent age population.

And you start talking about this country's position economically in the 21st century, with dropout rates of that level, here we are now, knowing what we have to do, knowing we have to keep kids in school, knowing they have to be the best educated generation this Nation has ever produced, and yet between 1985 and 1990, we have watched a 4 percent decline in the number of students actually completing high school. That is exactly the wrong direction of the trend lines in terms of where we need to be by the 21st century.

At any rate, this Kids Count report, as it is called, notes that the most recent poverty rate among children, 19.8 percent, is an improvement over the 1985 rate, which was 20.5 percent. Imagine in America today one out of five children living in poverty. Not much of an improvement at all, I might add, from 1985.

We are losing ground, Madam President, in our Nation. There is no other way to describe what these statistics tell us. And every single day gets worse; it gets worse.

We are losing our youth; we are losing these kids. We cannot continue to turn our backs on the issues that affect their lives most directly. The problems of our children are the problems of our families, and the problems of our families are central to the future of our Nation. For too long we have wasted precious energy arguing about who is responsible for our children's problems and who is to blame. We are all responsible, every single one of us. And we must all join together if we are to solve this terrible crisis.

I will continue with my efforts to make America a better place for children. Recently I introduced the Child and Family Services and Law Enforcement Partnership Act. This measure creates partnerships between police departments and child mental health professionals to provide immediate assistance to children exposed to violence. This is only one aspect of what must be done. To address the problems of poverty, educational deprivation, and violence, we must work both quickly and creatively. I urge my colleagues to join me in this legislation and other efforts to ensure that next year's Kids Count report will show far greater improvement than the one that is before us today.

Let me point out we are dealing here today with the stimulus package. While I am speaking in morning business, not directly a part of the stimulus package which the Senator from West Virginia is managing on the floor, it is worthwhile pointing out that a good part of that stimulus package is directed at our youth: The Head Start Program and summer jobs programs, even the issues involving jobs.

I am not going to take a lot of time here this afternoon, but people ask what can be done, how do you begin to make a difference? Again, I am maybe saying things I know my colleagues have heard me say repeatedly in the past, but there is no better social program anywhere than a job. That is the best social program I know of. Nothing does more for an individual or a family or a community than work—a decent job with a decent salary or wages.

So the stimulus package is directly targeted to trying to get this country moving again, to putting people back to work. We absolutely know today there is an increase in rates of spousal abuse, child abuse, and substance abuse in areas of high unemployment. I am not suggesting that a job necessarily cures all of those problems, but we clearly know without any question whatsoever that people who have jobs, in families that have decent incomes, and in neighbors and communities that are working, you see a significant decline in these problems that affect these children and affect these families. Certainly, you see a far higher rate of children staying in school, in their performance level, in their health care and related issues.

While the Kids Count report was not designed to be released at the time when we would be considering the stimulus package, I think there is linkage here. I think exactly what Senator BYRD is talking about—trying to do something in the area of early childhood education, improved health care opportunities for children, seeing to it that we have summer jobs for these kids when June and July and August arrive, to give them some opportunity and some hope—I think relates directly to the report that came out today from Kids Count, showing an alarming crisis in this country affecting our children.

I hope for those who are arguing about whether or not this is necessary, whether or not this makes any sense, they might just take a look at the wire service stories about the data and statistics accumulated by this very reputable organization that has tracked the condition of America's children for years. One out of every four Americans is under the age of 18; one-quarter of our population. We are the only industrialized nation in the world that has, as the poorest sector of its population, its children. No other industrialized nation has that unique distinction. America's poorest are its kids. The next time you hear someone get up and give a speech about America being No. 1—not supporting, of course, the basic elements to strengthen America's children—then you have every right to question the sincerity of the remarks, to try and keep this Nation strong and vibrant for the 21st century.

I hope we will pass the stimulus package, and I hope when people do so they will take into account the Kids Count report that came out today.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMPSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 667 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, just let me say a few words about the situation we are in regarding the supplemental appropriations bill. We hear a great deal in this Chamber about gridlock and about obstructionism. I would like to offer some of my own perspectives regarding these highly charged terms.

I suggest, Madam President, that obstruction is, like beauty—"In the eye of the beholder." Right now there is before the Senate an appropriations bill which many thoughtful Republicans and Democrats alike have indicated an intent to amend. I do not think that any attempt to amend the contents of a bill should be termed "obstructionism."

The distinguished and respected President pro tempore has pointed out that Senators in this Chamber are at liberty to offer amendments to this legislation and he has called for them to come forward, and they certainly are at liberty to do that. However, we are also fully aware that any substantive amending of this bill can ultimately be wiped out by the contents of the Senator's amendment, which is the final amendment, which could then be adopted as a substitute. It would displace the underlying language, however amended by us in the Senate.

I would not venture to call any player in this process an obstructionist.

The President pro tempore has achieved some extraordinary acknowledgment from members of the fourth estate who have called this an adroit parliamentary maneuver. He, of all of us here, knows the rules of the Senate to a greater and extraordinary degree. He has a deep love for the Senate and constantly demonstrates his extraordinary fealty and respect for this institution.

So with what has been described as an adroit parliamentary maneuver, the Senator has used the rules of the Senate to preserve the whole of the President's supplemental appropriations program and to protect it from amendment. I do find it interesting, whimsically so, that when Republicans avail ourselves of the Senate rules, we are often not treated so kindly in terms of media characterization. That apparently goes with the territory.

It certainly perplexes me, though, to see why it would be obstruction to try to amend legislation, but it is not obstruction to set up a parliamentary procedure by which the efficacy of any such amending can be thwarted. This maneuver has led us to a state of affairs now where Senators who otherwise would like to amend this bill—and have their amendments voted on up or down and see what happens to them—are not coming to the floor. They know full well that their amendments will not ultimately affect the contents of the legislation in any way.

So the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee is correct in saying that "the rules are the rules" and that no one should be condemned for using them to advance the policies that they favor.

The President pro tempore will do that, and he will do it with all of the adroitness for which he is highly regarded and famed, and I say that with great respect. He has taught me much and assisted me in my course of service in this body.

But we, on the Republican side, have the right and responsibility to do that, too. So I hope we can hear perhaps just a little bit less discussion about Republican obstructionism whenever we attempt to use our magic number of 41 votes to influence policy. For the general public, that is simply a number of votes we must have in order to avoid being cut off and to stop us from debating an issue. To curtail debate, the opposing party, the majority party, must produce 60 votes. So it is not just that the Republicans will do well here by delivering 41 votes. The fact is that the majority party really has to deliver 60 votes. It is a nuance of language, surely, but it is nevertheless worthy of distinction.

So this current situation did not come about because of anything Republicans did. We were ready to press forward to amend this bill, as Senators BREAUX and BOREN and other Democratic Senators, such as Senators FEINSTEIN and KOHL, were anxious to do. So when it becomes necessary for Republicans to make full use of the rules to try to influence legislation coming from this Chamber, I hope we will all agree with the President pro tempore when he said, in essence, that there should surely be no reason to carp or complain just because someone has used the rules to press one's agenda.

We will do that. Indeed, we will. The majority is certainly doing it on this bill. That is the way that that is going to be. If it is obstruction from the one side, it is most assuredly obstruction from the other.

And so, Madam President, I hope we can work through this impasse. And please recall that we have not done this before on our side of the aisle. When a similar tactic was used before, it was done by the leadership, the majority leader or the minority leader. It is my experience—and my memory could certainly be refreshed—that I have not seen it done by a committee chairman in the past. I believe it has generally been a leadership prerogative, and certainly in any case it now stalls us. Hopefully, with good faith, the majority leader and the President pro tempore and our fine and remarkable ranking member, Senator HATFIELD, and of course our respected leader, Senator DOLE, the leader of the Republican minority, will be able to resolve this. If not, there will be a great solidarity from our side to use the rules to protect ourselves.

I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, beginning on last Thursday and continuing through today I have had a number of discussions with Senators BOREN, BREAUX, BRYAN, BYRD, and others, and they have had numerous discussions among themselves outside of my presence, in an effort to reach agreement on how best to proceed with respect to the pending supplemental appropriations bill.

I commend all of my colleagues who have been involved in these discussions for their constructive and positive attitudes and suggestions. We share a common agreement in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike—in our desire to achieve economic growth and job creation, and we recognize that to achieve that goal there must be a combination of economic stimulus and deficit reduction.

The disagreements we have had have not been over ends, but rather over the means best suited to achieve those ends.

As a result of these discussions, which continue throughout the day today, I am pleased to announce that Senators BREAUX, BOREN, and BRYAN, have received a letter from the President, which I believe satisfies their intentions in this matter. I will, shortly, yield to permit them to address the matter in more detail. But I thank them very much for their positive and constructive contribution.

I also take note of the special effort made on behalf of this legislation and in these discussions by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the manager of the bill, Senator BYRD, who has, as always, assisted in our achieving a satisfactory and, I believe, a desirable resolution of this matter.

I am heartened by this result. I believe it significantly enhances the prospects for early enactment of this important element of the President's economic recovery program, and all of those who have contributed to that end deserve to be commended, and I do so commend them.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the distinguished Republican leader here on the Senate floor. I wish to state also that I have had a number of discussions with the distinguished Republican leader throughout the last few days in an effort to determine or devise a way to permit us to proceed on the pending bill, and those discussions are still ongoing. We are making some good progress, and I hope we will be able to make an announcement in that regard in the near future. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished Republican leader at this time.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as has been indicated, I have had discussions with the majority leader, and we are in the process of determining how many amendments might be offered on this side. I must say that some of our people are frustrated because we are sort of locked out of the process. It is sort of a one-Senator lockout.

We are trying to see what we might work out, but it is very difficult when the floor is controlled by the distinguished President pro tempore, and the farming out of the floor. So some of our Members are not particularly excited about that prospect. But we are trying to put together a list of amendments, and we hope to be able to get back to the majority leader soon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his comments and look forward to further discussions with him in the near future.

Mr. President, I want to repeat just briefly what I said earlier. This legislation is a very important part of the President's overall economic program. It is essential that we act, and that we act soon. The American people have made clear their support for the Presi-

dent's program and their desire that the Congress act expeditiously on that program.

I believe what has just occurred with respect to the matter raised by Senators BOREN, BREAUX, and BRYAN, will enable us to reach that objective significantly sooner than might otherwise have been the case.

So I thank my colleagues. I am prepared to yield to my colleagues for such comments as they may wish to make.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I want to, first of all, start by acknowledging the good work of the majority leader and the patience of the majority leader, as well as the patience of all of our colleagues, as the past few days have gone before use. The work that was being done on this effort, much of which was being done off the floor of the Senate, and the patience of our colleagues while action on the floor was delayed, is something that I apologize for.

Let me say at this point that, initially, when I raised the possibility of a Breaux-Boren amendment, my concern in doing so was that I wanted to make absolutely certain that we were embarked on a process that would lead us to a goal and a goal that I feel very strongly about. I think many of our colleagues share that goal completely, which is that we in this body were not going to start off this year by appropriating new funds, many for new programs, without an absolute and complete commitment to be very serious about the budget reduction process, the budget reconciliation process, which is going to bring about some real reductions in Federal spending.

As I indicated on the floor, people in my State of Louisiana have told me: Senator, we think you and the President indeed are on the right track but, quite frankly, we just do not trust you to make the real cuts in Federal spending that is necessary as part of the overall package. My effort was to try and put a greater degree of assurance that we in this body would actually take the tough medicine with the medicine that was not so difficult to swallow.

What we have today is an agreement from this administration—which I happen to support very strongly—that I think clearly spells out their commitment to the entire package. By that, I mean, yes, the stimulus package, but also the long-term investment, as well as their commitment to real, significant, and honest budget reductions in Federal spending, which we will achieve through the budget reconciliation process.

I, along with Senator BOREN and Senator BRYAN, who have been very active in this effort, have received a letter, which we will make part of the RECORD at the appropriate time, which does some very significant things with regard to what this President is committing to do.

The President clearly points out in the letter, speaking of the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994, that "If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to the Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that fail to meet their targets."

Mr. President, that is very significant, and that is putting the President on record as being committed to this. It is that, instead of sitting back and perhaps letting Congress pass by a 60-vote margin a budget act that does not meet the targets and programs, that do not meet that target, this President is saying,

> I will submit specific legislation to this Congress that makes the cuts in those programs and with those committees that have failed in their effort to meet that target.

I think that is significant, and I think that is appropriate. I think that is a major provision of this letter which makes me feel a lot better about what we are talking about doing.

The President also says that in part because of the criteria that we have requested that he consider criteria of creating additional jobs that are needed on an emergency basis. He says.

> In part because of the criteria * * * a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation. Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that the deficit reduction goals are met.

Mr. President, I think that is real progress. I think that is a very clear statement on behalf of this administration of their dedication to the concerns that I was voicing during the debate on the floor last week.

So I think the letter goes a very long way to giving me the confidence and I hope the American people the confidence that they need, that this is not business as usual, that this is a different administration which is truly committed to stimulating the economy, while at the same time reaching real budget deficit reductions through the budget reconciliation process.

With this assurance and with assurance of the President and our colleagues, I do not plan to offer an amendment. I think that what we have is a commitment and I trust, Mr. President, it will be followed through completely and unequivocally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague from Louisiana.

I join him in thanking the majority leader for his participation in the discussions which have led to this agreement, also the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee who has worked with us and who has exchanged ideas with us during this process.

I also thank the President of the United States, who has been open to our suggestions, who has heard us with respect, who has engaged in a real interchange with us.

Several days ago, about 15 of us had the opportunity to sit down and personally visit with the President. We visited with him at length about our concerns. He listened to us. I am convinced he heard us. I think this letter reflects the fact that he understands our concerns very thoroughly and he has responded to them.

I am very pleased by the outcome and by what is represented in this letter.

When we began, we began with a point that I think the American people understand very well. In fact, it is exactly what Senator BREAUX was saying and what they were saying to us.

My constituents have been saying to me, and I heard it from those in other States as well: We are ready to sacrifice. We are concerned about the future. We are concerned about our children and our grandchildren. We do not want them burdened by continued increases in the national debt. We want them to have the kind of opportunity that we have had. It if means we have to pay a little more in taxes or if we have to have some benefit cut which we received, we are ready for that kind of sacrifice to be made.

But our constituents have been saying to us: Make sure that you really get the deficit reduced, and those of you in Congress just do not go out and spend the money after we have been asked to make this sacrifice.

So the people have been watching us. They want to make certain that we do not fall back to the old ways of the past of spend now and put off indefinitely, but make those budget cuts that are necessary to bring down the budget deficit.

That is why Senator BREAUX, Senator BRYAN, and I, with support of others in this Chamber and considerable number of others, particularly on our side of the aisle, crafted this amendment.

What we were saying in this amendment is that some of the spending under the $16 billion supplemental stimulus package would simply not take effect until the budget reconciliation agreement was passed. The idea was that that would keep the pressure on, that would be a statement by Congress to the administration that we want to make sure that before we can complete all the spending or before we consider other spending we meet those targets for real deficit reduction.

Mr. President, the letter which we have received says exactly that. As Senator BREAUX has quoted the part where the President says: "In part because of the criteria stated above,"—

that is the kind of spending that should occur now versus the kind of spending that can occur later—"a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation."

He goes on to say, "Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that deficit reduction goals are met."

That accomplishes, as far as I am concerned, exactly what we hoped to accomplish in our original amendment. The letter in many ways goes even further because the President then explicitly says:

> * * * I will insist that the reconciliation bill meet the 5-year deficit reduction targets contained in the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that failed to meet their targets.

This is real accountability, and it means that the President is going to force those committees of Congress one by one to meet their individual responsibilities, and whether the Finance Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Agriculture Committee, or any other committee of Congress, whatever committee that is, he is going to hold us accountable, and he will send proposals forward for those committees to meet those targets if any committee falls short.

To me that is a very, very important commitment of leadership by the President. I think it is the kind of signal that we wanted sent to the American people, a signal that we are simply not going back to our old ways. We are only going to spend if we can afford to spend by continuing to meet our deficit reduction goals.

So I commend the President for this letter. I appreciate it. As far as I am concerned, it accomplishes the goals that we had when we began with the crafting of our amendment. In fact, I think it does it even more effectively.

Some have said to me: Is not the matter that you are arguing about really a symbolic matter? Is it not more symbolic than real? While it is true that $16 billion out of many hundreds of billions of dollars in a budget is a relatively small amount, it is still a large amount in the eyes of the American people who do not want to see us waste a single dollar. That is one point.

But, second, I think that the message is important and the precedent, the expression from the President and the expression from the Congress is important because what we are really saying here is there are a lot of things we would like to do and if indeed we can get the budget deficit really reduced we also do need to have a stimulus package that goes along with it to make sure that the economy remains strong while we are reducing the deficit. But the President is also saying,

> Above all else, I am not going to let these deficit reduction targets slip and slide. I am going to keep the pressure on and I am going to make sure that those targets are accomplished.

I think that is extremely important. It does say what we were trying to say. Let us make sure we do not eat the dessert without eating the spinach, as we have done all too often in the past. And I think it does say, as Senator BREAUX has said, that this is a President who takes deficit reduction seriously and is not simply giving lip-service to it.

I feel very good about the result that has been reached here in light of this commitment from the President, and I take the President completely at his word. I certainly am prepared to join with Senator BREAUX in withdrawing our amendment and in supporting the package with full confidence that it will in no way diminish our commitment to deficit reduction.

No sooner had the House, for example, acted on the budget resolution there were some voices raised that said, we are not sure we can cut as much as we said in the budget resolution.

What this really does is reaffirm our commitment, and we all feel it was very important that we have that kind of reaffirmation, that while we go ahead to take care of the short-term emergency needs for the unemployed and create jobs for students this summer, and for others, that we in no way are going to let up on the commitment to deficit reduction. We will make it sure it happens.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their understanding and their understanding of the importance of the point that we have been trying to make. Most of all I thank the President for this forthright statement which he has sent to us. In light of this statement, I plan to vote for the supplemental appropriations bill, this stimulus bill, and I do so with great confidence that the entire package, including the deficit reduction, will ultimately be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I endorse the statements made by my distinguished colleagues from Louisiana and Oklahoma. I wanted to make it clear that in joining with them in this amendment, it was never our intention to be obstructive in terms of getting the stimulus package approved. I supported the package then, and I support it now.

But the stimulus package is only one piece of the President's economic program. Another very important piece of that is the deficit reduction piece. Like my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, in talking with my fellow Nevadans most Nevadans are supportive of the President. They want him to have success with this package as do I for the benefit of the entire country.

I must say that there is a nagging skepticism, based perhaps on the ways of the past, that we will be all too forthcoming in approving supplemental appropriations, the stimulus, the additional money but when the time comes to make the tough judgments as to the deficit reduction piece somehow that part of the overall message or package will be lost.

It was in that spirit that I joined with my colleagues in offering this amendment to make sure that that occurs.

Let me say that I, too, have had occasion to read the President's message to us. I compliment the President on his leadership, because he has made it clear in reaffirming his support for the deficit reduction goals and has gone an extra step by indicating that if legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, he expresses himself by saying: "I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls in the committees that failed to meet their targets."

That, Mr. President, in my judgment, is real leadership. I commend and praise the President of the United States for that leadership and for the good work that our distinguished majority leader has performed in working us through this process.

I am satisfied by this letter. I express my support for the package and join with my colleagues in withdrawing the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think we ought to first understand the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment does not cut any spending. If you listen to the speeches, you would think, "Boy, they really had a tough amendment out there."

It did not cut spending at all—not one dime. It delayed the spending for awhile until we got reconciliation, but there was not any reductions in spending in that package.

I have not read the letter in full, but what I heard quoted on the floor is not very reassuring to this Senator. Again, it does not say how we are going to meet the deficit targets. And I assume they mean, by meeting it, more taxes. That is not going to be widely accepted by the American people.

So I think precisely what the letter does—and it is not unusual around here—it says, in effect, "Well, we will do our best. If the President does not get what he wants in reconciliation, he will send another request to the Congress."

That does not mean Congress is going to do anything. So we should not be under any illusion that by writing a letter we are, in effect, going to reduce

spending or not raise taxes. And I do not know what the mix is, either.

There is such a thing as the Anti-Impoundment Act which was passed in the 1970's. I do not think the President talks about withholding funds.

So I just suggest that there never was much to start with in the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment, as far as it did not cut one dime in spending. So the fact we have a letter saying, "Well, we are not going to cut any spending, either," is not very reassuring, should not be very reassuring to the American taxpayers.

So I am certain, from the standpoint of moving the legislation along, it is good to have a letter from the President of the United States saying that he, in effect, agrees with those who did not want to cut spending in the first place. That may move it along. But it does not change the fact that we are not cutting spending. That is the problem that we have on this side of the aisle.

We do not need this stimulus package. I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] if he offers his amendment, at least it would not let us spend the second phase of money until it went back into the budget and went through the regular process. That certainly has more merit than the so-called Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment.

But, above and beyond that, this package is not necessary. We ought to have a right to debate it fully and freely on the Senate floor, which we do not have at this point. We, in effect, have a House Rules Committee or traffic cop who tells us what we can do and when we can do it.

I must say, in fairness to my friend from West Virginia, this is very frustrating on this side of the aisle. There is no similarity, or very little similarity, to this effort and what happened in 1985 when I happened to be the majority leader. We did allow perfecting amendments. Many were adopted.

It seems to me we are, in effect, shut out, locked out, of the process on this side of the aisle. Maybe it is a precedent for what we may have the next time we have an appropriations bill or some other bill from some other committee.

It is hard for our Republicans to accept. We had a conference today and I must say they were very, very frustrated, I guess, would not be an exaggeration.

We do not see any reason we should be offering amendments if they can be wiped out by a later vote on the substitute of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

We do not know what will finally happen. But I must say, the amendment that is being withdrawn never did anything in the first place, so it probably does not make much difference.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I would like at this time to send up a copy of the letter from the President, addressed to Senator BREAUX, Senator BRYAN, and myself, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. JOHN B. BREAUX,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS BREAUX, BOREN, AND BRYAN: As you know, I share your concerns that the deficit reduction goals which I called for, as well as those that are contained in the fiscal year 1994 budget resolutions of the House and Senate, are a key to economic recovery. I appreciate the support that you have given to our deficit reduction efforts. Immediate enactment of my short-term economic stimulus package, together with long-term investments, is also an integral and essential element of our total plan.

I assure you that I will insist that the reconciliation bill meet the five-year deficit reduction targets contained in the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that failed to meet their targets.

I will also ensure prudent expenditure of the funds in the supplemental appropriations bill now before Congress. I believe that these expenditures should be primarily targeted at programs that create a substantial number of jobs per dollar expended, programs that are needed immediately, and programs that meet significant human needs, especially with regard to health, education, and housing.

As I told Senator Byrd, I must oppose undue delay in obligating funds for essential programs. In part because of the criteria stated above, a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation. Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that the deficit reduction goals are met.

With these assurances I hope that I can count on your assistance in achieving expeditious completion of congressional action on the economic stimulus appropriations bill as well as on the budget resolution and the reconciliation bill.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, let me simply say that I, of course, do not fully subscribe to the interpretation just made by my good friend, the distinguished minority leader. We are dealing with cuts in spending and cuts in the deficit.

The President's plan cuts the deficit by $502 billion. We are dealing with real figures. Probably half of that, almost half of that, comes from spending cuts.

That is why this Senator feels so strongly about it. For the first time in many, many years, we have honestly faced up to what the deficit will do to destroy this country if we do not do something to change it, if we do not do something to reduce that deficit, so that we will not be spending more and more of the total budget each year to pay interest on the national debt.

So I do think that what is going forward is important. I do think the President's commitment to stay the course is a very important commitment. I do think that the timing of the spending and the fact that the President has shown sensitivity in his letter to us, as we tried to show in our original amendment, that it is very important that we understand that we send a signal to the American people that we are not sliding back into our old ways of spend now and reduce the deficit later, but that we are moving forward with a comprehensive package.

So I do hope that, when the distinguished minority leader reads the letter, he will understand why we feel it is a very important and significant statement.

I do feel, with all due respect, that our original proposal was an important one. Sensitivity to timing, in terms of spending and deficit reduction, is an important issue that we have tried to address.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee seeking recognition, so I will yield the floor.

But I simply wanted to make that point. Again, I commend the President for what I think is a real program with real numbers to get the deficit reduced. That is what the American people want. They understand the need for it. I believe that, because of his leadership, we have created in this country the greatest opportunity to really reduce the budget deficit than we have had in at least two decades. I commend him for it.

It is my hope that Congress will continue to work with him to really get the deficit reduced.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think that the Senators have performed a constructive job. I think they have done something that is very pleasing to this Senator and to the appropriators.

The appropriators have stayed within the caps. The appropriators have not been the budget busters. We have kept within the caps. We have kept within our allocations. Every subcommittee on my committee—13 subcommittees—has kept within its allocations every year that I have been chairman.

But the appropriators are the targets, always, of those who want to have the line-item veto and enhanced rescissions. It is always the appropriators.

The three Senators have done, in a nonlegislative way, what they were seeking to do through an amendment. They have encountered a lot of the pressures that the President has on the other side, philosophically, ideologically, and otherwise. And the President has indicated that he will insist on the

reconciliation bill meeting its targets, meeting its deficit reduction targets.

I am very pleased that the President has done that because those committees ought to meet their targets. We meet our targets on appropriations. We meet our targets. And I say let the other committees, the Finance Committee, other committees that devise programs that result in back-door spending over which the Appropriations Committee has no control—let them meet their targets as well. That is what the President is saying he is going to do and that is what the three Senators, and others with them, sought to accomplish. So I congratulate them. I congratulate the President as well.

Now, the distinguished Republican leader has made several comments here about being locked out, farming out the floor, traffic cop, frustrations, shutouts, and so on.

Mr. President, I am the manager of this bill. I am doing my job. What am I supposed to do? Turn this job over to somebody else? The President, in no uncertain terms, in his letter indicated where he stood on this package. And as he says in this letter, "As I told Senator BYRD, I must oppose undue delay in obligating funds for essential programs."

Now, I believe in this President's programs. It is only the 68th day of his Presidency and I want to see him succeed, because if the President succeeds, the country is better off. If he succeeds we all succeed, because he is trying to do the right thing. He is trying to make investments in infrastructure, he is trying to reduce the budget deficit, and he is trying to put people to work, immediately and in the long run.

I believe in this package. It fell to my lot to protect his package because I am the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. If Senator BREAUX had been the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that would have been his job. If Senator DOLE, my good friend Senator DOLE, the Republican leader, had been the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that would have been his job—his job. But this was my job and I did my job. And I am rather proud of the way I protected the President's package.

Now we have this—very dangerous amendment, in my judgment—have it resolved, and resolved in a nonlegislative way. Now we are ready to do business on the rest of the amendments.

I have not sought to lock anybody out without good reason. This Senator is no dummy. He may have a plumbiferous cranium, but he knows what he is doing. I have been around here a long time. I have been frustrated many times and there are times when I will be frustrated again, so I might as well just get used to it from time to time. I felt my good friend, the Republican leader, had gotten used to frustrations around here. He can dish them out pretty well. I have been on the receiving end of them. I have laughed about it. I did not like it but I knew that he was doing his job, doing what he felt he ought to do for his President. Now I am doing my job.

Now, why did I act as traffic cop? Very simply this, may I say to the Republican leader. Had I walked off this floor, the Republican leader might have walked in and moved to table my amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I had that in mind.

Mr. BYRD. We have Senators absent today. And until this matter was resolved, I did not know whether we would be able to weather a tabling motion or not. I did not want to take a chance. That is exactly why I did that. So I hope that he will explain to his frustrated colleagues why I did this. I did my job. And I am ready, now, to work with the minority if they have their amendments and can identify them and can give us those, the identification of amendments, and we will get a time agreement on them so we do not have any open-ended situation because we, if we are going to do it in an open-ended way, we may be here next week. But let us have a reasonable number of amendments. I have always felt that I—at least I considered myself to be a reasonable man, whether other people did or not. And I want to be reasonable.

So, if the Republican leader has his amendments ready, and my colleague on the other side, Mr. HATFIELD, if he is prepared to agree to a certain number of amendments and to time limitations on them, and to a final time for a vote tomorrow—this Senator is prepared. I have accomplished what I set out to do, and I am sorry if it jangled the Republican leader's nerves or anyone else's.

Mr. DOLE. My nerves are pretty steady.

Mr. BYRD. I am not a bit sorry for what I did. I did what I thought was the right thing. I did what I told the President I was going to do. I did what I told the majority leader I was going to do.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DOLE. Would these be amendments that would not be wiped out later with a vote on the Senator's substitute?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I said as long ago as last Friday—and we only put this bill down about 2 o'clock on Thursday—I said as long ago as last Friday that I knew a way to provide for the offering of amendments. I did not say what it was on that day. But today I indicated I could move to recommit with instructions to report back. Someone approached me and asked if I would take the tree down and I said, "No, never." But I want to give the Senators a chance to offer their amendments. My plan is—and I have the amendment here on my desk—rather, the motion to instruct. I will move to recommit and instruct the committee to report back forthwith the House bill and the committee substitute that was included in the committee, together with the amendments that have been attached since that time, the amendment by Mr. HATFIELD and myself, the amendment that I offered reducing the IRS by something like $105 million. And that will be the base. And that will be open to amendment. And Senators can offer amendments and they can offer them in two degrees.

It will still be an amendment that I could erect a tree on if I wanted to, but I want to give the Senators a chance, now, to offer their amendments. And this amendment that Mr. BREAUX and Mr. BOREN and Mr. BRYAN had waiting in the wings, now that it has been resolved, it clears the way, I should hope. They ought to have a pretty solid Democratic side over here, Democratic vote.

But I am prepared, now, to take on the Republican amendments, and they could be offered to the substitute or to the bill—the committee substitute I am talking about. That committee substitute is a freebie. It is a complete substitute so it is open to amendments in two degrees. And just as soon as the distinguished Republican leader supplies me with the number of amendments that he wants to call up, we will try to work out an agreement on it as to time and to final passage.

So, there it is. The only thing I ask, that I offer the motion to recommit with instructions and nobody try to amend those instructions. Because I am coming back with a package that is wide open for amendments in two degrees. There is no tree. But I think it is reasonable to ask that I know how many amendments we are going to get. I do not want it to be open-ended, as I say; whatever the amendments the Republican leader and his colleagues and my colleague here, who is the ranking manager, agree on—I hope there will be a reasonable number of amendments. I hope there will not be too many—6 or 8 or 10 or 12. We hope to get this bill passed by sometime tomorrow.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further?

We are in the process now of trying to determine which amendments. I guess the thing I need to resolve is whether or not there is going to be any flexibility or whether everything is going to be under the total control of the distinguished chairman of the committee. Is there going to be free and open debate on the amendments, or you are going to determine which amendments can be offered? We cannot accept that on this side.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am not sure the Republican leader had been listening.

Mr. DOLE. I have been listening very carefully.

Mr. BYRD. I am not sure he listened. I have not said anything about closing down debate. I have not said anything about controlling amendments.

Mr. DOLE. You said to give you a list and time agreement.

Mr. BYRD. I am entitled to see a list of amendments, surely, because I am opening up the way now. I do not have to do what I am doing, you understand.

Mr. DOLE. You do if you want the bill passed.

Mr. BYRD. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. DOLE. In any event, we are trying to put together a list of amendments. I guess, after discussion with the majority leader, we will see how many there are. We are trying to condense some where there are three or four different Members who have almost identical amendments. There is no use having four amendments. So we are working on that process now.

Mr. BYRD. I just hope, may I say to the Republican leader, that we can narrow the amendments down to a reasonable number so that they can be disposed of today and tomorrow. I did not say anything about shutting off debate. I thought I indicated it was my hope that we could reach a time agreement on amendments, which means that there be an equal amount of time on each side. Does that sound like anything that is unusual around here? I have worked out many time agreements on this floor and worked a lot of them out with the distinguished Republican leader. And in a time agreement, each side has a certain amount of time. That is what I am hoping we can arrange. The traffic cop job is over. I have accomplished my purpose. I have protected the President's program now until we could get our own side with its act together. Now we are ready to play ball with the other side.

Mr. DOLE. I do not think that amendment had many votes on this side anyway, the amendment you just helped with.

Mr. BYRD. But it has some on this side.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I hope we can reach an agreement, and it is my expectation that we will. Both sides are working in good faith on that.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the current parliamentary situation, a lot of words to describe it. I would like to make one point that I think may have been lost in all of this discussion.

Under the rules, any Senator can come in at any time in the proceedings and offer a complete substitute which has the effect of wiping out previous amendments, if that is what the substitute proposes. Everybody here understands that. Any suggestion or implication that once an amendment is adopted by the Senate it is somehow engraved in stone and, therefore, must be a part of the final action is, of course, completely false and erroneous.

The only difference between the current status is that the amendment proposed by the chairman is the pending amendment. He could just as easily, I could just as easily, the Senator from Oregon could just as easily, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from New Mexico, or anyone else wait until 5, 10, 15, 20 other amendments were considered and, if they were adopted, propose then a substitute amendment which, if so drafted, would have the effect of wiping out all the previous amendments. That is ordinary and accepted and a regular part of the Senate's rules.

So I hope we can resolve this now in a manner that everyone agrees is acceptable. But I do not want there to be left any erroneous impression as to the effect of what was occurring. There is no process by which a Senator can assure that once an amendment is adopted, that amendment can withstand a later amendment to the contrary if the Senate so chooses. The opportunity to offer a complete substitute amendment which wipes out all previously adopted amendments exists right there in the rule for every Senator on every bill we take up, including this one.

My hope is that we can now reach agreement that we can proceed to vote on and dispose of amendments. But everyone should understand that reaching an agreement, unless the amendments are specified, does not preclude that possibility in anything. So I hope we can get this going, have some debate, some votes this evening and tomorrow, and that we can pass this bill at the earliest possible time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I would like to be advised when I have used 5 minutes.

Madam President, I rise not to engage myself in the discussion that is going on with reference to amendments or the status of the bill and the underlying amendments and the substitute amendments; I am sure that is being dealt with by others.

I rise to talk tonight a little bit about the budget game that is taking place. I am not sure that this evening I will even address the issue of specifics in the package because I think before we are finished, the American people are going to understand that a very large package of new spending is being called a stimulus when, as a matter of fact, the overwhelming proportion of it is not stimulus at all, unless you call Government spending a stimulus. It is not as if this package is laden with activities that are going to generate jobs, other than the highway and transit jobs, summer jobs, etc., which are interesting in and of themselves. I notice the occupant of the Chair is from a State where that portion of it is not even going to work, because California has more unemployed than anyone else. But as to even the highway and mass transit part, California, by a quirk of the formulas, ends up getting one of the lowest ratios of money from those programs of any State in the Union.

So it is rather a patchwork of things, under the heading of stimulus. Before we are finished, I am sure that the people of the country are going to be tired of hearing what kind of stimulus this is, because this funding is for the kind of things they would not believe should come on the heels of a much heralded deficit reduction package, which essentially is all new taxes and defense cuts and a little, tiny $7 billion net reduction in all of the domestic programs of the Nation.

It is, however, a heralded deficit reduction package that requires sacrifice of everyone, and obviously I am, in a sense, trying to say I do not believe it is much of that. It is not sacrificing because everybody has to remember that the President of the United States says he is cutting a lot in that package, but he is asking for almost an equal amount of new spending. I give you those two numbers: $131 billion in so-called domestic cuts; $124 billion in new programs, add-ons, new dollars. That is a real domestic cut of only $7 billion net. I mean, we could almost do that without going through any of this. We could probably have done that just asking the Appropriations Committee chairman to make those savings in committee and probably get that done.

Now, what they are doing is playing a giant budget game so we can spend more money in the appropriations process of the country. Frankly, I am not here arguing against appropriating money for American needs, be it educational, the National Institutes of Health, or whatever. I am here arguing that to try to tell the American people that we have just gone through this onerous deficit reduction exercise, and then come right around when the ink is hardly dry and put $16 billion into an appropriations bill to spend, and call it stimulus, is disingenuous when it has things like—maybe I will just read a few items. I think everybody knows that before we finish, an effort will be made to talk about what will be funded under this bill. Here are just a couple:

$28 million for new alternative fueled Government vehicles, at a time when the administration is trying to cut down on cars and drivers in the Federal fleet; restoring $197 million for the National Science Foundation for research grants, overturning Congress' decision last fall not to provide in full, a $352 million increase requested by the Bush administration because of tight budgetary times.

I am not against the National Science Foundation and their new grant program. But believe me, I cannot understand how we can try to tell the American people that this ongoing program, which has been increasing rather dramatically, ought to be funded with an additional $197 million under the guise of being a stimulative package.

There are many more that are even far more egregious than that. How about $148 million for IRS tax system modernization? The Department of the Treasury responded that 16 percent of this work will be subcontracted to Japanese firms. The House leadership refused to allow "Buy American" amendments. I do not know if they should have or not, but that is just a fact. I am pleased to see that the distinguished chairman has reduced the funding for this item in his substitute amendment.

There are scores more. There are millions of dollars put into the Interior Department because, even though we have been increasing the funding, we have a backlog of facilities needs and maintenance of some of our parks units. Frankly, those are wonderful things. But do the American people really believe that we have gone through an exercise in deficit reduction that is so tough and so onerous that we ought to come right back within 48 hours and fill that vacuum with $16 billion in new spending?

I do not want to repeat numbers, but I tried my best to look at previous stimulus packages of this country. We had almost gotten out of the habit of passing stimulus bills. We almost got out of the habit because they work so poorly. We have history books full of analyses of so-called stimulus packages that did not work, because do you know what generally happens? You do not spend the money in the year you think you will. You spend it 2 years later, and whatever you were trying to cure has already been fixed. Our history of experience with stimulus packages is that when we try to spend the money in a recessionary period, even on highways, it turns out you do not get the money into the system until 2 years later, when there is no longer a recession.

Some might ask, get to the point. Is that what is occurring here? Leave it to others than myself. What I find is that in the first year, the rest of this year, when stimulus is being sought, and jobs are supposed to be created by this Federal Government money, other than the unemployment checks, only $2.9 billion of it, Madam President, will be literally spent in the remainder of this year—a big, big stimulus for America, $2.9 billion. The rest will be spent in other years. Why would we even do that? Why would we today spend money in 1994, 1995, and 1996 under the guise of it being stimulus? It is absolutely without any rationale.

One reason I think it is being done—and it was not the original intention and I certainly hope it is not going to work out this way, is because it is a budget game. Let me repeat—this is a budget game because the Congress of the United States has adopted a law of the land that said: Here is a cap for domestic spending in the year of 1993, and you cannot breach that cap. And lo and behold, we did a very good thing. We said: If you do not spend what is allocated for defense or other discretionary spending what is left over in 1993 goes to reduce the deficit—not so bad.

What have we been running around trying to do? We have been trying to get the deficit down.

So we decided that if we did not spend all that money on defense, the law said you cannot spend it anywhere else. So it goes to deficit reduction. If you did not spend all the money on foreign aid, it goes to deficit reduction. Guess what is going to happen in this budget game. There is a little provision in this 1990 budget agreement which is very simply, very profound. It says these these caps are no longer operative if you have an emergency, and the emergency designation for the recession has never, never been adopted by the Congress or President heretofore. You would think if Congress wanted to do this, it would have adopted the emergency 2 years ago. No. On this one, the President and the Congress say we have an emergency when the recession is essentially behind us.

Madam President, I say to my fellow Senators that what that means is that those legal binding spending caps are no longer in existence for all of the money provided here. This spending is outside the caps, and you do not have to worry about deficit reduction. Spend the money.

I have to admit that when we put that together, that budget agreement with the caps, we had no better way to define emergency than that it must be declared by the President and the Congress. But under almost any commonsense definition, we are not in an emergency. But this Senator admits that under the 1990 budget agreement, if the President and the Congress say there is an emergency, there is. In this case, the reason for the emergency is to allow us to spend money we could not otherwise spend. And guess what that is going to do? That money is all going to get spent without any accounting under the caps. And, Madam President, we still have a little money left over under the caps because we underspent in the 1993 appropriations bills.

Guess what? In about 1 month or 6 weeks, there will be another appropriations bill coming through. It will be the second urgent supplemental, or some such thing. And because this did not count, this $16 billion did not count, we can probably fit some new spending in under those caps. In a sense, the American taxpayer is going to get it on both sides. We are going to pay taxes, supposedly 295 billion dollars' worth, to reduce the deficit. We have in place a congressionally adopted law that would apply a substantial number of billions of dollars against the deficit because we have underspent the caps. We will come along now, however, and say this new $16 billion is not subject to any of that. It is an emergency and thus we will leave open room under the discretionary caps—although it may be a strain because most of that saving is in defense.

Surely some can come to the floor and say, "Let us use the extra defense money within that cap to spend on this next urgent supplemental," which will come running through here and which will probably have to do with the disaster relief for farmers and others.

So, point No. 1, there is no emergency. This should not have been declared an emergency. It is a budget game to permit Congress and the President to spend more money; money they would not spend under the existing law of the land because they would need 60 votes here and a majority of the votes in the House for it to be in order. But it is going to get spent anyway.

And that Budget Act point of order that keeps us from just throwing money away is wiped out, so that we can come along and spend even some more money, while the taxpayers of the United States are out there being Mr. and Mrs. Sucker. They kind of think we have a grand plan, but they are beginning to wonder: What grand plan? Looks like a grand plan to tax us. And we are not so sure that Btu tax—that energy tax—we are not so sure that is so very good. Some are saying Btu means big time unemployment, which it very well could be.

So, from this point on, I am hopeful that, under our leader here on the Republican side, we can eventually have a number of votes to make our case.

My friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, has an excellent amendment regarding this emergency designation clause, which will take this right to the American people. They will understand, hopefully with this statement tonight and the debate on that amendment, what a budget charade this is.

There will be others to point out programs here that are just good Federal programs that everybody loves. We are going to love them so much that we are

going to say, even if it requires that we declare an emergency and use a phony name "stimulus," we are going to put more money into those good programs.

Well, how does that stack up against this hue and cry from the American people that we ought to be reducing the deficit?

So, from my standpoint, sooner or later it will be determined that this is not a stimulus package. It is close to porkbarrel. If it is stimulus, it is going to be the most expensive production of jobs by the Federal Government that we have ever seen. One estimate is $89,000 a job. That is incredible.

What it really means is that this is not a jobs bill. It is a bill to put out more money in Federal programs, some of which are very popular. If we do it this way, we have more to spend next year because the caps that are in existence are going to give us more room this year to spend on supplementals. Then next year, this ongoing spending will be outside of the cap again, the overall cap on discretionary spending, and we will be able to spend more money on top of this for other programs because we will have already taken care of some of these programs with the new funding in this bill.

With that I thank the Chair, I thank the Senate, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has suggested the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President and Members of the Senate, earlier I stated that discussions were underway among the managers, interested Senators, the distinguished Republican leader, and myself, in an effort to reach an agreement on how best to proceed with consideration of the pending bill. It now appears that no agreement is possible at this time. However, I have been advised by the Republican leader that Republican Senators are prepared to offer Amendments in the current procedural framework and accordingly it is my judgment, absent any agreement at this time, that we should proceed in that regard.

Senators should be aware now that amendments will shortly be offered, that there may well be—indeed I expect that there will be—a vote or votes this evening, depending upon how lengthy the debate on the first and subsequent amendments. I do not know what the amendments will be so we will obviously have to review them and consider them after their being offered.

Madam President, I yield the floor and invite any comment the distinguished Republican leader wishes to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I think the Senate majority leader has accurately stated the present circumstances. I think it is fair to say there are some on this side who are prepared to offer amendments, even though they know in this case they would be eliminated if later on we adopted the substitute by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Frankly I must say on this side of the aisle there is almost a unanimous feeling that we should not pass this stimulus package and that we have the votes to prevent that from happening. So I do not know how the leadership will proceed, but while we are trying to determine which avenue to pursue, at least we would be offering an amendment.

Senator BROWN from Colorado is prepared to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, let me just reiterate that in accordance with the earlier understanding that I think was had here among the distinguished Republican leader, the distinguished majority leader, and myself and others, I was prepared and am prepared to offer a motion to recommit with instruction to report back the House bill together with the Appropriations Committee substitute, including the amendments that have been adopted. And that would be open to amendments.

That is the simplest chart in the rule book. That would be open to amendments, open in two degrees: No three. So that would give Senators an opportunity to offer their amendments and in accordance with the understanding that I thought we were trying to work out—and I fully understand the Republican leader's inability at this point to achieve that objective for reasons over which he has no control—that would have enabled us, if we could have gotten time agreements on the amendments, to have completed work on the bill at a reasonable hour.

Another of the objectives that I have sought from the beginning on this bill is to act on a package that the House will accept and that will avoid having to go to a conference. And I have a good reason to believe, after some discussions I have had through my staff with some people on the other side, that the House would probably agree, and without any problem at all, to the amendment the committee agreed to having to do with retaining the current law in connection with the formulas in respect to summer jobs, and would agree to the amendment that Senator HATFIELD and I had joined in offering that would eliminate some of the what I refer to as kooky items, and would also agree to the reduction by $105 million in the IRS and the GSA accounts.

So I do not think we have any problem in the House with those amendments. We probably would not even have to go to conference. That was one of the objectives that I sought, as I tried to protect this jobs package from attack. Having accomplished what I think was a major step when the President, and the Senator from Louisiana, and the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Arizona, agreed upon a nonlegislative approach to the problems that those Senators had raised—having achieved that step I felt that we were well on our way toward acting on this bill and, hopefully, of protecting it against further attack.

I was willing to go to the extent that I suggested, that of offering a motion to recommit which would give all Senators—all Senators—an opportunity to offer their amendments. They would not have to worry about any tree wiping them out, at least early on. And if I could get an agreement on the amendments I would only want to protect myself fully against any line-item veto and enhanced rescission amendment.

But it appears that approach cannot be taken at this time. So Senators will call up their amendments, there will not be any time agreements with respect to amendments, no points of order are waived so they can call up their amendments to the bill and to the committee substitute and, in the final analysis, if this is the road we are going to proceed on, there will come a time when the Senate will vote up or down on the committee substitute.

I say to my friends on the other side, the way is still open. If they really want the opportunity that they have been talking about on the floor, the opportunity that I have been hearing about, that they want to offer amendments and feel that they are offering amendments that will be adopted to the underlying, basic measure, I am willing to proceed in that fashion if we can agree on the number of amendments, so we will have some identification on them and can work out some time agreements.

I close by saying to the distinguished Republican leader, if he is still able to achieve this, he and the majority leader go down the road and work out a time agreement, fine; I will be happy to work with them. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, may I inquire what the order is? I ask the distinguished President pro tempore to answer the question. I had earlier discussed speaking, and at the time we were considering a unanimous-consent request. Seeing there is not going to be one at the moment, I assume now is an appropriate time to speak.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator would be well within his rights to proceed. I had

hoped if we were able to work out a time agreement to include in the time agreement some time for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to speak. But no time agreement has been achieved at this point. The Senator has the floor and he may proceed.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the President pro tempore.

Mr. President, I rise this evening in opposition to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993, also known as the President's stimulus package.

I do so with great regret because of my respect for what President Clinton is trying to do: avoid a triple-dip recession. And I do so, with considerable regret, as a consequence of my respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I do so knowing that the stimulus package would provide some money for the State of Nebraska; that we are not going to receive some Federal money if this stimulus package is not approved that otherwise we would receive. The department and agencies of the Federal Government have been very quick to supply me with a list of $66 million that Nebraska would receive under this spending bill.

There is no question that Nebraska could quickly obligate additional funding for highways, mass transit, community development, rural housing, water, sewer projects, the so-called traditional stimulus areas. There is also no question that we have human needs that beg to be addressed. Head Start, Chapter 1, immunization programs, Pell grants are high priorities, as are the proposals to renovate and modernize our veterans hospitals. Finally, it is difficult for me to oppose funding for programs designed to advance technology and particularly the application of technology and networking in the classroom.

Mr. President, I choose to vote against this stimulus package because I believe it has been given a stature that it does not deserve. Its economic significance is at best marginal in that it generates a net 200,000 temporary jobs. At worst, it puts us and interest groups that call upon us in a mood to spend more money.

Thus, I choose to vote against this new spending because I have concluded that the risk is not worth the gain. The risk is that by voting for this new spending, we lose the edge that we need as representatives to say no, and as a result, fail to reduce our fiscal deficit.

Proponents of the stimulus package point out that investing in these areas would give us a jump on the process of altering our spending to place a higher priority on human needs and begin to invest in the technologies which promise to make our Nation more competitive and prosperous in the years ahead.

Mr. President, this stimulus package is not the best vehicle to begin this effort. Instead, I believe we took the most important step in restructuring those priorities last week, with the adoption of the budget resolution, and we did so in a way that reduces the deficit by $502 billion over the next 5 years.

This was much more than a budget resolution, Mr. President. It is the beginning of a fundamental change in the way our Federal Government spends money and the way the Federal Government operates. The central and powerful idea behind the message of President Bill Clinton is this: The economic status quo is unacceptable.

It is unacceptable because too often the Federal Government has been an opponent rather than a partner to the urgent need to create new jobs in an extremely competitive workplace. While American businesses and workers have been struggling mightily to increase their productivity, while delivering quality and value to their customers, Federal policies have been only occasionally supportive, and more often than not have stood in the way.

Mr. President, we all know where we need to change. The deficit is piling debt upon debt. Health care costs are driving workers on to welfare, jobs out the window, and businesses done the drain. Lobbyists have their hands at our throats while we have our hands in their pockets. Our public institutions, especially schools and social service agencies, are being crushed by paperwork and regulation.

In the midst of this chaos, we have been distracted and have not seen what is going on in the American workplace. The facts are we have around 100 million private sector jobs in America. These taxpaying workers support a lot of Government effort. Their taxes pay the wages of 18.5 million Government workers. Their taxes support the incomes of 46 million retirees.

Mr. President, our No. 1 concern as we debate the economic stimulus package is the lack of job creation in America. Our No. 1 goal is more American jobs. We share this objective because we all know the value of a job. A job is much more than just a paycheck. A job is a source of income, of pride, and of self-reliance.

To see how difficult job creation is today, we must look at the world from the vantage of the American workplace. From this vantage we see two dramatic and interrelated phenomenon.

The first is a very sharp and impressive improvement in the growth of productivity in manufacturing and services. In 1992, U.S. productivity grew 2.8 percent, our best performance since 1971. If we are able to sustain this rate, Americans will double their standard of living in a generation, and grow at a rate that we have not matched since the early 1970's.

There is no short cut to achieving gains in productivity. Skills, personal preparedness, attention to the detail that becomes total quality, the desire to improve and satisfy the needs of customers, organizational efficiency, and a finished product or service that can be sold for a profit, all of these and more are needed.

Economic success occurs only when we are individually and collectively becoming more productive. This is not the rhetoric of applause lines, but applause lines will not put food on the table or jobs in our country.

For human beings to excel—and make no mistake we rise and fall as a Nation according to our capacity to achieve excellence—there must be a willingness to toil long and hard for a purpose. All the special programs designed to make it possible for people to learn and achieve greatness is no substitute for individual initiative. Without courage, a good plan is just words.

And there is a lot of courage out there in the American workplace right now, Mr. President. The United States still produces more output per worker than any Nation on Earth. Because we do, our collective standard of living is still the highest. One follows the other as surely as night follows day. But there is no short cut.

The hard truth of politicians trying to satisfy the demand of audiences who want us to do something is that very often the best course of action is for us to do nothing. The less we yield to the temptation of protecting individuals or industries from the rigorous requirements of competition, the more our economy will prosper. Subsidies and protection must be the exception and not the rule.

So the first phenomenon, Mr. President, tells us we are winning the most important battle of all. While I believe there is much to be done, let us not make the mistake of striving to use Government to improve things only to find out once again that we have made things worse.

This does not mean we should stand around the job site idly leaning on our shovels. There is much work to do. It does not mean we should be blind or insensitive to the painful consequences of a competitive marketplace. Nor does it mean I am proposing to trust the invisible hand of the market to perform all good and wonderful things. It only means that if our goal is good jobs and good wages, then we must create an environment that allows America's entrepreneurs—those individuals who create the jobs that support the economy and our Government—to innovate, grow, and prosper.

The second phenomena which is evident in the American workplace is an unusually high level of anxiety about the permanence of employment. American workers fear their job could be gone tomorrow. Only 15 percent of today's laid off workers believe they will get their job back.

The culprits generating this fear are four trends which we have alternately ignored or made worse with foolish tax, trade, and regulatory policies. The four are large corporate downsizing; global competition in services and manufacturing; automation, again in services as well as manufacturing; and the tendency of cost-conscious managers to use temporary, contract, and part-time help. Dubbed the four horsemen of the workplace, they have generated apocalyptic change challenging our concepts of job security and stability.

For this second phenomena, Mr. President, help is unquestionably needed, and just as unquestionably we are fortunate to have a President who is prepared to do just that.

The old ways of helping will no longer work. We have erected a complicated and porous safety net that has institutionalized poverty. We have built-in disincentives to work. We penalize people when their incomes rise. We punish students who try to enter the workplace prior to graduating from high school.

I believe the best way to help Americans compete and succeed in today's workplace is through radical reform of our education and our health care institutions.

Every year, Mr. President, we spend hundreds of billions of dollars for education and health care. In this budget resolution, we will increase health care spending at the Federal level from $284 to $318 billion.

I have heard many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, come to the floor and say Democrats are proposing a Government takeover of health care. Then I have heard them stand and oppose reasonable efforts to constrain the growth of Federal spending. Mr. President, Federal spending or health care of $318 billion next year is an awful lot of money, especially when considered together with $145 billion in spending at the State and local level.

In fact, Federal, State, and local governments already account for nearly two-thirds of all of the non-out-of-pocket expenditures for health care.

What is needed is more competition in both areas. Health care and education are two of our least competitive environments. We need more accountability for outcome so we as purchasers of the services compare results. But we also, Mr. President—and this is much more difficult—need personal responsibility so that we as consumers of the services have incentives to excel academically and to stay healthy as well. President Clinton, fortunately for us, recognizes that health care costs threaten to undo constructive work in every other area.

Mr. President, I believe we should extend the right of health care access to all Americans. I do not want a single American to have to prove they are poor enough, or to prove they are old enough, or to get blown up in a war before they are deemed worthy of health care. I do not want a single American to discover that after paying for a policy for 25 years they are not eligible when they finally need care.

In short, Mr. President, I believe we will fail in our effort to get health care costs under control in a manner which will encourage job growth unless we eliminate all doubt about access to health care. But as we extend this right, let us make it clear to Americans that responsibilities accompany that right, responsibilities to make a contribution, both in money and in health in controlling costs.

We need to recognize we can no longer afford to give out free lunches anymore. Whether the generosity is extended to a hospital that underbids and overexamines, or a doctor who extracts more from the system than even his colleagues believe is justified, or a lawyer who attempts to do the same, or an insurance company crying out for more tax subsidies while ignoring the cries of their beneficiaries, or a wealthy American who can pay his own way, or a poor American who can pay a little, or finally a politician on election day who wants to spend just a little more in some favorite area of the health care system: we must face reality; the hour of truth has finally arrived.

Fortunately, we have a President who has faced that reality and told us and the American people that it is time to change.

But change is frightening to some. They want the old days back again. They prefer the quiet days of the status quo. Milton, seeing democracy spread through Europe, observed the change. He said:

"In dim eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
On half the nations, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs."

Well, let the monarchs shake their head in fits of nostalgia for the old order, Mr. President. I am ready to shake out the dust and make way for the new.

But, Mr. President, it is the budget resolution we passed last week, and not this stimulus package, which represents the beginning of this change. Not only does it reduce the deficit by $502 billion over the next 5 years, it also calls for focusing our attention on the human skills and talents needed for a high-wage economy. With this budget, we start to invest in our people, an investment that is long overdue.

But at the same time, Mr. President, we must with certainty slay this deficit which, like Freddy Krueger, of the dreadful series "Nightmare on Elm Street," keeps coming back to haunt us. This stimulus package sends a message that we prefer the easy course of more spending rather than the difficult course of real change.

As attractive as it would be to issue a series of press releases taking credit for this borrowed money, I cannot do it. This is $16.2 billion plus interest of money we do not have to spend. We will borrow in order to finance the spending. In doing so, we weaken our resolve to resist all those friends who are opposing the spending cuts in the budget resolution just passed.

Mr. President, the simple and difficult truth for us and America is that our most difficult problems will not be solved with increased Federal spending. Press releases announcing more money cannot paper over deep problems in the American workplace, frightening deterioration of the American family, and difficult structural problems with America's Federal Government.

Mr. President, if we want to create jobs with our action, then we must do some things that do not involve new spending.

First, we must acknowledge up front and without apology that for working American families of all incomes the price of Government has gotten too high. The very people we want to help with new spending are the ones who are paying the bulk of the bills.

Second, we should affirm that if new jobs are our goal, then our policies should embrace the spirit of entrepreneurial capitalism. Those who need the least amount of help will do the most good. Not only should we pay particular attention to taxes and regulation which can choke the breadth of U.S. entrepreneurs, but we should take care that we do not kill with words the goose that lays the golden eggs of jobs.

Third, we should declare that wage and price controls are poor policy no matter what the objective. These are not the best ways to get health care costs under control. These actions would simply and unnecessarily damage one of America's leading institutions. A better solution, which I intend to talk about at greater length at another time, would be to establish a Federal health care trust fund and agree that the Federal Government must use this fund and not borrowed money to pay all its health care bills. This would create the fiscal discipline that we need to control costs and would produce immediate deficit reduction.

Fourth, we should do more to face the bitter truth that growth in mandatory spending programs is unacceptably high. I was a cosponsor of the Nunn-Domenici amendment to cap entitlements because I fear for our country when I look at the 20-year trend lines of these programs. Mandatory spending represents over 60 percent of total Federal spending. The top five entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, other retirement programs, and unemployment compensation—totaled $587 billion this fiscal year.

And next year, do not let any one think that we are not being generous.

Next year, those programs will increase by $44 billion. These facts are why the President is right when he says all deficit reduction is overwhelmed by the increases that we see in health care alone.

While I believe strongly that Social Security recipients, particularly low-income Social Security recipients, should never have to fear cuts in their benefits, we must take care that we do not stand down here and simply pander to the audience of older Americans. I tell you that American seniors know better than most of us what America can accomplish if we are willing to sacrifice. Mr. President, to simply fund a $225 increase per recipient in annual retirement payments this year will cost American taxpayers $50 billion over the next 5 years. It is a double whammy for Americans paid by the hour to have to shoulder such a large share of the burden for deficit reduction as a result of higher than necessary payroll taxes as well as the greatest number of jobs lost due to budget cuts.

Fifth, we have to overcome our fear of being criticized by our friends in education and say the truth out loud: American schools are a mess. Most perform below the rigorous requirements of today's workplace. I am prepared to spend more money—particularly in poor districts—but I need to see comparable reductions in administrative expenses, and I need to see a lot more competition as well.

Those who think I am standing here school bashing, I recommend you look at what Thomas Sobol, the commissioner of education for the State of New York, did this past Wednesday. He asked the regents to endorse a broad policy change to include work in the school day and as a prerequisite for a diploma. According to the New York Times, he said:

> The proposal would in the most basic sense, change the way schools teach, refocusing education to include work experience and lessons about work skills in all curriculums.

Dr. Sobol's critique of our schools is on target:

> We have reached a point in history when social and economic trends create a crisis for many young people in the transition from education to workplace. Research, our constituents, and the public tell us our students are not prepared for this new workplace as well as they should be.

Mr. President, in another 5 or 6 weeks, about 2 million young Americans will be given high school diplomas. They will wear their caps and gowns in graduation ceremonies. In my State of Nebraska some 20,000 to 22,000 will graduate. I venture to say that of the 70 percent or so that are going into the workplace, half of those young people are not prepared. They do not have the skills they need today, let alone the capacity over the course of their lives, to adjust to the demands of the workplace.

Mr. President, I want to present one fact which tells me that not all education problems can be solved with new Federal money. Indeed, I must tell you, this one fact is as chilling a fact as I ever heard. In 1972, 116,630 American students scored over 600 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test on the verbal side. But in 1992, with more students taking the test, the number of students that scored over 600 on the SAT verbal fell to 75,243.

Mr. President, that is a 50 percent decline in the performance of our best students on the verbal side.

I am prepared to argue that this decline has little to do with what is going on in schools and a lot more to do with what is not going on in our homes. We simply, as adult parents, are not making the effort needed to learn.

To those who believe we are, I want to share the conclusion of another educator, Daniel Singal, noting the 50 to 60 point drop in the verbal SAT scores of students going to selective colleges, he concludes:

> These kids are less able to understand what they read than students a generation ago, so they need shorter and easier assignments. They are less able to write or think or carry on a coherent argument. And, because they have read less and understand less, they also know less.

Mr. President, I must tell you that despite President Clinton's effort to turn this country around, despite whatever else we do at the Federal level, unless we address that deterioration of our children's reading and writing skills, their capacity to persuade will deteriorate, their capacity to earn a living in the marketplace will deteriorate, their ability to participate in democracy as informed citizens will deteriorate, their ability to be parents will deteriorate. Everything rests, in my judgment, upon the quality of education we provide our young people.

At this hour I believe we are very fortunate to be led by President Clinton, who has demonstrated that he has the courage to tell the American people the truth. He has begun the process of change, which Americans in large numbers desire.

However, Mr. President, the changes we are fighting for this year must not be change for change's sake. In an essay called, "Defining Deviancy Down" in the winter, 1993 issue of American Scholar, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN accurately describes the dangers of morally blind political correctness.

We do not only have economic troubles in America. All of us who have observed the statistics of teenage pregnancy, who have looked at rising violence by teenagers in the United States who have examined the numbers surrounding our families, know that we have been making some terrible mistakes. No health care or education programs done at the Federal level will make our children healthier or better educated unless America's most powerful institution, the American family, is strengthened. No crime bill will turn back the tide of violence in America unless adults set the example and provide the role models young boys and girls need in a difficult world.

In short, Mr. President, some things should not change. They should be our foundation, our rock. They should guide us through the dark and stormy waters of our lives. The hymn, "Abide with Me" carries the message well:

> Change and decay in all around I see;
> O Thou, who changest not, abide with me!

I believe in the need for a secular Government, Mr. President, but its reach must and will always be limited. It cannot change the hearts of men and women who have not acquired the ability to tell right from wrong. The quiet battles by Americans to teach themselves and their children, their battles to set an example with their personal behavior. These will determine the shape of tomorrow.

Out of respect for the poetic preferences of the senior Senator from West Virginia I close with an early Emily Dickinson poem, which describes the internal battles so crucial for our country.

> To fight aloud, is very brave—
> But gallanter, I know
> Who charge within the bosom
> The Cavalry of Woe—
>
> Who win, and nations do not see—
> Who fall—and none observe—
> Whose dying eyes, no County
> Regards with patriotic love—
>
> We trust, in plumed procession
> For such the Angels go—
> Rank after Rank, with even feet—
> And Uniforms of Snow.

Mr. President, again, with great respect and great regret, I urge my colleagues not to support this stimulus package, and instead to focus their support on the efforts to change our spending priorities contained in the budget resolution and to do the difficult work of making sure not only that we create new jobs in America, but that we create a higher moral standard, as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for that very, very fine statement. I think he was right on in deploring this stimulus package, which I think is overweighted items that certainly are not of an emergency nature; overweighted with items that are clearly not of an economic stimulus nature.

What we have here in this stimulus package, Mr. President, is the old story, just as the Senator from Nebraska said. We can all have press re-

leases out in our home States talking about the wonderful things that are in the stimulus package, but there is never one mention that we do not pay for it. It is the old story. We once again increase the deficit of the United States of America by, in this case, $16 billion and send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. President, that is wrong. There was a great Governor in California named Earl Warren. I will never forget when he said to the people in California, he said: The people of California can have anything they want, anything they want, as long as they are willing to pay for it.

What this stimulus package is saying: The people of the United States can have 16 billion dollars' worth of goodies, but of course you do not have to pay for it. Your children, or somebody else—your great grandchildren, your grandchildren—will pay for it.

Mr. President, the most important single thing we can do for this country of ours is not to pass some ersatz stimulus package; it is to reduce these deficits.

That is not me speaking. That is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

And let me quote from Dr. Alan Greenspan's testimony before the Finance Committee on March 24, 5 days ago. This is what he said, Mr. President:

> The deficit is a corrosive force that already has begun to eat away at the foundations of our economic strength.

Later, he goes on to say, as he winds up this message—and 11 pages were totally devoted to the dangers of the deficit to the United States of America—"Let me conclude by reiterating my central message: The deficit is a malignant force in our economy."

That is pretty strong language, Mr. President—"* * * a malignant force in our economy. How the deficit is reduced is very important. That it be done is crucial."

In other words, he discusses taxes and reduced spending. But he comes to the conclusion that how you do it is important. Indeed, he thinks that increased taxes is not the way to go. But "the crucial thing," he said, "is that the deficit be reduced, and allowing it to fester"—these are the words he uses: malignant, fester, corrosive—"would court a dangerous erosion of our economic strength and a potentially significant deterioration in our real standard of living."

That is not a Republican Senator speaking, Mr. President. That is not John Chafee speaking. That is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Dr. Alan Greenspan.

Mr. President, of course, whoever designed this stimulus package had a wild imagination that these things were going to be of an emergency nature, that they are going to do something to foster the very name of the package—stimulus, to the economy. It has such things as $37 million for agricultural research buildings. Come on, is that going to stimulate the economy, $37 million for agricultural research buildings?

How about this one: $64 million for something that has the longest name in the United States of America; it sounds like a British lord's name: National Telecommunications and Information Administration Public Telecommunication Facilities Planning and Construction Program to Promote the Development and Use of Broad Band Interactive Telecommunication Networks.

How is that for a mouthful? And this is emergency money, borrowed, meant to stimulate the economy. We cannot pay for it, oh, no. We have to rush and get it, to promote the development and use of broad band interactive telecommunication networks. If the proponents of this legislation could tell me how that will stimulate the economy, I would be delighted to hear it.

Here are some other ones: $48 million for the Department of Energy supply, research, and development activities; $28 million to purchase 10,000 alternative fuel vehicles.

I yield to no one with my support for efforts to prevent deterioration of our environment. But to say that to purchase 10,000 alternative fuel vehicles is an economic stimulus, or is an emergency, or is going to do something about unemployment in the Nation, I think we will all agree that just is not accurate.

Here is $197 millon for strategic research initiatives at the National Science Foundation. Mr. President, of course, there are some good things in this package we are all for. There are lots of good things. There are summer jobs. There are opportunities for increased immunization of our young people. There are improvements in the Head Start Program. These are good programs. But why do the proponents not suggest that we pay for them? Why do they not suggest a tax? This came out as a spending program only. That is the way it went through the House. That was part of the budget resolution that we had here. Now it is coming forward in the Senate in this way. I think it is wrong what we are doing to our children and grandchildren by foisting upon them $16 billion of additional money that they have to pay for so that we can do some wonderful things that we would like to do.

So, Mr. President, am I opposed to raising taxes? No. I have supported tax increases on this floor many a time. But what I want to see the money go for, Mr. President, is a reduction of this deficit that is a corrosive, malignant, that is festering, and it is destroying the economic fabric of our Nation. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 279

(Purpose: To prevent funds from being used to assist certain projects through Community Development Grants)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 279.

On page 56, line 7, strike "$2,536,000,000" and insert "$2,432,486,654".

On page 56, line 24, strike the period, and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the foregoing amount may be used to assist the following projects:

"(1) Foster Park tennis and basketball court resurfacing and color coating in Evanston, Illinois.

"(2) Anthony Oats Park and pool renovation in Evansville, Indiana.

"(3) Expansion of shopping center at 165th Street, in Hammond, Indiana.

"(4) Miscellaneous pool repairs in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(5) Tennis court resurfacing in Florence, Alabama.

"(6) Orpheum Theatre renovation in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(7) Alan Witt Park aquatics facility and ball fields in Fairfield, California.

"(8) MLK Park, construction of 27,000 square foot community recreation center with indoor pool, in Los Angeles, California.

"(9) Fairmount Park boathouse restoration in Riverside, California.

"(10) Villegas Park soccer field in Riverside, California.

"(11) Ocean Beach commercial revitalization project in San Diego, California.

"(12) Art Ark, 29-unit new construction live and work unit, in San Francisco, California.

"(13) Swimming Pool refurbishment in Thornton, Colorado.

"(14) Poli/Majestic Theatres in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(15) Northwood Cemetery drainage system and roadway in cemetery in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(16) Facade improvement, renovation of 47 commercial building facades in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(17) Construct ice skating warming hut at Union Pond Park in Manchester, Connecticut.

"(18) Greens Harbor Beach in New London, Connecticut.

"(19) Capitol Theater in New London, Connecticut;

"(20) Golf course, parks, recreation, in Daytona Beach, Florida.

"(21) Key West Bight Marina development in Key West, Florida.

"(22) Whispering Pines Park, recreation center, in Port St. Lucie, Florida.

"(23) New Jersey Performing Arts Center in Newark, New Jersey.

"(24) West Las Vegas Arts Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.

"(25) Basketball court at Fox Hill Park in St. Charles, Missouri.

"(26) Inkster Community Shopping Center, 50,000–60,000 commerce shopping center project in Inkster, Michigan.

"(27) Northwest Family Center, with two gymnasiums, indoor pool and outside ball fields, in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(28) Optimist Park athletic facility (indoor and outdoor) baseball field, gymnasium and soccer field in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(29) Desert West Park in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(30) Construction of youth park project to include baseball, soccer, tennis, gymnasium, roads, utilities, and lighting in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

"(31) Soccer field improvements in Bell Gardens, California.

"(32) Agua Mansa Cemetery, historical site restoration work, in Colton, California.

"(33) Fairfield Sports Park, in Fairfield, California.

"(34) Construct youth sports complex, including baseball, soccer, softball, and other athletic fields in Merced, California.

"(35) Tuolumne River Regional Park, amphitheater and softball complex in Modesto, California.

"(36) Improvements to Barnes Park (tennis court relocation, infrastructure) in Monterey Park, California.

"(37) Improvements to Elder Park (tennis courts, bathrooms, picnic areas, ADA compliance) in Monterey Park, California.

"(38) Reconstruct swimming pool in CDBG area in South Gate, Georgia.

"(39) Playground renovations, 35th Street Ballfield, Loveland Playground, Hil-Dar/Housing Authority in Wheeling, West Virginia.

"(40) Storefront Rehabilitation, rehabilitation of storefronts in central business district in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

"(41) Renovation of historic mill for sports shop complex in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

"(42) Construction of an alpine slide and restaurant at Parque del Turabo recreational facility in Gaguas, Puerto Rico.

"(43) Marketplace and art craft center in Adjuntas, Puerto Rico.

"(44) Brewery District Theater, construction of a new movie theater, in Columbus, Ohio.

"(45) Falcon Park Baseball Stadium Redevelopment Project in Auburn, New York.

"(46) Proctors Theater, roofing, completion of roof repair on historic downtown theater in Troy, New York.

"(47) Constitution Soccer Field, grade field and construct 6 adult and 4 youth soccer fields, construct parking lots, restroom structure and concession stand in Salinas, California.

"(48) Civic center expansion in San Leandro, California.

"(49) Downing Neighborhood Shopping Center, a 25,000 square foot retail strip located in an inner-city neighborhood in Denver, Colorado.

"(50) HCO/Hi-Ho site work in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(51) Boykin Community Center, construction of a new gymnasium and reroofing the building in Auburn, Alabama.

"(52) Gymnasium lighting, North Birmingham Recreation Center, Howze-Sanford Recreation Center, and Ft. Heights Recreation Center in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(53) Miscellaneous park improvements, shelter repairs (picnic) in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(54) Buffalo Ridge Park in Phoenix, Arizona.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I took the liberty of not going ahead with our customary waiving of the reading so that Members who may be listening would have a chance to know the specific projects to which this amendment relates.

It is a pretty straightforward amendment. It simply outlines projects that will not be funded or should not be funded under this measure and deletes the amount of money that had been earmarked for those projects.

Mr. President, this debate over this bill embodies an honest and a sincere difference of philosophy. One side has a sincere interest in increasing jobs in this country and of improving our economy just as the other side does. The difference is how you get there—how you do it.

One side sincerely believes that to improve the efficiency in Government, reduce the deficit, and eliminate waste, is the way to improve our economy, to provide more meaningful good jobs, to stimulate the private sector by having lower interest rates, reducing the government deficit, and providing more capital for investment in new jobs and opportunities.

The other side sincerely believes the way to increase job opportunity in America and prosperity is to increase Federal spending and to increase the Federal deficit, and thus by that higher deficit stimulate economic activity in the private sector, and perhaps the public sector, and to provide a better way of life for Americans.

This is not about one side being good and the other side being bad. It is about a difference of philosophy, of how you get to a commonly shared objective and goal, that is a stronger, more viable, better economy for America and more meaningful, good paying jobs for the men and women of this country. It is a sincere difference of philosophy.

I come here tonight as one who believes that the best way to get America on track, to make us productive and creative and efficient, is to make Government more efficient, and most of all eliminate waste on the Federal level. That is what I have attempted to do in the amendment that is before this body.

The amendment lays out specifically so that Members can make their own judgment about the value of projects that this bill proposes to do. Let me hasten to add that the bill does not name those projects. The nature of the amendment is to specifically indicate projects which should not be funded and to take out an appropriate amount of money.

I think a reasonable and a fair question that can be offered by those who see the answer in higher Federal spending and higher deficits is what sort of indication do you have that indeed these projects are ones that are contemplated by the community development block grants?

Mr. President, for those who ask that question, let me emphasize that I think it is a reasonable question. Let me refer them to the statement of Secretary Cisneros when he spoke before the VA–HUD subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. The statement was on February 23 of this year. It addresses this specific bill and this specific subject.

Let me read from his remarks, from the verbatim transcript, from page 983. The Secretary is speaking, saying:

I have in front of me a listing, from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, of projects ready to go under the community development block grant program.

Mr. President, that is the listing from which I have come up with this amendment.

The Secretary continues:

Normally, communities have 5 or 6 times as many documented needs for CDBG's as they can fund with annual appropriations. The annual appropriation has been about $4 billion in the last 4 years, so $2.5 billion in additional funding obligated at one lump sum is a very significant amount. It comes to about 60 percent of what any community would receive. They will get it in a lump sum obligation.

As you will be able to see by perusing this information city by city, State by State, these are projects that can go forward immediately; streets, drainage, sidewalks, school improvements, municipal facilities, recreational facilities, things that are needed, things that will create jobs.

Mr. President, again this is the list that he spoke from. The project sheets included that the Secretary referred to are verbatim or at least summarizations of what he had offered to that committee. The sheets look exactly like this. They are simply a listing of the project and the amount of money.

So the source of the amendment is projects which the Secretary himself had identified as available for funding under this bill in which he had an interest in funding, and the amount of money that has been deducted from the bill is the amount of money related to the projects that the clerk just read.

The Secretary continues:

The distributional channels are well set. The communities know how to use the money. These projects, the Mayors tell me, and I have had them come in now repeatedly, including 30 Mayors of larger cities of America, to visit with the President, and they tell me projects are designed, engineered, environmentally cleared, permitted, and ready to go. So from a perspective of stimulus purposes, there is not a better program than the CDBG program.

Mr. President, that is the statement of Secretary Cisneros in indicating that the administration was ready to move on it and spend the money on the projects which were outlined by him, including the ones that are included in the amendment.

Now, it should be clear that this amendment does not include all of the projects that the Secretary laid out. It only includes some of the projects that at least this Member feels, upon reading the list, are the least deserving of Federal money and least match the purpose of this legislation. It does reduce the appropriations amount in this bill by a little over $103 million, which

is no small savings for any taxpayer. The amount is $103,513,346.

Mr. President, I thought it appropriate to offer an amendment that dealt specifically with projects that Members could evaluate and their own judgment as to whether that is worth breaking the budget agreement for, whether it is worth overspending the budget, and whether truly these kinds of projects fit in with the definition of "emergency." I think by having the specifics we give people the opportunity in this Chamber to make their own judgments.

I think a fair question at this point, Mr. President, would indeed be, what is an emergency for the purposes of Congress?

Some Americans who listen in and read our deliberations will wonder why it is that this has become an issue. In this Senator's view, this has become an issue because what is proposed to us is not only just additional spending, but it is quite importantly spending that breaks the budget agreements of past years.

In other words, Congress, by its own action in a budget resolution, set a cap on spending for each consecutive year. This measure comes to us not within that cap, the agreed upon amendment that we would spend or the limit on the amendment we would spend, but under an emergency declaration that implies that this matter is so important, of such great emergency value, that you have to throw aside the caps and the limits on deficit spending.

I might say, my view on this is also influenced by the fact that Congress has not stayed within the total spending for that appropriated year. Let me be specific. We are talking about the overall spending limits. I think some Members may point out that, indeed, much of the problem with regard to our overall spending limits are in the entitlement areas. Let me say, I think that is a fair observation and an accurate one.

But the reality is, this stimulus package, this overspending of the budget, comes in a year when we have already had a deficit soar far higher than anyone contemplated.

Last year, the deficit reached $290 billion. It will be higher in this fiscal year. And so this proposal for additional spending comes to us not as something to increase spending in a year in which we have had a surplus, because we have not; it does not come to us as a way of increasing spending that get us up to the limit of the deficit which we planned for, because we have already exceeded it; it comes to us as a waiver of the spending limits that Congress has already set through the declaration of an emergency.

Now what is an emergency? If this spending is a problem because it does not truly fit the definition of an emergency, surely it is fair to ask whether it is an emergency that we are talking about.

Well, there does not appear to be a specific definition in the statute. The dictionary, though, defines emergency this way:

A sudden and unexpected turn of events calling for immediate action.

Well, is breaking the budget agreement unexpected? Hardly. This Congress has seemed to have done it on a rather consistent basis.

Is this an immediate action? No, this has been under contemplation for some period of time.

The closest that I have been able to find for a true definition of what an emergency is comes in a report on the cost of domestic and international emergencies that was put out by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget. This report dates from June 1991, but it is the closest thing we could find to an attempt by the executive branch to define emergency.

Here is what is says:

"For the purposes of defining spending provisions that qualify for an exemption, the President uses the definition of an emergency requirement that includes the following elements: the requirement is a necessary expenditure"—golf courses, necessary—"that is sudden"—ice skating rinks?—"urgent"—tennis courts?—"and unforeseen."

It is not permanent. These elements defined as follows; what follows is the definition included in this document.

"Necessary expenditures. An essential or vital expenditure, not one that is merely useful or beneficial."

Are the things included in this measure essential and vital? Are the golf courses essential for America's future? Are the swimming pools vital? My guess is this has far more to do with domestic politics and the rewarding of partisans than it has to do with anything that is essential or anything vital.

The definition continues:

"No. 2, it should be sudden. Sudden is defined as quickly coming into being, not building up over time."

Sudden ice skating rinks? Well, perhaps the water freezes overnight. But, beyond that, the warming of the ice skating rink hardly seems sudden.

"Urgent," the definition continues, "pressing, compelling, requiring immediate action."

When was the last time you saw a compelling tennis court?

Mr. President, this measure, this so-called emergency measure that is before this body, says a great deal more about this Congress' sense of humor than it does with regard to emergencies.

"Unforeseen," the definition continues, "not predictable or seen beforehand as a coming need. An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance would not be unforeseen."

Mr. President, how could anyone claim that the items that are listed in this amendment fit into that definition?

"Not permanent. The need is temporary in nature."

Mr. President, it is hard to imagine that these items come under the normal definitions.

Mr. President, I have further observations that I hope will refine the issue, but at this moment, I would like to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for bringing forward this amendment, because it highlights the problems which this bill has.

We are a nation which is running——

Ms. MIKULSKI. Point of order, Mr. President.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I always thought, under the rules of the Senate, when a Senator yielded to another Senator, it was for a question and not for an additional speech.

Would the Chair clarify that?

If I am out of order, then I would withdraw my objection. If not, I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would state his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator in his own right. My understanding was, he was to take the floor in his own right and not yielded to for a question.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I may continue my question of the Chair, has the Senator from Colorado yielded to the Senator or yielded the floor? And when one yields to a Senator, is it not normally for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. My understanding was that the Senator from Colorado had yielded the floor and that the Senator from New Hampshire had sought recognition.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, this Senator—continuing my parliamentary inquiry—this Senator has been standing for some time.

Had the Senator said "I yield the floor," this Senator would have claimed, along with the Senator from New Hampshire, the right for the Chair's attention, but I do not believe it happened quite that way.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, certainly my intention was that Senators here would have an opportunity to speak. I will certainly complete my remarks at another time.

I would be happy to yield the floor.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, regular order. I believe the Chair had already recognized me in my own right, if I interpret the Chair's statement correctly.

Now, I do not really know that we need to have an extended parliamentary discussion here.

Ms. MILKULSKI. I would like the Reporter to read back what the Senator from Colorado said. He said, "I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire" before yielding the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, please.

The Chair's understanding was that the Senator from Colorado yielded the floor, and I did recognize the Senator from New Hampshire.

The Senator from Maryland now asks to be recognized, and I am recognizing the Senator from Maryland——

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the event the Senator is asking a point of order or some other consideration.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, regular order. Parliamentary inquiry. I believe I was recognized and have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Thank you Mr. President.

Again, I wish to rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, who has, I think, done this body a service by bringing forward an amendment which clearly highlights the problem with this supplemental appropriation, which has been called an economic stimulus package. We are, as a nation, running approximately a $300 billion deficit, something which the people of this country are extremely concerned about.

Those of us who stood for election in the last electoral cycle heard a great deal about the deficit and talked a great deal about the deficit. Yet, as one of the first major items for legislation before this body, we find that we are confronted with a $16 billion-plus supplemental which will aggravate the deficit by that amount of dollars. It is able to avoid the traditional rules relative to the budget process by being cited as an emergency event. And what the amendment of the Senator from Colorado does so clearly is point out that there is nothing about this supplemental, or at least about the items that are affected by this amendment, which have in their nature anything to do with an emergency.

There are 24 projects for bike paths in this supplemental, representing $40 million—24 bike path projects. As the Senator from Colorado so aptly pointed out, that is not an emergency.

Within those bike path proposals which will be funded, according to the mayors' list of what the projects are, as was outlined by the Senator from Colorado, they are not only building bike paths but there is $800,000 for research on bike paths. There are $450,000 for widening existing bike paths. And there is $165,000 for something called the Ice-age trail. One does not know whether you can go on the Ice-age trail on a bicycle or not. But let us assume that you can and therefore we will put it under the bike path list—24 projects which are represented as maybe funded by this proposal dealing with bike paths. There are 13 projects which are represented that may be funded which involve parking lots. That is 17 million dollars' worth of parking lots. I am sure this Nation is in great need of parking lots. But we do not happen to have the money right now to declare an emergency to go out and build a lot of parking lots. There are 15 projects which are represented that may be funded involving baseball fields and tennis courts—21 million dollars worth of baseball fields and tennis courts.

What is the emergency that we need baseball fields and tennis courts? None of them will get built by this spring anyway when the baseball season starts, so it is not for this baseball season, if that were the emergency, and I doubt if that falls under the term "emergency," even the most elastic application of that word.

The problem here is that what we have is a classic piece of legislation, it is going to spend a lot of money on a lot of projects which a lot of community leaders may want but which are not necessarily needed and which we clearly cannot afford and which are obviously not an emergency. And it is totally appropriate that these funding mechanisms which would fund these items, as they have been proposed or requested by the mayors and leaders of these various communities, should be deleted from the bill.

Thus, the Senator from Colorado has done us a considerable service by bringing forward this amendment to strike from the bill what I believe is somewhere in the vicinity of $100 million of funding, with specific reference to these titles and these projects so that we will not have this sort of spending occurring at this time.

Now, it may be that these projects make sense. But they do not qualify as an emergency. And if they do make sense, they need to be paid for. That is the problem we have here with this whole piece of legislation. These are just examples, egregious ones I believe, but they are examples of the fundamental flaw that this legislation represents, which is that it is spending that is not paid for. It is spending which will aggravate the deficit, and it is spending, as a result of which, it will not generate economic growth but will generate economic contraction.

Because the American people are smart enough to understand that, you are not going to expand this economy by continuing to expand this deficit. In fact, their message was very clear on that point, I believe, last November. They want the deficit brought under control. They want cuts in spending to occur. They do not want us to undertake new spending without paying for it. What they would really like us to do is reduce the deficit, not aggravate the deficit as this proposal does.

That is what they have asked for. Yet in this piece of legislation we get just the opposite. This section of this bill could best be called, not an economic stimulus bill, but a bill to promote baseball and bicycling in America. We can call it the bike path bill. Or we could call it the parking lot bill. Or we could call it the baseball field bill. But let us not call it the economic stimulus bill, because it is not. It is a bill to take care of community interests which may be in order at some point to address but at this time are not. It is a bill which has in it a lot of items which simply are not an emergency. That is regrettable.

Therefore, I strongly endorse the efforts of the Senator from Colorado, first, to highlight this failure of this bill and point out that there is nothing in the nature of an emergency about it, especially as it applies to these items; and, second, to point out that these items are not going to energize economic activity. In fact, a number of them ironically create no jobs at all.

There is the building of three bike paths in Modesto, CA, which are identified as creating no jobs. There are a group of projects in San Luis Obispo, CA, which cost $1 million which create no jobs. There are a group of projects representing $8 million in Fort Pierce, FL, which create no jobs. There are a series of projects in Atlanta, GA, totaling almost $10 million, which create no jobs. They involve replacing a gym and restoring a historic cemetery, but they are represented as creating no jobs.

There is a project in Maui, CA, for $1.3 million, which creates no jobs. There are four projects in Gary, IN, representing $1.1 million, which create no jobs. There is a playground in Cedar Rapids, IA, which creates no jobs. And on and on the list goes.

It is not a jobs promotion effort. It is not an emergency effort. It is your classic "let us go out there and spend some dollars from the taxpayers' wallets" effort. It is a baseball bill, and a parking lot bill, and a bike path bill. And it should be called that. Let us apply none of these euphemisms to it. And it is inappropriate because the American people have to pay for it. And the next generation has to pay for it because the dollars are not here to pay for it. This is a deficit bill and, as such, it aggravates and puts weight upon the future opportunity for prosperity of our children. And it is a mistake.

Therefore, I again congratulate the Senator from Colorado for having brought forward this amendment which so targets and points out the fundamental flaw of the theory behind this bill with some very specific points—24 bike path projects, $40 million; 1 parking lot, $17 million; 5 bus stops, $3 million; 15 baseball fields or tennis courts, $21 million. How do we explain that to the folks back home?

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

Mr. GREGG. Is the question put to the Chair?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I will yield to the Senator for a question. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUTENBERG). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator point to these items in this bill? Can he find a single one of these items that he has been talking about in this bill?

Mr. GREGG. As the Senator from West Virginia knows, those items are not specifically listed in the bill. The dollars that fund those items are in the bill. As I would point out to you, Secretary Peña has said those items will be spent——

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado to read a statement which reflects the answer to the question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a question about yielding the floor. The Senator has no right to yield the floor to another Senator for a statement. The Senator has a right to respond to a question if he so chooses, but that is the extent of the Senator's right to yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the President for that point. I believe the Senator from Colorado has a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire respond to the question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. GREGG. I believe I did. I will be happy to respond further, Mr. President, by stating the dollar figure for this spending is in this bill. The specific projects are not listed in the bill, but the process by which the administration intends to fund projects has been clearly outlined by the administration leadership and the Cabinet Secretaries, who are responsible for the community development block grant, and we have the list from the mayors.

In fact, the President said he wants projects that are ready to go, and he has asked for that list of the specific proposals we talked about.

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

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

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado for a question, and I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator believe that the statement of Secretary Cisneros of February 23, 1993, to the Veterans, HUD Subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations in the House in which he says, "I have in front of me a list from the United States Conference of Mayors of projects ready to go under the Community Development Block Grant Program," does the Senator believe that that statement is an affirmation that that is how the administration intends to spend the money?

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his question. And I will say that, yes, I do, and in fact believe the President has also made that clear when stating that he wanted these projects to be ready to go and he asked the mayors and the Governors to come forward with a list of projects. The projects which we have been citing in this discussion have been projects which were excerpted from the mayors' list of ready-to-go projects. And the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered specifically addresses those projects so that there can be no doubt but that those projects will not be funded.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. I believe I said I would yield to the Senator from West Virginia first for a question, and then I will yield to the Senator from Texas for a question. But the Senator from Maryland wishes to get the floor, so it is not a question of——

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Maryland is very patient, and I will be happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia for any questions he might have for the next hour and a half.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire realize that Mr. Panetta has written a letter, which I have placed in the RECORD, a letter that was addressed to me, in which he says, "Let me assure you that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded"? Is the Senator aware of that letter?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I have seen this letter you are referring to, and I presume—well, I yield further to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator aware of the statement that the President stated to the effect that those who talk about these fictitious projects could look for years and they would never find them in this bill? Can the Senator point to these items in this bill?

Mr. GREGG. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the question of the Senator from West Virginia. I believe I addressed that.

The point is that in this bill, there are not specific projects listed. However, the funding for the community development block grant is as a gross figure in the bill.

What the Senator from Colorado is offering his amendment for is to make sure that the specific list, which has been referred to as the list we believe will be the funded list—and I think it has been in the public domain for quite a while; certainly, Secretary Cisneros was aware of it when he made his statement, as a mayors' list, and the President specifically asked for such a list from Governors and mayors of projects that are ready to go—that that is the list that I think is logically going to be the list that is funded off of, because that is the ready-to-go-list, and the President already said he wants to get things going now.

Of course, on that list are these items, and that is what we are talking about deleting.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. For a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Yes.

Is the distinguished Senator aware that on the first amendment adopted to this bill the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, listed by name projects from the same list that you speak of when he specifically forbade funds being used from this act to pay for white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Texas for pointing that out. I believe that to be an accurate statement.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a question from the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. GREGG. I will follow up with the Senator from Texas for a question, and then I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware, in an amendment previously offered, that none of the funds in the bill would be allowed to be spent on golf courses and cemeteries?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I believe the Senator from West Virginia made that his first amendment to the bill.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware that fisheries atlases and studies of the sicklefin chub were also specifically excluded?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I believe the Senator from West Virginia made that as part of his first amendment.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware that there was a major difference, however, between the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking member and the amendment offered by Senator BROWN?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, there is a significant difference because, as the Senator from Texas knows, Senator BROWN's

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 5) 26

amendment specifically defunds those projects or makes it inappropriate to fund those projects which are listed on the mayor's list, which include baseball parks, the swimming holes, and the bike paths, and the art ark, which is a project in San Francisco. I am not sure what it is. It sort of sounds interesting, actually, but probably is not necessary at this time, whatever an art ark is. And some of the other items which have been listed by the Senator from Colorado and myself.

Mr. GRAMM. I want to thank the Senator for yielding because it seems to me it is very important to understand that this is an amendment which has already been adopted, and it seeks to do exactly the same thing except with one fundamental difference; and that is, Senator BROWN's amendment deletes the money, whereas the earlier amendment simply requires that it be shifted to another project.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Texas. And I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Brown amendment, and I do it on the basis that this is the heavy hand of the Federal Government at its absolute worst. It will turn the U.S. Senate into a Federal city council making microdecisions about what community development block grant projects would be funded and what would not be funded. It violates the basic principle of the statute as established under the administration of President Gerald Ford and his very able Secretary of HUD, Carla Hills.

President Ford and Carla Hills knew that it was time to break through the way the Federal Government handled housing projects and wanted to follow the principles of self-determination, the belief that people who are the most affected should have the most to say, and to empower local communities on how to fight back and raise the level of employment and help our communities revitalize. That is when they came in with the Community Development Block Grant Program that did not go into categorical funding, did not go on to a long list of mandates, but gave block grants to local government so that government, the city council, and the mayor closest to the people could decide what they needed to do in order to create affordable housing, to eliminate poverty, and to bring about neighborhood revitalization.

Now we come in with this very specific, microamendment eliminating these 54 projects that do not even exist in terms of the law, but recommending that funding be eliminated. That is not what the community development block grant was created to do. I chair the subcommittee. I know the purpose of the law. But it is not what Senator MIKULSKI thinks. It goes back to what Gerald Ford and Carla Hills thought, and what they said was this: That we needed to give maximum flexibility to our communities, and their job to give maximum flexibility was Federal funds to provide decent housing, suitable living environment by expanding economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons.

And that we would give money on the basis of a formula, and the formula would be the extent of the poverty in a community, its population, its overcrowding, how old the housing was, and its population growth lag in relationship to the other metropolitan statistical areas; and the whole purpose of the idea was that communities develop their own programs, their own funding priorities but limited to those that would be eligible, that would benefit low- to moderate-income families, eliminate or prevent slums, and meet other development needs.

Now, I know a lot about these programs, having been in the Baltimore City Council, and therefore I know the difference between being a councilwoman and being a Senator. But often these minimum or small items will leverage a tremendous amount of private sector money. What might seem to be a small item, or even a frivolous item here, in a local community can mean the life or death of a community, could mean the leverage of private sector funds, or could be that funding that anchors and acts as a magnet for other funding to come in from other sources.

What I believe we should be doing is not speculating about these 54 items but passing President Bill Clinton's package so that whether you are a Democratic mayor or whether you are a Republican mayor, you are, first of all, the mayor of your city and you decide with your city council and the mandated consultation with your community groups about what you need and not have Senators tell you what you should have and what you should not have.

We go through legislation after legislation and we hear about how we need flexibility, how the Federal Government should not be coming up with mandates, how we should not micromanage the Federal budget, and yet this is exactly what this does. The Senator from Colorado, who offered this amendment, I recall in last year's debate on my appropriation led the charge about too many Federal mandates and too many resources over the safe drinking water laws in my EPA account. The Senator made excellent points, because we do know that we have too many mandates with too few resources.

But now they would turn this principle on its head by restricting Federal money for projects that will go through a mayor, a city council or a county council, and a local hearing process. This amendment defies the very principle of self-determination. That was the purpose of the bill. We are the United States of America. We travel around the world. We are for freedom. We are for democracy. We are for self-determination of nations and local communities. Why should we not be for self-determination of the community development block grant? We are for freedom of choice. We want to give freedom of choice for vouchers in our public schools. If we want freedom of choice for vouchers in our public schools, should we not give freedom of choice to mayors and local governments who know how to spend for their own priorities?

I stand here to defend the principle of the community development block grant. I stand here with the legacy of Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush that says the local people have the most to say, and therefore I urge the Senate to reject this heavy-handed intrusion of the Federal Government into local decision-making.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment would delete a specific amount of money for a fictitious list of projects that never would have been funded in the first place, and the amendment which Senator HATFIELD and I added earlier provides that "the Secretary" of HUD "shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading."

Mr. President, this is much ado about nothing, and I am going to move to table shortly, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Texas wishes me to yield to him first. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, what I had hoped to do was to get recognized to speak for about 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] for not to exceed 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I retain my rights to the floor, after which I expect to move to table the amendment.

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HATFIELD. Reserving the right to——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I had yielded the floor as a courtesy to other Senators who did not want to wait until the end of my statement introducing the amendment, and I would simply prevail on the distinguished Senator from West Virginia my hope

that he might allow me 5 minutes to finish my statement before he might move to table this amendment. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. President, at this moment I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, then I could move to table now, but I hesitate to do that because we have Senators out on both sides. I did not want to move to table at this point. I was going to yield to the distinguished Senator for 10 minutes and would like to accommodate the Senator. That would give some time for Senators to be notified that there is a motion to table about to be made.

Does the distinguished Senator from Oregon wish to have some time also?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I objected because 10 minutes to go directly to a vote is not sufficient time to gather back the Members who are now off the Hill. That was the only reason I objected. The Senator indicated he would have 10 minutes extended here to the Senator from Texas, at the end of which he would make the motion to table. I am only saying that 10 minutes is not sufficient.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. Mr. President, I make the request that I may yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], and that I be protected in my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for allowing me to speak for 10 minutes before he moves to table the amendment.

I would like to try very briefly to define where we are, what the underlying bill is about, what the amendment is about, and then raise a couple of questions that hopefully the distinguished author of the amendment can answer. And I have one question that I would pose to others.

But let me begin by saying that we have before us a $16 billion spending bill. It is being considered under a special provision whereby this bill is being deemed an emergency, which creates a loophole through which $16 billion can be spent and not one penny of it will count as spending, not one penny of it will count as deficit, and yet it is real money being spent on real things, that we are going to have to go out and borrow and that we are going to have to pay interest on and that we are going to have to pay back.

The reason this extraordinary provision is in the bill is that without it, under the current law of the land, it would be illegal to consider President Clinton's economic stimulus package because it violates the law. The law sets out a level of spending above which we cannot go in this fiscal year and next fiscal year. This was part of an agreement whereby the American taxpayer paid $152 billion of new taxes in 1990 to get this constraint imposed on spending; but, by calling this bill an emergency, we are going to sweep all of that aside and spend $16 billion the week after we passed a budget that we claimed would reduce the deficit.

I suggest, Mr. President, that to pass this bill, to spend $16 billion and say it is not spending, to borrow $16 billion and say it is not deficit, and not to count any of it on the official books of the Federal Government and comply with existing law, places in doubt our credibility about our commitment to deal with the deficit.

I bet I have had 100 people come up to me in the last 2 weeks and say, "Are they going to cut spending before they raise taxes, before they fund these new programs?" I am sure many of my colleagues on the floor have had many questions similar to that posed to them.

We have our answer tonight. Our first action tonight is to increase spending by $16 billion.

Let me try to define what it is we are talking about, in case someone is watching this debate, Mr. President, and is confused. We have $16 billion of new spending in this bill; $2.5 billion of it comes from the community development block grants; another large chunk of money comes from the Transportation Department; and what those two departments have done is they have gone to mayors all over the country and said, put together a ready list of projects that you would like to spend money on, because we are going to make some money available and we can fund these projects. What the distinguished Senator from Colorado has done is, he has taken the ready list that lists the spending that would be undertaken by the cities with these grant funds.

We have heard tonight from our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that these lists are not real. That is a strange statement, given that the first amendment that was adopted on this bill was an amendment that specifically said none of the funds would be spent on golf courses, and cemeteries, that none of the funds would support white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River, that we would have no fisheries atlases printed with this money, and that there would be no studies of the sicklefin chub with this money.

Where did these names come from? These names came out of the list, the ready list, that our distinguished colleague from Colorado is trying to strip provisions from.

Why is it that it is OK not to fund the sicklefin chub, but it is OK to fund all of these other projects that the distinguished Senator from Colorado has identified and wishes to strike? Did the earlier amendment adopted by the Senate contain the entire list of potential pork that could be funded with this borrowed $16 billion?

Well, the distinguished Senator from Colorado does not think so. He has other provisions. But I will tell you something. One of the things he does is he takes out the money as well as the projects. Quite frankly, I think if the American people could vote on it, probably 99 percent of them would do the same thing.

I would like to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator cannot ask a question. He can yield the floor. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Would the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. GRAMM. The distinguished chairman is saying that I cannot ask him a question.

Mr. BYRD. That is according to the rules. Another Senator can ask the Senator from Texas a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me—I can make my points without going through the asking of the question.

Our distinguished colleague has listed a lot of pork, bacon, sausage, pigs knuckles, but there is a lot left in here that he has not yet scratched. Throughout this bill we have graffiti abatement, we have bike paths that are not touched by this amendment, we have an ice skating warming hut in Manchester, CT. We construct a casino building in West Haven, CT.

I was wondering—I cannot pose a question under the rules and under the 10 minutes I have by unanimous consent—I notice that the chairman and the ranking member prohibit expenditures on cemeteries, but I notice a provision in Atlanta, GA, $2.5 million to repair a historic wall around a cemetery. I was wondering—maybe I should make a parliamentary inquiry, which I can do on my time.

Mr. President, with the amendment adopted earlier which prohibited funds under the community development block grant in this act to be used for a golf course or a cemetery project, in the opinion of the Parliamentarian, would that prohibition include the repair of a historic wall around a cemetery?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot speculate as to the legal effect of that.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, if I could pose a question to my colleague from Colorado, in Niles, IL, we have a water tank that is going to be painted. And I wonder, Mr. President, if anybody really believes that we will pro-

mote jobs, growth, and opportunity in America, that we will promote competitiveness, that we will put our people back to work by painting water tanks in Niles, IL. I am sure that they want to paint that water tank. But I am also sure if they have been wanting to paint that water tank for a long time, when these two new Cabinet secretaries said we want to spend money, send us ways to spend money, somebody in Niles, IL, said you know, we have been wanting to paint this water tank for a long time, and we never thought it was worth it. But there is somebody in Washington, DC, that honest to goodness believes that it might be worth it and we are going to put in on this list if they provide the money.

Sure enough, we are going to get it out and we are going to send in this proposal. We are going to paint that water tank.

Mr. President, we do not have $16 billion. We are going to have to borrow every single penny of it. If Niles, IL, is not willing to paint their own water tank, if they think it is such a low priority that they do not want to do it, why in the world would we want to do it?

If they are not willing to put up money to build casinos in Connecticut, why in the world would we want to do it?

If they will not build trolleys in Pensacola, FL, with their own money, why should we do it?

That is the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes is up.

Several Senators addressed the Chair

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a fictitious list that we are hearing read tonight.

This so-called list comes from a 1,700-page report which was a bipartisan survey, overseen by a Republican mayor. It is over $7.2 billion in community development and transportation projects that are capable of immediate startup. Not one of these items is in this bill. The distinguished Senator from Texas, the items that he mentioned, water tank, is it in the bill? No.

Mr. GRAMM. Would the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. The casinos? No? None.

He says "throughout this bill," and he went on to name a long list of items that he says would be funded with the moneys in this bill. "Throughout this bill," those are his exact words. "Throughout this bill." Those items are not throughout this bill. They are not included in the bill at all.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Well, in a moment.

The Appropriations Committee, when it marked up the bill, included a statement that Senator HOLLINGS suggested, and it is as follows:

"During House of Representatives debate on H.R. 1335, numerous assertions were made * * *" Several Senators have asked, "Where did Senator HATFIELD and Senator BYRD get the items that they included in their amendment?" Well, this answers that question, the statement itself, which accompanies the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. It says,

During House of Representatives debate on H.R. 1335, numerous assertions were made that the President's economic stimulus program earmarked funds for lower priority profits. Included were such items as, one, community development grants for golf courses and cemeteries; two, fisheries, atlases, and studies of the Sicklefin chub; three, construction of white water canoeing facilities; four, payments for a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration class 6 computer.

On March 22, 1993, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget wrote to assure the committee that these types of low priority projects were not proposed in the legislation submitted by the President and would not be funded. The Director committed to work with Cabinet members and the Appropriations Committees to ensure that economic stimulus funding is used only for programs of merit and not for the types of projects discussed during House debate.

These items, then, were discussed during the House debate. Senator HOLLINGS proposed that we include in our statement language that clearly points out that these types of items are not to be funded, and indicates in the statement that the Director of OMB had written to the committee to assure that these items were not proposed in the legislation, not submitted by the President, and would not be funded.

Furthermore, Mr. President, Senator HATFIELD and I offered an amendment—and it was agreed to—and it is in the substitute before the Senate, which reads as follows, and I will read an excerpt: "* * * provided that the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading."

So Senator HATFIELD and I are requiring—and the Senate adopted this amendment—that the Secretary of HUD publish in the Federal Register such requirement necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading.

That is protection for all Senators, and for the people, against the use of funds for such items. Mr. Panetta, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget stated in a letter addressed to me on March 22, 1993, as follows:

Let me assure you that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded.

So there you have it, Mr. President. You have the President of the United States saying that you can search in this bill for years and you will not find these items. He is exactly right. You have the Director of OMB stating succinctly that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated—speculated—would be funded. You have a statement by the committee itself, which I have already read.

So, Mr. President, this is a list, as I say, a 1,700-page report, and it identifies over $7.2 billion of community development and transportation projects that are capable of immediate startup. So we could go into that list and we can pick hundreds; anyone can select hundreds of additional items, I am sure, from the list and say, look, these are the items that are going to be funded; and they could say, it has been said here that, throughout this bill, "throughout this bill" can be found these items.

They are not in the bill—not in the bill. And so from the standpoint of what is actually being voted on here, it is a fictitious list. It is a fictitious list that would not ever be funded under the conditions that are in the statement in the amendment offered by Mr. HATFIELD and myself, and in accordance with the assurances of the President and the OMB Director.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. HATFIELD and I have provided a guarantee that such items would not be funded with our provision that the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I understand that another 8 minutes are needed for Senators to be put on notice and given a time in which to arrive.

So I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I make an observation?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object. I say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that I would also like to request 3 minutes in a similar fashion.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico 3 minutes and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN],

the author of the amendment, 3 minutes, and that I may be protected in my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any objections?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for this amendment, because I think it truly points up what this stimulus package is all about. There can be all kinds of discussions here on the floor as to what list of projects is governing, but I think it is obvious to anybody that attended the National League of Cities convention here in this town that what is really intended is to help mayors by giving them projects that they want in their communities. That is what this list is.

To say that we do not know which part of that list is going to be funded, and therefore, your amendment, somehow or another misses the mark, is to ignore the reality that a substantial portion of that list is for these various projects that the American people would, under no condition, believe to be an emergency, much less a stimulus. It just happens that some of them are going to be funded, unless amendments like this, or even subsequent amendments, take more and more out of that wish list, that pork barrel list promised to the mayors of America, if they would help the President of the United States. I happened to go to that convention, so I know of what I am speaking.

Having said that, I want to tell the Senate what we are going to do when we finally adopt the stimulus package. We have gone through 10 days of debate about a deficit reduction package. Listen to me carefully, fellow Senators. The sum total of domestic cuts in the President's package in the next 5 years is a net of $7 billion.

We are tomorrow sometime going to pass a spending package that, if my appropriations staff is correct, totals more than $16 billion. Actually, it is $16 billion in spending authority for ordinary programs and $3.2 billion additional money out of the highway trust fund.

So we are going to spend $19.3 billion and wipe out all the savings we got in the President's deficit reduction package because it only has a net $7 billion in domestic savings.

Believe you me, the American people ought to understand that, on the one hand, we cut a net $7 billion over 5 years, and 2 days later we come to the floor wringing our hands about the deficit and about jobs and we spend over $19 billion. This bill more than wipes out the entire domestic savings that are in that big multi-year deficit reduction package that we are waiting to be reconciled to control the deficit. I do not believe we really ought to do any of this package, but the Senator from Colorado is on the right track pointing out what is in it.

I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator COVERDELL as cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN. And I ask unanimous consent to add Senator GRAMM from Texas as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, let me also thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He certainly has a right to offer a motion to table at any time, and I appreciate his willingness to give me 3 minutes to wind up my additional arguments on this amendment.

Mr. President, part of the discussion has been how in the world we got this list of projects. I did not come up with this list of projects. This list of projects I got from a Member of the House of Representatives who sat in on the session where Secretary Cisneros told the committee what they were going to spend the money on. I have read into the RECORD the verbatim statement from the transcript of the committee hearing where he said that. This is not invented. This is the verbatim transcript out of his testimony.

This is a copy of the document he put his hands on when he says, "I have in front of me a list from the U.S. Conference of Mayors." That is this list. This is the list that he handed out.

Now, some of my friends have said that this is just speculation. This is not speculation. This is what the Secretary said, and this is what the Secretary put his hand on in terms of a list.

Some have said, "Well, we do not mean to fund those." If they feel that way, I hope they will vote for this amendment because this is what this amendment accomplishes. This amendment makes sure they do not fund them because it names them specifically and it takes the money out of the bill. If you do not want swimming pools funded under the guise of an emergency, vote "yes."

The question we have is: Are golf courses urgent? Are swimming pools vital? Are tennis courts emergencies? Are skating rinks essential? If you really think they are essential and vital emergencies, then by all means vote "no."

The fundamental difference that is here in this bill is this. Some people honestly and sincerely believe the way to build a strong economy is with a high deficit and more Federal spending and make-work projects such as laid out here that do not contribute to the productiveness of this Nation.

If you think a $290 billion deficit is not enough, or $300 billion is not enough to provide a stimulus, the crying need of America is more deficit spending, then vote against the amendment. If you think making America competitive again depends on efficiency, productivity, and investment, if you think eliminating silly, nonsensical, wasteful Government spending is wrong, then vote for this amendment. This gives you a chance. This amendment has teeth in it. This amendment shoots real bullets. It shoots $103½ million of bullets because that is what it cuts out of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes are up.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the Senator from West Virginia is now recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader such time as he may require without losing my right to the floor.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this amendment could be called Broadway Comes to the Senate. One of the most popular Broadway shows of recent years was the "Phantom of the Opera." This is a phantom amendment which takes items that are not in the bill and says we should eliminate them from the bill. Not one of these specific projects is in the nature that we are debating, not one.

We could make up an amendment that took 23 pages out of the encyclopedia and say those should be stricken from the bill. We could make up an amendment that took three pages out of the phone book and say those should be stricken from the bill.

These measures are not in the bill. So no one should think when we vote to eliminate these projects that we are voting to eliminate them from the bill because they are not there.

One related point: Throughout the past decade, over and over again in this Senate the debate raged over what level of government should be responsible for what measures. And we were told over and over again that the proper level of government for making decisions ought to be the Senate and the local governments.

I recall very clearly when the debate involved revenue sharing in this Chamber. That debate said that it is not up to us at the Federal level to make these decisions. We should be leaving them to the Governors and the mayors because they know their areas best.

This, of course, reverses that argument. This simply says that we are to preclude any judgment, any decision-

making, any input by Governors and mayors in this process. So let us be clear about what is involved here.

This amendment does not involve these projects. They are not in the bill. This amendment is part of a continuing assault on President Clinton and President Clinton's economic program. We had dozens of such amendments on the budget resolution. They did not succeed and now the effort resumes again.

Stop the President's program. That is what this amendment is about. Do not let President Clinton have a chance to get started. Do whatever is necessary to undermine the President's program—anything that President Clinton proposes. And everything that President Clinton proposes our colleagues want to prevent. That is what this is about.

This is an effort to continue the policies of the past 4 years as opposed to having a change in policy—as opposed to having a new economic policy. The American people said in November they wanted change in policies, and they changed Presidents to accomplish that change in policies.

So the question here is not on some list of projects that is not in the bill. The question here, as it has been for the past few weeks, is whether they are going to support or oppose the President, whether we want to undermine the President's program before it gets started, or whether we want to give President Clinton a chance. That is the issue here.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I would like to join with my colleague from Tennessee and take this opportunity to set the record straight with regard to a project that is of importance to our State.

There has been much controversy in recent days regarding certain projects that some have speculated would be funded by this bill. The bill and report do not include the projects. Nevertheless, critics have complained that the money to be appropriated could be used for purposes that are not directly related to economic stimulus and job creation. The committee's report and the amendment passed last Thursday by voice vote, make clear that the money provided in this bill, cannot be used for programs or projects that are not directly related to economic stimulus, or are of low priority.

One project cited by critics and in the report and amendment is Forest Service funding for whitewater canoeing. This cryptic reference fails to describe adequately the project at issue, and I believe it is necessary to provide additional background to ensure that this funding is properly evaluated in the future.

The Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games has chosen the Ocoee River in Polk County, TN, as the site for the 1996 Olympic games whitewater slalom events. Since 1977, the Ocoee has been the site for extensive recreational and commercial whitewater rafting activities. The river's challenging rapids and its proximity to Atlanta make it an ideal site for the whitewater events. The State of Tennessee has worked closely with the Atlanta Olympic Organizing Committee and pledged its support for holding the events in Polk County.

As the Senator is aware, the Ocoee River and surrounding lands are owned and managed by the Federal Government. Facilities to improve access to the site, and to support increased visitation to the area, are crucial if the events are to be staged successfully and without a negative impact on these Federal lands. Those facilities will be permanent improvements under the jurisdiction and control of the Forest Service. In fact, language in the Senate report accompanying the fiscal year 1993 Interior appropriations bill (S. Rpt. 102-345, p. 82) specifies that any funds provided for this purpose be used only for public-use improvements that will extend to the post-Olympic years.

The Forest Service has provided initial funding for design and concept work on the project, with assistance from the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Economic Development Administration. In addition, the State of Tennessee has provided $200,000 for the project and is prepared to contribute several million dollars in addition. The project will also depend on substantial private funding, and a structure for private fundraising efforts is being put in place.

There is ample precedent for the Federal Government providing financial assistance to international athletic events, even in cases where the event is not being held on Federal lands. More than $110 million was given in support of the 1980 Winter Olympics in Lake Placid. In 1987, the Pan-American games received more than $34 million in Federal funds and in-kind assistance. There are numerous other examples of such Federal help, including assistance provided to the 1990 Goodwill games and the 1993 World University games. I believe that the 1996 Olympic whitewater events—which will be held entirely on Federal lands—deserve the same kind of support.

Mr. President, my colleague from Tennessee and I have not sought and do not seek to designate any of the emergency funding provided in this bill for the Ocoee project. We agree that while funding for the project is time sensitive, it does not warrant funding in the President's economic stimulus package. Our concern is that this project may be deemed wasteful or without merit simply because of its mention among the types of projects that are singled out for exclusion. Many of those projects may indeed be wasteful, but others, like the Ocoee project, should be excluded only because they do not qualify as an emergency under the terms of this bill. I am hopeful that the Senator from West Virginia will work with us during the normal budget and appropriations process to see that this project is adequately funded.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, my colleague from Tennessee, Senator SASSER, raises a very important point with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Discussions in the House of Representatives and here in the Senate have stipulated that funding support for the Olympic whitewater events on the Ocoee River does not constitute emergency spending. While Senator SASSER and I agree that such funding should not be categorized as emergency spending, and thus should not be included in the stimulus package, we disagree with those that categorize such funds as wasteful.

The area surrounding the Ocoee River is almost entirely owned by the Federal Government and depends greatly upon the activities managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Having come recently from the Governor's office in Tennessee, I realize how much the area has come to depend upon recreation activities as a source for local income. For this reason, I hope that we will not jump to the conclusion that future funds for the whitewater events of the Olympic games of 1996 are wasteful spending.

Future funds appropriated through the Forest Service will be supplemental to those provided by the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, the State of Tennessee, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and private sponsors. These moneys will be used for developments along the river corridor that will support the Olympic events, but also will provide economic benefits to the community long after the Olympics events are over. I view these moneys as an economic investment in a rural community which is as much in need of Federal assistance as any part of the country.

Mr. President, 54 percent of the land in Polk County, through which the Ocoee River runs, belongs to the Federal Government. The local government derives over 25 percent of its annual income from recreation associated with these Federal lands. This is a community which is struggling to survive, and the opportunity which the Olympics will provide will assist Polk County and the entire region in becoming more self sufficient. Future appropriations will be investments in these communities, not wasteful spending.

I join Senator SASSER in this effort to clear up any misunderstandings that funds were being appropriated for whitewater canoeing under emergency appropriations. However, I feel that future funds should be available to the

Forest Service so that they might support completion of the whitewater venue for the 1996 Olympics. This is a time-sensitive matter that I plan to pursue with Senator BYRD and other members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would be attractive if the amendment only said that none of the community development block grant funds in this bill could be spent on the projects he enumerated. I, too, question whether those projects are emergencies which justify new spending without offsetting spending cuts.

However, the Brown amendment goes beyond just limiting projects for which funds cannot be spent. It also actually cuts from the bill $100 million, which is the amount equivalent to the cost of those projects. The flaw in this amendment is that there may well be other projects which would still qualify for community development block grant funding even after the Brown amendment is adopted which could utilize the full $2.5 billion that the President has proposed in his stimulus package. However, because the Brown amendment would have stricken $100 million from the bill, those other legitimate projects would not be fully funded. So, although the Brown amendment is headed in the right direction, it overshoots the mark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe that all Senators have had sufficient notice now. There is going to be a motion to table.

Mr. LEAHY. Let us vote.

Mr. BYRD. We will vote in just a minute.

I announced that such a motion would be made about 25 minutes ago.

I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to table the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boren	Hollings	Pell
Boxer	Kerry	Pryor
Bradley	Kohl	Reid
Breaux	Krueger	Riegle
Bryan	Lautenberg	Robb
Bumpers	Leahy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Levin	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lieberman	Sasser
Dodd	Mathews	Simon
Dorgan	Metzenbaum	Wellstone
Feingold	Mikulski	Wofford
Feinstein	Mitchell	

NAYS—48

Bennett	Exon	McCain
Bond	Faircloth	McConnell
Brown	Graham	Murkowski
Burns	Gramm	Nickles
Byrd	Grassley	Nunn
Chafee	Gregg	Packwood
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Jeffords	Simpson
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
Danforth	Kerrey	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Durenberger	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—8

Biden	Gorton	Johnston
Campbell	Heflin	Kennedy
DeConcini	Inouye	

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 279) was rejected.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I qualify to move to reconsider. I make such a motion and am prepared to go out and have the vote tomorrow morning. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the leader for the purposes of his moving to go out.

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I can move if the leader will tell me what time he wants to go out.

Mr. GRAMM. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

Mr. BYRD. I have the floor. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GRAMM. Is it in order on a motion to reconsider to debate that motion or to yield the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would you restate the question?

Mr. GRAMM. Is it in order on a motion to reconsider to debate that motion or to yield the floor to someone else?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia made a motion to reconsider the vote, having voted on the prevailing side. The motion to reconsider is——

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I guess I should state it more precisely. Is the motion to reconsider debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the underlying question is nondebatable, the motion to reconsider in this case is similarly nondebatable.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, the Senator from West Virginia has made a motion to reconsider. That is not a debatable motion. At the request of a very large number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, I agreed that this would be the last vote today. Therefore, I believe it would be most unfortunate were we now to proceed to a vote on the motion to reconsider.

I therefore suggest that the best course of action under the circumstances, with a large number of Senators having left, is to proceed to a vote on the motion to reconsider tomorrow.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Would it be the objective of the Senator, since this is not debatable, that we would set a time in the morning when we could vote on it again?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, that is my intention. I always discuss that with the distinguished Republican leader and members of the staff.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the distinguished leader, and on that basis I am happy with the decision.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977 AMENDMENTS

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of S. 284 and the Senate

proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 284) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 280

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I send a substitute amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator PRESSLER and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 280.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994."

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I rise today to offer a substitute amendment to S. 284. I am pleased to report that this substitute represents an agreement worked out between all parties involved in this legislation. As a result, I am hopeful that this legislation will be passed by Congress and signed by the President very soon.

The substitute to S. 284 addresses two provisions in the law that address State administration of the Food Stamp Program. Specifically, this substitute delays implementation of a provision enacted as part of the 1900 farm bill requiring States to stagger food stamp issuance for families living on reservations. This provision has never been implemented. It is set to take effect on April 1, 1993. Therefore, the legislation we are passing today would delay until January 31, 1994, this provision and enable current practices to be maintained.

In addition, this substitute would delay implementation until January 31, 1994, of another 1990 farm bill provision. This provision exempts reservation households from the Food Stamp Program's State option of monthly income reporting. Again, this provision also is scheduled to take effect on April 1 within the estimated 13 State programs serving native Americans who live on reservations. My legislation would delay the effective date until January 31, 1994.

During the time before January 31, 1994, a joint congressional hearing—involving the Committees on Agriculture and Indian Affairs—would be held. This joint hearing would, among other things, look closely at the American Indian and Alaskan Native participation in the Food Stamp Program. This is an important program for them. It is essential all eligible individuals, in each State, participate in the most effective manner possible.

In short, Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the individual States have the flexibility to administer the Food Stamp Program in a manner that best meets the unique needs of their citizens who receive food stamps. This flexibility is crucial in States like South Dakota that have a significant number of American Indian food stamp recipients. This legislation is an important step toward preserving State flexibility in Food Stamp Program administration.

Madam President, it was imperative that a bipartisan agreement be reached and enacted into law before April 1, 1993. Fortunately, with the passage of S. 284 as amended, it will be possible to reach that goal. I am pleased that the interested parties were able to come together to achieve the agreement reflected in the substitute offered here today. I wish to extend my thanks for the cooperation and leadership of the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, Senator LEAHY and Senator LUGAR; the chairman and ranking member of the Indian Affairs Committee, Senator INOUYE and Senator MCCAIN; and the staffs of both committees.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to extend a special thank you to Julie Osnes, administrator of the Family Independence Program and the Food Stamp Program of the Department of Social Services in my home State of South Dakota. Julie's knowledge, gained from 14 years of administering South Dakota's exemplary Food Stamp Program, has been invaluable to all parties involved in this process. In addition, her leadership, as president of the American Association of Food Stamp Directors, an affiliate of the American Public Welfare Association, has been instrumental in reaching this compromise.

Madam President, I am pleased to be able to offer this substitute to S. 284. I understand it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle and therefore urge its immediate adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 280) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 284

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

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994".

The title was amended so as to read: "To extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the Food Stamp Program on Indian reservations, and for other purposes.".

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider en bloc messages from the House on Senate Joint Resolution 27, Senate Joint Resolution 28, Senate Joint Resolution 29, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 13; that the messages be deemed to have been laid before the Senate; and that the Senate concur en bloc to the amendments of the House; further that the motions to reconsider be tabled en bloc.

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

HANNA HOLBORN GRAY APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 27) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of William G. Gowen of New Jersey on March 12, 1992, is filled by the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray of Illinois. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.".

BARBER B. CONABLE, JR. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 28) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Barnabas McHenry of New York on July 21, 1991, is filled by the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. of New York. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.".

WESLEY SAMUEL WILLIAMS, JR. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 29) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley Samuel Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with the section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of David C. Acheson of the District of Columbia on December 21, 1992, is filled by the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. of the District of Columbia. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.".

PERMITTING USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR A CEREMONY TO COMMEMORATE THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S. Con. Res. 13) entitled "Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used from 8 o'clock ante meridiem until 3 o'clock post meridiem on April 20, 1993, and from 8 o'clock anti meridiem until 3 o'clock post meridiem on April 6, 1994, for ceremonies as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremonies shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

Amend the preamble so as to read: "Whereas the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has designated April 18 through April 25, 1993, and April 3 through April 10, 1994, as "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust": Now, therefore, be it".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for ceremonies as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.".

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE HART BUILDING ATRIUM

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 83 submitted earlier today by Senator BAUCUS, a resolution to authorize the use of the atrium of the Hart Building by the Congressional Chorus; that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BAUCUS. I am submitting a resolution today which will bring culture to our own Hart atrium. The resolution grants the Congressional Chorus authority to perform a spring and a winter concert for each session of the 103d Congress. The chorus would perform from 12 noon to 1 p.m. on a day in coordination with the Rules Committee.

The Congressional Chorus, founded, in 1987, is composed of over 50 volunteer members from the legislative branch, including the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Library of Congress, and the Congressional Budget Office. Under the musical direction of Dr. Michael Patterson, the chorus serves as a showcase for American music. Its repertoire includes classical compositions, traditional folksongs and spirituals, jazz, classics, and Broadway show tunes. The members meet to rehearse during their lunch hours one day a week.

The chorus presented its first concert in the atrium of the Hart Senate Office Building in December 1987, and went on to sing at the inauguration of President Bush in January 1989. They have performed for a wide variety of occasions on and around Capitol Hill, including the lighting of the Capitol Christmas tree, the gala benefit for the U.S. Capitol Building, and most notably at the inauguration of President Clinton.

Madam President, I commend the Congressional Chorus members for providing us with this fine music and look forward to their concerts.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the atrium of the Senate Hart Office Building may be used from 12:00 noon until 1:00 p.m. on one day during the spring and one day during the winter of each session of the One Hundred Third Congress, for a concert of American music to be presented by the Congressional Chorus.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS WEEK

NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged, en bloc, from consideration of the following joint resolutions: Senate Joint Resolution 53, designating "Women's History Month;" Senate Joint Resolution 56, designating "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week;" Senate Joint Resolution 62, designating "National Crime Victims Rights Week;" that the Senate then proceed en bloc to their immediate consideration; that the joint resolutions be deemed read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; that the preambles be agreed to, en bloc; further that any statements relative to the passage of these joint resolutions be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place, and the consideration of these items appear individually in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolutions were deemed read three times and passed.

The preambles were agreed to.

The joint resolutions (S.J. Res. 53, S.J. Res. 56, and S.J. Res. 62) with their preambles, are as follows:

S.J. RES. 53

Whereas American women of every race, class, and ethnic background have made historical contributions to the growth and strength of our Nation in countless recorded and unrecorded ways;

Whereas American women have played and continue to play a critical economic, cultural, and social role in every sphere of the life of the Nation by constituting a significant portion of the labor force working inside and outside of the home;

Whereas American women have played a unique role throughout the history of the Nation by providing the majority of the volunteer labor force of the Nation;

Whereas American women were particularly important in the establishment of early charitable, philanthropic and cultural institutions in our Nation;

Whereas American women of every race, class, and ethnic background served as early leaders in the forefront of every major progressive social change movement;

Whereas American women have been leaders not only in securing their own rights of suffrage and equal opportunity, but also in the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, the industrial labor movement, the civil rights movement, and other movements, especially the peace movement, which create a more fair and just society for all; and

Whereas despite these contributions, the role of American women in history has been consistently overlooked and undervalued in the literature, teaching, and study 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 March 1993 and March 1994 are designated both as "Women's History Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

S.J. RES. 56

Whereas over one-half million dedicated men and women are engaged in the operation of emergency response systems for Federal, State, and local governmental entities throughout the United States;

Whereas these individuals are responsible for responding to the telephone calls of the general public for police, fire and emergency medical assistance and for dispatching such assistance to help save the lives and property of our citizens;

Whereas such calls include not only police, fire and emergency medical service calls but those governmental communications related to forestry and conservation operations, highway safety and maintenance activities, and all of the other operations which modern governmental agencies must conduct; and

Whereas America's public safety telecommunicators daily serve the public in countless ways without due recognition by the beneficiaries of their services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 12, 1993, is hereby designated as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

S.J. RES. 62

Whereas there were over thirty-five million crimes committed last year in America, with one violent crime occurring every seventeen seconds;

Whereas victims of crime across America deserve respect and assistance not only from the criminal justice system, but from society as well;

Whereas there is a crucial need to provide crime victims with quality programs and services to help them recover from the devastating psychological, physical, emotional, and financial hardships resulting from their victimization;

Whereas there are ten thousand public and private agencies and organizations in the United States that are dedicated to improving the plight of crime victims;

Whereas the Nation's victims' rights movement and allied professions deserve recognition for their tireless efforts on behalf of victims of crime and to reduce senseless violence in America; and

Whereas it is essential for all Americans to join together and commit their individual and collective resources to victim assistance and violence reduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 25, 1993, is hereby designated as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 5 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hays, one of it's reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Congressional Award Act, the Speaker appoints Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey to the Congressional Award Board on the part of the House; and from private life Mr. Michael A. Reza, Hacienda Heights, CA; Ms. Mary L. Howell, Arlington, VA; and Ms. LaBrenda Garrett Stodghill, Washington, DC.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2501 of title 44, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. SHARP of Indiana to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Speaker appoints the following Members to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GILMAN.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a)(2) of Public Law 101–363, the Speaker appoints Mr. MCCLOSKEY to the National Advisory Council on the Public Service on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. GEJDENSON and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), the Speaker appoints Mr. DINGELL and Mr. WELDON to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99–498 (20 U.S.C. 4412), the Speaker appoints Mr. KILDEE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 103, Public Law 99–371 (20 U.S.C. 4303), the Speaker appoints Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GUNDERSON as members of the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1295B(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. MANTON and Mr. KING as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1424(b)(1) of Public Law 102–325, the Speaker appoints Sister Maureen A. Fay of Detroit, MI, and Mr. Philip M. Phibbs of Tacoma, WA, both from private life, as members of the National Commission on Independent Higher Education on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76H(a)), the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. MCDADE.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–687. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on the assignment of special operations forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-688. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the administration of the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-689. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-690. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-691. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to naval stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-692. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to "Standards for Review of Base Closure Recommendations"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-693. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Department of the Navy's Base Structure Data; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-694. A communication from the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-695. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser (Treaty Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of international agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-696. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-15 adopted by the Council on March 2, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-51. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to examining federal banking laws and regulations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

"That the Congress is encouraged to examine federal laws and regulations which relate to the regulatory and paperwork burden of commercial banks and to repeal those laws and regulations which are unfairly restrictive and burdensome; and

"That President Clinton is urged to issue an executive order to alleviate the unnecessary burdens and restrictions of these laws and regulations; and

"That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the New Hampshire Congressional delegation."

POM-52. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to cable television operators; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission is currently working on regulations to preclude cable television operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence; and

"Whereas, the Commission should establish rates for the installation and monthly use of cable connections based upon the actual cost; and

"Whereas, cable operators should be required to use the same cost methodology which they use for the installation of other cable equipment to calculate the rates for installation of connections for additional receivers; and

"Whereas, if additional connections are installed at the same time that a subscriber's initial service is installed, cable operators should recover only the incremental cost of the additional installation; and

"Whereas, the costs of cabling used for additional connections should be recovered through one-time charges or charges that will end when the operator has recovered those costs; and

"Whereas, the New Hampshire house of representatives currently has legislation pending to preclude cable operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives;

"That the New Hampshire house of representatives hereby urges the Federal Communications Commission to enact regulations to preclude cable television operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence unless the cable operators can justify additional incremental costs directly associated with providing additional connections; and

"That the general court of New Hampshire should refrain from enacting legislation on the costs of cable connections until such time as the federal regulations are in place, so that the general court can enact legislation that reflects the changes in the federal law; and

"That copies of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the house be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairperson of the Federal Communications Commission and to each member of the New Hampshire Congressional delegation."

POM-53. A resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Lands of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"RESOLUTION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE'S COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS SUPPORTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SPRING MOUNTAIN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

"Whereas, The Spring Mountain area in Southern Nevada is one of the State's most scenic locations; and

"Whereas, The area includes popular recreational spots at Mt. Charleston; Carpenter, Kyle and Lee Canyons; and Yellow Plug; and

"Whereas, Nevada Representative James H. Bilbray has introduced a bill to designate 316,000 acres in the Spring Mountains as the First National Recreation Area in Nevada; and

"Whereas, Nevada Senator Richard H. Bryan has introduced a companion bill in the United States Senate; and

"Whereas, Designation as a National Recreation Area would qualify the Spring Mountains for more Federal management funding and as a higher priority item in the budget of the United States Forest Service; and

"Resolved by the Nevada Legislature's Committee on Public Lands, That the committee gives its unqualified support for the designation of the Spring Mountains as a National Recreation Area and for the Congressional legislation, H.R. 63 and S. 172, creating the National Recreation Area; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution replaces the committee's resolution approved on October 23, 1992; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation, Citizens for a Spring Mountain National Recreation Area and the Nevada Mining Association."

POM-54. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Utilities Board of Albertville, Alabama relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority Board; to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works.

POM-55. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, New York relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION 1993-37

"Whereas, the City of Niagara Falls is composed of many senior citizens whose primary income is the monthly Social Security check they receive; and

"Whereas, for most seniors, this is a check that they or their spouses earned over many years; and

"Whereas, this Council is mindful of the sacrifices that our senior citizens have made for many years by paying in earnest into the Social Security system, so that in their golden years they would have this small pension to rely on; and

"Whereas, President Clinton has stated that his administration is considering cutting the cost of living adjustments for 41 million social security recipients; and

"Whereas, twenty-five percent (25%) of those over 65 years of age rely solely on Social Security for their income; and

"Whereas, the President's budget director Leon Panetta has been orchestrating this proposal which will inflict a tremendous burden on many senior citizens who live in Niagara Falls.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the city Council of Niagara Falls, New York that this Council calls upon President William Clinton and Senators Patrick Moynihan and Alfonse D'Amato to reject any proposal to cut living

adjustments in Social Security benefits for seniors, and be it further

"Resolved, that the City Clerk is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to President Clinton, Vice President Gore, Senator Moynihan and Senator D'Amato."

POM-56. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Whereas, Recent newspaper accounts have stated that the President's administration has proposed a limitation on the cost-of-living increase calculation for Social Security recipients; and

"Whereas, Many senior citizens of the United States and of this Commonwealth are having trouble making ends meet while trying to live on a fixed income; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to oppose limiting Social Security cost-of-living increases; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 667. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve procedures for the exclusion of aliens seeking to enter the United States by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 668. A bill to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 667. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve procedures for the exclusion of aliens seeking to enter the United States by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PORT OF ENTRY INSPECTIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to address a very serious immigration problem at our Nation's international ports of entry. Because of the loopholes that exist in current immigration law, large numbers of illegal aliens are entering the United States at our major points of entry, claiming asylum and then disappearing into the interior of our country.

The problem is particularly acute in international airports. During fiscal year 1991, the latest year for which we have figures, approximately 37,000 aliens sought illegal entry, either with fraudulent documents or no documents. These aliens have discovered a certainty. Given our Government's limited detention space, they will likely be paroled into the community at large with a work permit—which, of course, is the most valuable of documents—if they can simply indicate a desire to apply for asylum in the United States. Although these aliens are directed by the Immigration Service to return on a particular date to pursue an asylum application, the majority simply fail to do so.

At New York's John F. Kennedy Airport for the last 6 months of 1991, 1,855 out of 3,100 aliens who were paroled—that means allowed to enter the country temporarily—failed to appear for any hearing on their claim of asylum status. The problem is a growing one. The Immigration Service has advised us that asylum cases at JFK this year are 300 percent above the number in 1991.

The amendment we offer today would address this problem while at the same time preserving and protecting the rights of those aliens who present legitimate, good-faith applications for asylum. This amendment provides that any alien who uses a fraudulent document to enter the United States or who uses a document to board an airplane overseas but fails to present that document upon arrival in the United States would be subject to an immediate order of exclusion by an immigration officer.

What is happening is that persons will board the aircraft with documents, arrive at the port of entry and say, "I have no documents." Some have actually ingested their documents. Some have flushed them, literally. And then they step off the aircraft and say, "I am an asylee." Because we have limited detention facilities at JFK for example, then they are simply released into the community with a document that says: Be sure and come back for your hearing in 14 or 18 months. And they say: "Yes, of course, I will."

I will say that the Los Angeles International Airport acquired more detention space, and once they did that, it relieved that problem immeasurably because the aliens knew they would have to wait, and they would not be able to simply go out into the community. I think that is something that must also be addressed here.

By enabling the Immigration Service to immediately remove these illegal aliens, we will deter those abroad who seek a free pass into the United States from inundating our airports, and we will spare U.S. communities the burden and potential risks of persons on whom we have no background information whatsoever, no health records, no criminal checks, no nothing—a truly weird way to run the country's immigration system.

The bill would still protect those aliens who have legitimate claims to refugee status but who attempt to enter the country without proper documents—we do understand due process in this magnificent country; the problem is so many know how to misuse our due process. The legislation would prevent the Immigration Service from immediately removing any alien who has a credible fear of persecution in the country to which he or she would be returned. This determination of a credible fear of persecution would be made by a specially trained asylum officer at the port of entry. If an alien had such a fear, he or she would be paroled in the United States, and a hearing on the merits of the asylum on his or her asylum claim would be held.

Similar legislation was passed by the Senate in 1982 and 1984 and passed by the House in 1984 as part of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. As the occupant of the chair knows, there has been a lot of thoughtful work by many Republicans and Democrats for many years on these issues. I consider some of my finest allies in this cause to be some of the Democratic Party in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, the summary exclusion provision was not included in the final version of that legislation which was enacted in 1986. Nonetheless, previous support for this important enforcement tool is noteworthy. This is not some extreme, harsh or radical proposal, but rather one with broad public and bipartisan support. I share with my colleagues the names of the cosponsors of the bill: myself, of course, as sponsor; Senators BYRD, D'AMATO, SHELBY, KASSEBAUM, NICKLES, REID, LOTT, HOLLINGS, ROTH, WARNER, GRAMM, and THURMOND.

While the legislation I introduce today is more specific than the 1984 version, the intent and the effect is quite similar. It is quite simply put thusly: Legitimate seekers of political asylum should not be turned away at international ports of entry, but those who seek to abuse our very generous immigration and refugee laws to enter this country illegally should swiftly, surely and certainly be removed.

This legislation is urgently needed. It addresses a problem that has become more critical over these past years, the past 2 years especially. It is important to close this all too convenient loophole for illegal aliens to enter our country under the guise of a frivolous claim of persecution—a serious misuse

of the cherished grant of asylum, and it must stop. We believe that this is a very valid method to attempt to do just that.

Madam President, I expect that some of the cosponsors of the measure may come to the floor and speak on behalf of this bill today or tomorrow, and I will certainly welcome their comments. I felt it appropriate to proceed at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 667

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 "Port of Entry Inspections Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ADMISSIONS FRAUD.

(a) EXCLUSION FOR FRAUDULENT DOCUMENTS OR FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS.—Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(C) MISREPRESENTATION" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, AND FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS";

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) FRAUDULENT DOCUMENTS AND FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS.—

"(I) Any alien who, in seeking entry to the United States or boarding a common carrier for the purpose of coming to the United States, presents any document which, in the determination of the immigration officer to whom the document is presented, is forged, counterfeit, altered, falsely made, stolen, or inapplicable to the alien presenting the document, or otherwise contains a misrepresentation of a material fact, is excludable.

"(II) Any alien who, in boarding a common carrier for the purpose of coming to the United States, presents a document which relates or purports to relate to the alien's eligibility to enter the United States, and fails to present such document to an immigration officer upon arrival at a port of entry into the United States, is excludable.".

(b) PROVISION FOR ASYLUM AND OTHER DISCRETIONARY RELIEF.—

(1) Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), any alien who, in seeking entry to the United States or boarding a common carrier pursuant to direct departure to the United States, presents any document which, in the determination of the immigration officer to whom the document is presented, is fraudulent, forged, stolen, or inapplicable to the person presenting the document, or otherwise contains a misrepresentation of a material fact, may not apply for or be granted asylum, unless presentation of the document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(A) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(B) a country in which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), an alien who, in boarding a common carrier pursuant to direct departure to the United States, presents any document which relates or purports to relate to the alien's eligibility to enter the United States, and who fails to present such document to an immigration official upon arrival at a port of entry into the United States, may not apply for or be granted asylum, unless presentation of such document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(A) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(B) a country in which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(3)(A) Whenever an immigration officer determines that an alien seeks entry to the United States as described in paragraph (1) or (2) and that the alien has indicated a desire to apply for asylum, the immigration officer shall refer the matter to an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for asylum, who shall interview the alien to determine whether presentation of the document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(i) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(ii) which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(B) If the immigration officer determines that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution in the country from which the alien was last present before attempting entry into the United States, and that there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned from such country to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution, the alien may be specially excluded and deported in accordance with section 235(e). The alien may not appeal such determination.

"(4) As used in this subsection, the term 'credible fear of persecution' means—

"(A) it is more probable than not that the statements made by the alien in support of his or her claim are true; and

"(B) there is a significant possibility, in light of such statements and of such other facts as are known to the officer about country conditions, that the alien could establish eligibility as a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A).".

(2) Section 212(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(c)) is amended in the third sentence by inserting before the period "or to any alien who is excludable pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii)".

(3) Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any alien, who has not been admitted to the United States and who is excludable under section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii), is ineligible for withholding of deportation pursuant to section 243(h), and may not apply for withholding of deportation or for any other relief under this Act, except as provided in section 208(e) with respect to asylum.

"(2) An alien under paragraph (1) who has been found ineligible to apply for asylum under section 208(e) may be returned only—

"(A) to a country in which, in the judgment of an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for asylum, the alien has no credible fear of persecution upon return; and

"(B) to a country from which, in the judgment of such officer, there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.".

(4) Section 237(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) by striking out "Deportation" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 235(d)(2), deportation"; and

(B) in the first sentence of paragraph (2) by striking out "If" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 235(d)(2), if".

SEC. 3. SPECIAL PORT OF ENTRY EXCLUSION FOR ADMISSIONS FRAUD.

Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) (as amended by section 2(b)(3) of this Act) is amended by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any alien (including an alien crewman) who may appear to the examining immigration officer or to the special inquiry officer during the examination before either of such officers to be excludable under section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii) may be ordered specially excluded and deported by the Attorney General, either by a special inquiry officer or otherwise.

"(2)(A) An alien who has been found ineligible to apply for asylum under section 208(e) may be returned only—

"(i) to a country in which, in the judgment of an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for asylum, the alien has no credible fear of persecution upon return; and

"(ii) to a country from which, in the judgment of such officer, there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(B) Such special exclusion order is not subject to administrative appeal and shall have the same effect as if the alien has been ordered excluded and deported pursuant to section 236, except that judicial review of such an order shall not be available under section 106 or, except by habeas corpus as herein provided, under any other provision of law.

"(C) Nothing in this subsection may be construed as requiring an inquiry before a special inquiry officer in the case of an alien crewman.".

SEC. 4. RESTRICTIONS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) is amended by adding after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

"(f) ALIENS EXCLUDABLE FOR ADMISSIONS FRAUD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review, except by petition for habeas corpus, any determination made with respect to an alien found excludable for admissions fraud pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii). In any such case, review by habeas corpus shall be limited to examination of whether the petitioner (1) is an alien, and (2) was ordered specially excluded from the United States pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(iii) and 235(e).

"(g) INTERVIEWS AND SPECIAL EXCLUSION.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction—

"(A) to review the procedures established by the Attorney General for the determination of admissions fraud pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii); or

"(B) to enter declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the implementation of subsection (d) or (e).

"(2) Notwithstanding the nature of the suit or claim, no court shall have jurisdiction (except by habeas corpus petition as provided in subsection (f)) to consider the validity of any adjudication or determination of special exclusion or to provide declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the special exclusion of any alien.

"(h) COLLATERAL ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—In any action brought for the assessment of penalties for improper entry or reentry of an alien under sections 275 and 276, no court shall have jurisdiction to hear claims collaterally attacking the validity of orders of exclusion, special exclusion, or deportation entered under sections 235, 236, and 242.".

SEC. 5. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN ALIEN SMUGGLING.

Section 274(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "five years" and inserting "ten years"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (1) ", except that in any case in which a person causes serious bodily injury to, or places in jeopardy the life of, any alien involved in the offense, such person shall be fined in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 20 years for each alien with respect to whom any violation of this paragraph occurs, or both.".

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and such amendments shall apply to aliens who arrive in or seek admission to the United States on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROTH. Today, Mr. President, I rise to cosponsor the Port of Entry Inspections Improvement Act of 1993, which Senator SIMPSON is introducing today. This legislation will help remedy serious deficiencies in America's immigration system. These deficiencies have been linked to recent acts of terrorism within our borders, including the bombing of the World Trade Center and the shootings outside the CIA.

For example, Mir Aimal Kansi, who is suspected of shooting five people outside CIA headquarters last month, demonstrated the ease by which illegal aliens can enter our country, stay for extended periods of time and even legally work. Did Kansi sneak into our country in the dead of night? No, he simply flew into New York, presented what is believed to be a phony business visa, overstayed his visa and a year later, applied for political asylum. Upon applying for asylum, Kansi was issued a work permit and used this permit to get a Social Security number and a Virginia driver's license, which allowed him to purchase the AK-47 he used to kill two innocent people and wound three others. Although almost a year had passed between the time Kansi's asylum petition was filed and the date of the shootings, no immigration hearing had taken place. Kansi has since fled the country, and is the subject of a worldwide manhunt.

The American people are calling on the Congress to take a serious look at the impact of our immigration procedures. The legislation I join in introducing today is directed at the tens of thousands of illegal aliens who arrive at United States ports of entry every year with fraudulent documents or no documents whatsoever, but are nevertheless allowed into the United States by making phony asylum claims.

Under current law, while undocumented or fraudulently documented illegal aliens are subject to exclusion, few are actually excluded. Such aliens simply take advantage of our overburdened asylum system. Any illegal alien arriving at a U.S. airport today who asks for political asylum, whatever the merit of the claim, will be released into the general population within a minimum of a few hours and a maximum of a few days. Due to a severe shortage of detention space, and a serious backlog of asylum cases, those who come to the United States asserting an asylum claim generally cannot be detained until their asylum hearing. In the interim period, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has no means of tracking the asylum applicants, and as a result, thousands of aliens never appear for their asylum hearings.

Since passage of the Refugee Act of 1980, over 100,000 asylum cases have been administratively closed by INS, primarily due to the applicant's failure to appear for the asylum interview. It is clear that the system is being exploited, and that the word is out around the globe that anyone can gain immediate access into the United States, at virtually no risk.

Under the legislation introduced today, those who arrive in the United States lacking legitimate documentation, and claim asylum, will immediately go before a special immigration officer, who will seek to determine if such an alien possesses a credible fear of persecution in the country from which the alien departed. Those who have such a credible fear will be granted access to the full asylum application process. Those who clearly lack a legitimate claim will immediately be excluded from the United States.

Further, Mr. President, this legislation takes aim at the spread of international alien smuggling networks, which are taking advantage of our immigration system to earn enormous profits. The business of alien smuggling was the subject of an investigation I initiated in June of 1991 into Asian organized crime. The 15-month investigation conducted by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations found that Chinese alien smuggling groups, many of which are run by Chinese organized crime figures, have successfully smuggled thousands of illegal Chinese aliens into the United States over the past several years.

These smuggling organizations charge up to $30,000 per person for travel and entry into the United States. The smugglees are generally poor residents of China who cannot afford to pay the entire smuggling fee up front. As a result, when these aliens arrive in the United States, they often must choose between paying the smuggling fee by working in low-wage jobs in so-called sweat shops or by committing crimes on behalf of organized street gangs with ties to the smuggling organizations. Those who refuse these options face the possibility of kidnapping or even torture.

While the total size of the Chinese alien smuggling industry is not easily quantified, one recent study includes information on a total of 108,975 aliens smuggled from China to the United States between 1983 and 1992, and concludes that smuggling entities are currently collecting more than $250 million per month.

Current penalties available for use against organized alien smuggling enterprises are grossly inadequate. The average sentence is currently less than 6 months in prison. Given the lucrative profits currently being earned by alien smugglers, such penalties do not provide an adequate deterrent. The legislation introduced today would double the maximum penalty for alien smuggling from 5 to 10 years, and would allow for sentences of up to 20 years in cases in which the defendant causes serious bodily injury or puts the life of an alien in jeopardy in the course of the offense.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation introduced today, which offers a common sense approach to the currently widespread abuse of our immigration system.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the public was shocked by reports that the shooting at the CIA headquarters and the bombing of the World Trade Center were carried out by people who were in this country by claiming political asylum. In many cases, the public saw on primetime television how easy it is to enter the United States through our international airports and other points of entry by claiming asylum.

Not only is it easy to enter the country, but also to remain for years, working legally while asylum claims are adjudicated.

There is no question that our asylum process is severely strained and undermined by this abuse. Originally, when the law was passed in 1980, fewer than 5,000 persons per year, who were current residents of the United States, were expected to seek asylum. The claims were to be handled on an individual basis.

Today, that number has increased to about 8,000 claims a month, and the system is swamped. The backlog of

cases is now over 200,000, assuring years of waiting for asylum seekers. Even then, most people do not even show up for their asylum hearings, having disappeared into the general population.

Swelling the ranks of asylum seekers are throngs of people whose passage is arranged by smugglers. The people who are smuggled into the United States often find themselves indentured servants, having to work off the cost of the passage by prostitution, pornography, drug dealing, sweat shop labor, and other illegal activities.

Until decisive steps are taken to stop it, this abuse of our generous asylum laws will only worsen. This has been a growing problem for years. The shooting at the CIA headquarters and the bombing of the World Trade Center were wake up calls. Now is the time for corrective action.

I urge prompt consideration of a proposal that has been thought through very carefully, the Port of Entry Inspection and Improvement Act of 1993. This legislation would correct the current abuses and at the same time protect those aliens who present legitimate asylum claims.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 668: A bill to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FAIR HOUSING RIGHTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I came over a little earlier, Mr. President, because I wanted to introduce legislation known as the Fair Housing Rights Amendments of 1993 and did not have a change to secure the floor until the distinguished Senator from South Dakota finished. I had a brief conversation with the Senator from West Virginia. So I appreciate this time.

Mr. President, I am again introducing a bill I have introduced in both the 101st Congress as S. 2966 and the 102d Congress as S. 1697, the Fair Housing Rights Amendments Act. The legislation, drafted at the behest of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, has enjoyed the support of a bipartisan group of cosponsors, and I hope that the new administration will support it. The bill is designed to close a gap in the provisions of the Fair Housing Act, title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, prohibiting criminal intimidation or interference with the exercise of fair housing rights.

In the 101st Congress, the bill was unanimously polled out of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Judiciary Committee, but there was not sufficient time for its consideration by the full Committee. In the last Congress, S. 1697 was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent near the close of the second session, but the House failed to act on the bill. Therefore, I am introducing the legislation once more. This year, I hope the bill receives prompt consideration and approval by both bodies.

Current law proscribes the use of intimidation, force, or threat of force to willfully injure, intimidate, or interfere with a person's exercise of rights secured by Federal fair housing laws. Unless acting as part of a conspiracy, a person who violates this provision may not be prosecuted for a felony under Federal law unless death or injury results. Thus, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has been presented with cases in which homes were firebombed and destroyed for the purpose of intimidating the residents, but because, thankfully, no deaths or injuries resulted, these crimes could not be prosecuted as felonies under the fair housing laws. Of course, these acts do violate current Federal law, but only as misdemeanors.

Clearly, there is a loophole of injustice that must be closed. It is beyond discussion that firebombings or the commission of some similar intimidating crimes should be punished as felonies—whether or not someone is killed or injured. It is equally irrelevant that the perpetrator is acting alone.

Closing this gap in felony coverage under the current Fair Housing Act is all that this legislation is designed to accomplish. The bill would make it a felony for an individual acting alone to use force, or the threat of force to intimidate or interfere with the exercise of rights guaranteed by the Fair Housing Act if the defendant's action results in property damage exceeding $100 or if the defendant uses or carries a firearm in the commission of the offense. If these conditions are not satisfied, then the violation would remain a misdemeanor. The bill creates no new Federal crime; it merely makes an act that is currently a misdemeanor and subjects it to the more stringent penalties for commission of a felony.

In addition, the legislation would conform the penalties available for criminal intimidation under the fair housing laws to those mandated by section 3571(b) of title 18 of the United States Code. Thus, the bill works no change in currently applicable fines and jail sentences, except to the extent that the bill establishes a sentence of up to 5 years for the new substantive violation established in the legislation.

Mr. President, this legislation is not controversial. It is needed to close a gap in the criminal provisions of the fair housing laws. The Senate passed identical legislation last year, and I hope we can act quickly to do so this year.

I ask for unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 668

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 "Fair Housing Rights Amendments Act of 1993".

SEC. 2 PENALTIES FOR ACTS OF VIOLENCE OR INTIMIDATION.

Section 901 of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes", approved April 11, 1968 (known as the 'Civil Rights Act of 1968'; Public Law 90-284; 42 U.S.C. 3631), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 901. PREVENTION OF INTIMIDATION IN FAIR HOUSING CASES.

"(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—It shall be unlawful to use force or threat of force, whether or not acting under color of law, to willfully injure, intimidate, or interfere with, or attempt to injure, intimidate, or interfere with—

"(1) any person because of the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin of the person and because the person is or has been selling, purchasing, renting, financing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, purchase, rental, financing, or occupation of any dwelling, or applying for or participating in any service, organization, or facility relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings; or

"(2) any person because the person is, or has been, or in order to intimidate the person or any other person or any class of persons from—

"(A) participating, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations, or facilities described in paragraph (1) of this section; or

"(B) affording another person or class of persons opportunity or protection so to participate; or

"(3) any citizen because the citizen is, or has been, or in order to discourage the citizen or any other citizen from lawfully aiding or encouraging other persons to participate, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations, or facilities described in paragraph (1), or participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity so to participate.

"(b) PENALTIES.—Whoever commits an act described in subsection (a)—

"(1) shall be fined not more than $100,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both;

"(2) that results in bodily injury shall be fined not more than $250,000, or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

"(3) that results in death shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life; and

"(4) that results in property damage exceeding the sum of $100, or uses or attempts to use fire in committing the act, or uses or carries a firearm while committing the act, shall be fined not more than $250,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

"(1) FAMILIAL STATUS.—The term 'familial status' has the meaning given the term in section 802.

"(2) FIREARM.—The term 'firearm' has the meaning given the term in section 921(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code.

"(3) HANDICAP.—The term 'handicap' has the meaning given the term in section 802.

"(4) BODILY INJURY.—The term 'bodily injury' has the meaning given the term in section 1515(a)(5) of title 18, United States Code.".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Richard "Red" Skelton, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to the public.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] were added as cosponsors of S. 208, a bill to reform the concessions policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 216, a bill to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to reform Customs Service operations, and for other purposes.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to require the Secretary of Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and modify the low-income housing tax credit.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for the portion of employer Social Security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 585, a bill to provide greater access to civil justice by reducing costs and delay, and for other purposes.

S. 636

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] were added as cosponsors of S. 636, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit individuals to have freedom of access to certain medical clinics and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to reauthorize the Indoor Radon Abatement Act of 1988, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 56, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 24

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 24, a resolution urging the criminal prosecution of persons committing crimes against humanity, including participation in mass rapes, in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—RELATIVE AUTHORIZING USE OF THE HART BUILDING ATRIUM FOR A CONCERT BY THE CONGRESSIONAL CHORUS

Mr. BAUCUS submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 83

Resolved, That the atrium of the Senate Hart Office Building May be used from 12:00 noon until 1:00 p.m. On one day during the spring and one day during the winter of each session of the One Hundred Third Congress, for a concert of American music to be presented by the Congressional Chorus.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

COHEN AMENDMENT NO. 278

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. COHEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . REFORM OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1(a) of the Act of March 3, 1991, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by striking "$2,000" and inserting "$1,000,000".

(b) PROHIBITION ON DIVISION OF CONTRACTS.—Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections.

"(c) Any person entering into a contract under which wages are to be determined in accordance with this Act shall not divide the contract into contracts of $1,000,000 or less if the contract would not have been so divided but for the purpose of avoiding the application of this Act.

"(d) If the Secretary of Labor determines that a division of a contract has occurred for the purpose described in subsection (c), the Secretary may—

"(1) require that the contract (or grant, or other instrument providing Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) be amended so as to incorporate retroactively all the provisions and stipulations that would have been required under this Act, or under other provisions of law governing the applicable prevailing wage, if the contract had not been so divided; and

"(2) require the contracting or assisting agency (or the recipient of Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) or any other entity that awarded the contract (or the instrument providing Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) in violation of this section, to compensate the contractor (grantee, or other recipient of Federal assistance, as appropriate) for payment to each affected laborer or mechanic, of—

"(A) the amount equal to the difference between—

"(i) the rate received by the laborer or mechanic; and

"(ii) the applicable prevailing wage rate; and

"(B) the interest on such amount, calculated at the rate payable under section 6621(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for an underpayment referred to in such section, from the date the work was performed by such laborer or mechanic.

"(e) The Secretary shall make no determination that a division of a contract for a project has occurred for the purpose described in subsection (c) unless the Secretary has notified the agency or entity in question not later than 180 days after completion of construction on the project that an investigation will be conducted concerning an alleged violation of this section.".

(c) APPLICATION TO RELATED LAWS.—The Act of March 3, 1991, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. APPLICATION TO RELATED LAWS.

"No provision of law requiring the payment of prevailing wage rates determined by the Secretary in accordance with this Act shall apply—

"(1) to contracts for construction, alteration, or repair involving not more that $1,000,000; or

"(2) in the case of rent supplements or other assistance for which the method of Federal financing or assistance does not have an aggregate dollar amount, where the assisted project is in the amount of not more than $1,000,000.".

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE COPELAND ACT.—The Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c, commonly known as the Copeland Act) shall not be applicable to contracts that are not subject to coverage under the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act), as amended by subsections (a) and (b).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to any contract—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) made pursuant to an invitation for bids outstanding on such date.

BROWN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 279

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1335), supra, as follows:

On page 56, line 7, strike "$2,536,000,000" and insert "$2,432,486,654".

On page 56, line 24, strike the period, and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the foregoing amount may be used to assist the following projects:

"(1) Foster Park tennis and basketball court resurfacing and color coating in Evanston, Illinois.

"(2) Anthony Oats Park and pool renovation in Evansville, Indiana.

"(3) Expansion of shopping center at 165th Street, in Hammond, Indiana.

"(4) Miscellaneous pool repairs in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(5) Tennis court resurfacing in Florence, Alabama.

"(6) Orpheum Theatre renovation in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(7) Alan Witt Park aquatics facility and ball fields in Fairfield, California.

"(8) MLK Park, construction of 27,000 square foot community recreation center with indoor pool, in Los Angeles, California.

"(9) Fairmount Park boathouse restoration in Riverside, California.

"(10) Villegas Park soccer field in Riverside, California.

"(11) Ocean Beach commercial revitalization project in San Diego, California.

"(12) Art Ark, 29-unit new construction live and work unit, in San Francisco, California.

"(13) Swimming Pool refurbishment in Thornton, Colorado.

"(14) Poli/Majestic Theatres in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(15) Northwood Cemetery drainage system and roadway in cemetery in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(16) Facade improvement, renovation of 47 commercial building facades in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(17) Construct ice skating warming hut at Union Pond Park in Manchester, Connecticut.

"(18) Greens Harbor Beach in New London, Connecticut.

"(19) Capitol Theater in New London, Connecticut;

"(20) Golf course, parks, recreation, in Daytona Beach, Florida.

"(21) Key West Bight Marina development in Key West, Florida.

"(22) Whispering Pines Park, recreation center, in Port St. Lucie, Florida.

"(23) New Jersey Performing Arts Center in Newark, New Jersey.

"(24) West Las Vegas Arts Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.

"(25) Basketball court at Fox Hill Park in St. Charles, Missouri.

"(2) Inkster Community Shopping Center, 50,000-60,000 commerce shopping center project in Inkster, Michigan.

"(27) Northwest Family Center, with two gymnasiums, indoor pool and outside ball fields, in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(28) Optimist Park athletic facility (indoor and outdoor) baseball field, gymnasium and soccer field in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(29) Desert West Park in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(30) Construction of youth park project to include baseball, soccer, tennis, gymnasium, roads, utilities, and lighting in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

"(31) Soccer field improvements in Bell Gardens, California.

"(32) Agua Mansa Cemetery, historical site restoration work, in Colton, California.

"(33) Fairfield Sports Park, in Fairfield, California.

"(34) Construct youth sports complex, including baseball, soccer, softball, and other athletic fields in Merced, California.

"(35) Tuolumne River Regional Park, amphitheater and softball complex in Modesto, California.

"(36) Improvements to Barnes Park (tennis court relocation, infrastructure) in Monterey Park, California.

"(37) Improvements to Elder Park (tennis courts, bathrooms, picnic areas, ADA compliance) in Monterey Park, California.

"(38) Reconstruct swimming pool in CDBG area in South Gate, Georgia.

"(39) Playground renovations, 35th Street Ballfield, Loveland Playground, Hil-Dar/Housing Authority in Wheeling, West Virginia.

"(40) Storefront Rehabilitation, rehabilitation of storefronts in central business district in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

"(41) Renovation of historic mill for sports shop complex in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

"(42) Construction of an alpine slide and restaurant at Parque del Turabo recreational facility in Gaguas, Puerto Rico.

"(43) Marketplace and art craft center in Adjuntas, Puerto Rico.

"(44) Brewery District Theater, construction of a new movie theater, in Columbus, Ohio.

"(45) Falcon Park Baseball Stadium Redevelopment Project in Auburn, New York.

"(46) Proctors Theater, roofing, completion of roof repair on historic downtown theater in Troy, New York.

"(47) Constitution Soccer Field, grade field and construct 6 adult and 4 youth soccer fields, construct parking lots, restroom structure and concession stand in Salinas, California.

"(48) Civic center expansion in San Leandro, California.

"(49) Downing Neighborhood Shopping Center, a 25,000 square foot retail strip located in an inner-city neighborhood in Denver, Colorado.

"(50) HCO/Hi-Ho site work in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(51) Boykin Community Center, construction of a new gymnasium and reroofing the building in Auburn, Alabama.

"(52) Gymnasium lighting, North Birmingham Recreation Center, Howze-Sanford Recreation Center, and Ft. Heights Recreation Center in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(53) Miscellaneous park improvements, shelter repairs (picnic) in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(54) Buffalo Ridge Park in Phoenix, Arizona."

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977 AMENDMENT ACT OF 1993

PRESSLER AMENDMENT NO. 280

Mr. HATFIELD (for Mr. PRESSLER) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 284) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to permit a State agency to require households residing on reservations to file periodic reports of income and household circumstances, and to remove the requirement that a State agency establish a procedure for staggered issuance of coupons for eligible households residing on reservations, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commit-

tee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Monday, March 29, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the military policy concerning the service of gay men and lesbians in the Armed Forces: The historical and legal background.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, March 29, at 3:30 p.m. to hold nomination hearings on George E. Moose, to be Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DONALD EPLEY AND CHARLIE WILKINSON FOR THEIR 115 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HARTLAND TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to honor Don Epley and Charlie Wilkinson today, two men who between them have dedicated more than 100 years of service to the Hartland Township community.

Hartland Township, located 45 miles northwest of my hometown of Detroit, MI, is a close-knit community of 7,000 people. Don and Charlie, at 87 and 84 years young respectively, have dedicated themselves to serving their neighbors over the years.

Active in Scouting, health, and welfare issues and taking leadership roles in activities helping seniors and the young people in Hartland, Don and Charlie have exemplified the best kind of community involvement. Most notably, however, since retiring they have given 100 percent of their time to volunteer firefighting activities, and both remain active today.

Don Epley, with 65 years of very active duty, holds the title of the longest, active duty firefighter in Michigan. In fact, it is quite possible Don holds that title for the entire United States. With 50 years of volunteer service, Charlie Wilkinson is Michigan's second longest active duty firefighter.

It is clear to see, Mr. President, why Don and Charlie's friends, families, and neighbors view them as part of the heart of Hartland Township. Hartland is truly fortunate to have two such unselfish and giving individuals. Every community should be so blessed.•

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WOODARD

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of my home State of New Mexico. I am very proud to honor Mr. Larry Woodard, who has devoted 35 years of his life to public service in the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Woodard began his distinguished career with the Bureau of Land Management in 1957 after completing his education at Oregon State University. Larry's first assignment with BLM was in Roseburg, OR. Shortly after that he was assigned to the Bureau office in Portland, OR, where he served until 1964. Larry then transferred to Washington, DC until 1969. Following additional appointments in the field he assumed the State director's position in New Mexico in 1987.

Larry has skillfully met the difficult challenges that come with managing the checkerboard and multiple-use lands of the West. He has earned the respect of ranchers, conservationists, wildlife enthusiasts and other groups who do not always agree on the appropriate use and management of public lands. Larry deserves our profound respect for the way he has managed the BLM in New Mexico. He has implemented many changes in his agency that will benefit all New Mexicans for decades to come.

Larry is a recipient of the Department of Interior's Distinguished Service Award, and has over the years represented the Department on many task forces and commissions. He is a trustee of the New Mexico Nature Conservancy and has been selected for inclusion in "Who's Who in the West."

Larry will retire from the Bureau in April of this year. He and his wife Bette have three children and five grandchildren and plan to make their home in Idaho. New Mexicans will miss him and his distinguished record of achievement.•

HONORING THE HEBREW FREE LOAN SOCIETY

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Hebrew Free Loan Society of New York for its contribution to the financial security of the city of New York and its surrounding counties for the past 100 years. I wish to commend the work that this society is doing to restore dignity to their less fortunate neighbors.

The Hebrew Free Loan Society, during its century of service, has extended more than $1 million in loans to immigrants of all races and creeds. The society has based its organization on the central principle that we must help others to help themselves. In this way, one is ensuring not only the financial stability of the other, but also preserving one's self-respect and self-dependency.

In a rapidly changing society, increasing numbers of people are emigrating to the United States every year. Each seeks the American dream. Organizations like the Hebrew Free Loan Society help immigrants in America, the land of opportunity. The United States was founded by men and women seeking the same opportunities as immigrants do today. They work hard to fulfill their dreams but they need a helping hand from those that have already accomplished their goals. These struggling individuals deserve the same opportunities that our ancestors had over the decades and the Hebrew Free Loan Society has understood this. As the grandson of immigrants, I know the value of having friends to lend a hand when someone is in need.

I have always been a firm believer in the principle of helping others to help themselves, so I am particularly appreciative and supportive of the work that the Hebrew Free Loan Society is doing. It is important for new immigrants in the United States to know that they are not alone. The receipt of interest-free loans from this unique organization enables people to start new lives with dignity. This country was built through the hard work of immigrants and we must not forget that.

It is important to recognize the Hebrew Free Loan Society as an organization that seeks to provide assistance in a spirit of dignity through loans and service. Thus, I am honored to have this opportunity to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Hebrew Free Loan Society and to recognize the important work that they are doing for the people of New York.•

TRIBUTE TO DUPONT MANUAL HIGH SCHOOL AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE KENTUCKY SPEECH FESTIVAL

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of pride that I rise today in order to inform my colleagues of the winners of the Kentucky Speech Festival.

The winner of the overall team title was Dupont Manual High School. Mr. President, I take particular pride in announcing this honor because I was a graduate of Manual High School.

There were many other participants and winners in the competition, among them Andy Spears of South Oldham High School, who won the Gifford Blyton Book Award for outstanding contributions to his school and community. In addition, B.J. Tinsley of Crittenden County High and Lynda Jeffries of Pleasure Ridge Park High were recipients of $1,000 scholarships.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in the pleasant task of saluting my alma mater as well as the other winners. I ask that an article from the Courier Journal be inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MANUAL WINS SWEEPSTAKES AT SPEECH FESTIVAL

DuPont Manual High School captured first place in the team-debate sweepstakes of the

Kentucky Speech Festival held at Western Kentucky University over the weekend.

Manual had 52 points, South Oldham High School took second place with 39 points, and Covington Latin was third with 38 points.

The Gifford Blyton Book Award, named after the retired director of speech and debate at the University of Kentucky, went to Andy Spears of South Oldham for outstanding contributions to his school and community.

Blyton also established two $1000 scholarships for the winners of an essay contest on the value of speech and debate.

This year's recipients were Lynda Jeffries of Pleasure Ridge Park High an B.J. Tinsley of Crittenden County High.

Ellen Lord and Dalton Lyon of Lexington's Henry Clay High were the top varsity debate team. Second place went to Elishia Cohen and Amanda Walker of Manual, and Pleasure Ridge Park's Jeffries and Leslie Smith took third.

Individual varsity debate awards went to Leslie Smith of Pleasure Ridge Park, Aaron Whaley of Jeffersontown High, Jennifer Smith of Manual and Ellen Lord of Henry Clay.

In the novice debate-team category, Holly King and Sarah Reece of Eastern High took first place, and Joey LaMere and Fiona Mack of Manual finished second.

Chris Miller and Sarah Leong of Covington Latin placed third, and Becca Byrd and Tom Hearn of Ballard were fourth.

Covington Latin High captured the top three places in novice policy speech.

The Kentucky High School Speech League and Western's departments of communications and broadcasting sponsored the event. Eight of the 12 debate teams were from Jefferson County.•

VERMONT DECLARED A WORLD WISE SCHOOLS STATE

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have the pleasure and responsibility of working quite closely with the Peace Corps. It is a matter of great personal pride that Vermont has provided more Peace Corps volunteers per capita than any other State in the Nation.

Vermont's special relationship with the Peace Corps took on an added dimension today with the proclamation of Vermont as a World Wise Schools State. I'd like to congratulate and commend the Peace Corps, Governor Dean, Commissioner of Education Richard Mills, and most importantly, the Green Mountain Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for their hard work and dedication to add Vermont to the States benefiting from this program.

Our returned volunteers have been effectively sharing their Peace Corps experience with Vermonters for many years. Now they are enhancing their efforts by bringing the World Wise Schools Program to Vermont youths. They have brought to this project the same zeal and energy that made them terrific Peace Corps volunteers, and I would like to salute them on this important achievement.

The World Wise Schools Program, established by the Peace Corps in 1989, is a global education program serving American students in grades 3 through 12. The goals of the program are threefold: To encourage the study of geography, promote cultural understanding, and to help our Nation's youth recognize the importance of volunteer service. To achieve these goals the program provides correspondence matches between American classes and Peace Corps volunteers serving overseas, resource packets consisting of videos and study guides with information on the countries where Peace Corps volunteers serve, and classroom visits by returned volunteers to share their Peace Corps experiences.

The World Wise Schools Program has been endorsed by the National Geographic Society. In its short 3-year history, the program has reached some 140,000 American students. In my State, 32 schools are participating to the benefit of 800 young Vermonters.

Anyone who has looked at education studies in the last two decades knows that many American students have a very poor grasp of geography. In today's world, that puts our Nation at a serious competitive disadvantage. The Peace Corps World Wise Schools Program provides an innovative way to enhance cultural and geography awareness while reinforcing good citizenship. In our changing world, one that is more interdependent and interactive than ever, it is very important that our students learn all they can about the people and countries outside our borders.

I am delighted that Vermont has become the 17th State to officially proclaim itself a World Wise Schools State. I again congratulate the Green Mountain Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for their excellent work on this project. I highly recommend the World Wise Schools Program to all my colleagues.•

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN LOGAN

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment from today's debate to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. John Logan, the medical director at Community Methodist Hospital in Henderson, KY.

Dr. Logan has long been an active member in his community. A medical school graduate of Vanderbilt University, he returned to Kentucky following his postgraduate training at Toledo Hospital in Ohio. Over the years, Dr. Logan has provided more than medical care to his fellow Kentuckians; his chairmanship of various fund raising efforts successfully led to State funding of a new civic auditorium and technical building at Henderson Community College.

Recently, Dr. Logan was honored by the Henderson Chamber of Commerce by being selected as its distinguished citizen of the year. In noting his work with a wide variety of organizations and associations, he was recognized as a model volunteer, and ideal patron, an enthusiastic, cheerful supporter of this area and its inhabitants.

Dr. Logan revealed his deep appreciation for his community and fellow citizens when he remarked that, "[t]his is a great place. It's not a great place because we have buildings. It's not a great place because we have technology. It's a great place because we have great people."

Mr. President, I know my colleagues join me in honoring this great Kentuckian and in extending our heartfelt congratulations on his many achievements. So that my colleagues may learn more of Henderson's distinguished citizen of the year, I ask that a copy of an article that appeared in the Gleaner be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Henderson (KY) Gleaner, Mar. 17, 1993]

CHAMBER NAMES LOGAN CITIZEN OF YEAR

(By Frank Boyett)

Longtime resident Dr. John Logan got what he called his "citizenship papers" Tuesday night when the Henderson Chamber of Commerce honored him as its distinguished citizen of the year.

A litany of his public service was recited by Marianne Walker, who nominated him for the honor.

"He is a model volunteer, an ideal patron, an enthusiastic, cheerful supporter of this area and its inhabitants," she said.

Logan has helped a wide variety of organizations and causes, but she said she first became acquainted with him in 1979 when he volunteered to help organize a hospice program, which eventually evolved into St. Anthony's Hospice 10 years ago.

More recently, she said, Logan served as chairman of two important fund-raising projects: One that led to state funding of the new civic auditorium and technical building at Henderson Community College and the other provided computer laboratories in every school in Henderson County.

A native of Brownsville, in Edmondson County, Logan attended high school and college in Bowling Green, and medical school at Vanderbilt University. He came here shortly after completing his post-graduate training at Toledo Hospital in Toledo, Ohio.

Logan, 55, resigned from his family practice in 1986 to become medical director at Community Methodist Hospital, a post he still holds.

An old professor told him "to be a good doctor you've got to be a good citizen," Logan said. He apparently took that advice to heart.

"I'm thankful tonight that after 30 years here I've finally gotten my citizenship papers," he said. "I hope over the next 30 years we can leave this community a better place.* * *"

"This is a great place. It's not a great place because we have buildings. It's not a great place because we have technology. It's a great place because we have good people."

During the many fund-raising campaigns he has been involved in, he said, "I've leaned hard on a lot of people * * * for the benefit of the community. The list is long."

But he said he always got a good response to his "leaning" and always reminded those

who gave: "It's not for me—you're honoring your community."•

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF WEI JINGSHENG

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise on this the 14th anniversary of the imprisonment of Wei Jingsheng, China's longest serving political prisoner, to celebrate a great honor bestowed upon him today by the Gleitsman Foundation. As a recipient of the Gleitsman Foundation's International Activist Award, Wei Jingsheng is being recognized for his leadership in the fight for democracy in China.

I also rise, Mr. President, to report that Wei Jingsheng's jailer, the People's Republic of China, continues to violate basic principles of human rights with reckless abandon, especially in regard to its political prisoners.

Wei Jingsheng has been confined in a Chinese prison for the last 14 years because he dared to speak his mind. Despite his imprisonment, he has inspired a whole generation of democracy advocates to challenge the repressive status quo in China.

Wei Jingsheng came to the attention of the human rights community in China, and around the world, as the founder of a magazine dedicated to the exploration of a variety of political views. In his journal, Explorations, he called attention to the plight of China's political prisoners and published several articles on democracy which were critical of the Chinese Government. His writings and his prescient words that Deng Xiaoping was becoming a new autocrat got him arrested and sentenced to a 15-year prison term in 1979. Throughout his prison term, he has been monitored by a team of special security personnel and has been repeatedly subjected to solitary confinement. Wei Jingsheng is now reportedly imprisoned on a salt farm, where he is confined to a tiny cell and permitted to speak only to his guards.

During the period of his imprisonment, Wei Jingsheng's health has deteriorated. He is reported to suffer mental disorders and has lost almost all his teeth, due to the lack of access to medical attention. This mistreatment is not due to any lack of attention by higher authorities. Indeed, Mr. President, Deng Xiaoping has reportedly taken a personal interest in his imprisonment and has his office regularly kept informed of his condition.

Chinese authorities have gone so far as to pressure his parents to shun Wei Jingsheng. Still, he remains unrepentant in his view and has not renounced his commitment to freedom of expression. He remains a popular figure among democracy activists and free thinkers in China. In fact, a petition for Wei Jingsheng's release signed by dozens of China's intellectuals marked the beginning of the peaceful, prodemocracy movement in the spring of 1989 which was so brutally crushed in June.

Mr. President, one of the basic principles of international law is respect for the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of other nations. Consistent with this principle, the nations of the world have been encouraged to refrain from interfering in the domestic affairs of their fellow nations. The principle of noninterference was a cornerstone of international relations when the United Nations first came into existence almost 50 years ago. But another principle that has gained stature over the years is the obligation of states to respect the human rights of their own citizens. The principles of national sovereignty and respect for human rights sometimes conflict. One stark example of this conflict is China's inhumane treatment of political prisoners.

The leaders of China urge noninterference in their internal affairs, but they should no longer be allowed to hide behind the shield of national sovereignty and assault the human rights of their own people. It is our duty to speak out for civility, decency, and respect for free thought and liberty. We cannot continue to let the principle of respect for national sovereignty keep us from forcefully challenging China's human rights practices.

China has imprisoned people simply for organizing prodemocracy groups. Once imprisoned, they have been brutally beaten and tortured, treatment far worse than that afforded the common criminal. Though the Chinese penal system expressly seeks to help all its prisoners to become useful members of society, it only serves retributive, deterrent, and vindictive ends when dealing with political prisoners.

What is clear, Mr. President, is the contrast between official descriptions of how prisoners are reformed and the autobiographical accounts of that process by individual prisoners. The official version claims that prisoners improve their situation through technical schools and recreational activities. Prisoners' accounts include chilling tales of beatings by policemen and common criminals, foul living conditions, torture, and daily deprivation.

In response to growing international criticism and pressure, the People's Republic of China has issued a white paper on "Human Rights in China." It has also improved the treatment of a few well-known dissidents held in Beijing. However, the treatment of many dissidents held in other places has not improved, and in some cases, it has even worsened.

In the preamble of the white paper, the People's Republic of China claims that no person will be subjected to criminal punishment merely because he holds divergent political opinions. It even asserts that there are no political prisoners in China. Mr. President, this is obviously not the case. Organizing a peaceful prodemocracy movement is not an act of treason, but people in China have been jailed for doing so.

The white paper also suggests that as long as people do not incite an armed rebellion or engage in espionage activities they will not be punished. In practice, however, the Chinese Government is extremely intolerant of dissenting political views and there have been countless instances where the Chinese Government has violated its own standards.

One former political prisoner, Liu Qing, was convicted on charges that were fabricated by the Government. The prosecution dismembered his writings and created a text to convict him on. He was imprisoned merely because the Government saw him as a threat to the political status quo. The white paper states that courts employ a system of public trials. However, at Liu Qing's trial, only Government officials were present; no ordinary citizens, family, or friends were allowed to attend.

The treatment political prisoners receive in Chinese prisons is reprehensible. In the United States penal system a person convicted of treason would not be treated differently from a common criminal. However, in China the treatment of political prisoners is often worse. The white paper says torture is forbidden. Yet political prisoners are subject to frequent beatings and torture from the minute they arrive at the prison.

Political prisoners are often not permitted to exercise or work; that is, forced to sit completely still for 12 hours a day or forced to work more than 12 hours a day. Performance quotas for political prisoners are often set higher than those set for other prisoners. If these quotas are not met, then political prisoners are often forced to work on Sundays. In contrast, nonpolitical criminals who work more than 8 hours a day receive overtime privileges which are not available to political prisoners.

The Chinese Government claims that it allows all prisoners to read newspapers and magazines, watch television, listen to the radio, and take part in recreational activities. This is just not the case for political prisoners. They are often placed in solitary confinement where they have no access to these amenities. The Government also claims that political prisoners have the right to contact and remain in correspondence with family members. However, family members are not allowed to visit or correspond with prisoners when the authorities do not want the outside world to know how they are being treated. Like the pressure it exerted on the family of Wei Jingsheng, the Chinese Government often at-

tempts to intimidate a political prisoner's family into shunning or denouncing him.

Mr. President, the Chinese penal system supposedly guarantees medical treatment to its prisoners. Not so for political prisoners. Ren Wanding, a leading dissident, is in danger of losing his eyesight, yet nothing is being done to help him. Others have heart conditions and other ailments that remain untreated. The Chinese claim to have an ideal criminal justice system, but that claim in no way reflect reality.

The United States must not turn a blind eye to these human rights abuses. Nor should it tactly condone them. It must instead call them as it sees them, and press for their cessation.

Economic sanctions are among the possible means to induce compliance with international standards of human rights. Diplomacy, both public and quiet, is another. The pressure of public opinion is a third. The United States should press for guaranteed access by humanitarian organizations to China's prisons and labor reform enterprises. When abuses are found, the Chinese Government should have to acknowledge and explain them, and either change its ways or continue to come under international pressure. The United States should also seek verifiable commitments by China to abide by international standards of respect for human rights.

Mr. President, five dissidents, Wang Dan, Guo Haifeng, Wang Xizhe, Li Guiren, and Zhu Hongsheng, were recently released early from prison, indicating that China might respond to further international pressure and change its policies. But there are still many hundreds, maybe even thousands of political prisoners in China. Though the releases appear encouraging, 40 or more arrests have also been made just since June 1992. So, it is premature, at best, to conclude that any fundamental change in Chinese policy has occurred.

Mr. President, as we approach the 21st century, the United States will be looked to, more and more, as a defender of human rights. Operating as a standard-bearer of human rights is a daunting task, but it is not one from which we as a Nation should shrink, especially when the need is so compelling. I urge my colleagues to mark this anniversary of Wei Jingsheng's imprisonment with a renewed commitment of vigilance toward human rights abuses in China. The amazing courage demonstrated by Wei Jingsheng and others shows that our vigilance provides sustenance for those who continue to struggle against repression in China. Let us not forget them as we seek ways to deal with, and influence, the People's Republic of China.●

TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHILDREN'S DAY NURSERY IN PASSAIC, NJ

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the Children's Day Nursery, in Passaic, NJ, is among an elite group of day care centers in America that can claim a century of service to over four generations of disadvantaged families within its community. I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Children's Day Nursery as it commemorates its centennial anniversary today.

Quality day care is a priority in our modern world. So many, many families must seek dependable child care arrangements, and we all know there just are not enough qualified resources. Yet the Children's Day Nursery has been a safe, nurturing haven for hundreds of thousands of inner-city children from diverse ethnic origins for a remarkable 100 continuous years. The center is an invaluable support for the city of Passaic, a well-known source of pride in the State of New Jersey, and an outstanding model for the rest of the country.

I applaud the impressive history and important future of the Children's Day Nursery. On behalf of our Nation, I send best wishes for continued growth, service, and leadership.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 30; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with Senator GRAMM of Texas recognized for up to 10 minutes; that at 11 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill; and that on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. in order to accommodate the regular party conferences.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, so that Senators may be aware, a vote will occur at 11 a.m. when the Senate resumes consideration of the pending bill. The Senate will vote on a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate failed to table the pending Brown amendment. That vote will occur at 11 a.m. Senators should be present and ready to vote at that time.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:42 p.m. recessed until Tuesday, March 30, 1993, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS R. PICKERING, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, WITH THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RONALD K. NOBLE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE PETER K. NUNEZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT D. CHELBERG [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOSEPH S. LAPOSATA [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARVIN L. COVAULT [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD F. KELLER [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ROGER F. BACON [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ROOSEVELT GREEN [redacted]
SANFORD D. ZELNICK [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

YVONNE D. CAGLE [redacted]
RICHARD J. MONTMINY [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GARDNER G. BASSETT [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING CADETS, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, FOR APPOINTMENT AS SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 541 AND 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LORI L. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES A. COOK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. DABERKOW xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. GEORGIAN xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT E. HAYFORD xxx-xx-x...
KRAIG M. HILL xxx-xx-x...
ALEX B. MCKINDRA, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JEREMY M. SLAGLEY xxx-xx-x...
AMIT Y. YORAN xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK ARE ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

*GARY D. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

*JOHN A. RICHMOND xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD C. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

*BRIAN J. O'HEA xxx-xx-x...
*MICHAEL SZKRYBALO xxx-xx-x...

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

*DONALD W. GILMORE xxx-xx-x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

RUFUS Y. BANDY xxx-xx-x...
E. J. BELFIGLIO xxx-xx-x...
RONALD W. BICE xxx-xx-x...
CONRAD F. BODAL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL A. CANNAVA xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. CARINO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. CARR xxx-xx-x...
GERALD D. COX xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
ELADIO DELEON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
NORMAN B. FARRAR xxx-xx-x...
LINCOLN D. FRETWELL xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN C. GUY xxx-xx-x...
BENJAMIN S. *. HANSON xxx-xx-x...
BRADFORD W. HARPER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. HARRELL xxx-xx-x...
KARL K. HARRIS xxx-xx-x...
GENOUS S. HODGES xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY K. JONES xxx-xx-x...
MARK G. KOCH xxx-xx-x...
RONALD J. LAMBERT xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. LECLAIR xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. LOUSHINE xxx-xx-x...
JACK B. MEYER xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT G. MINNICH xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. ONEAL xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. PALIAN xxx-xx-x...
MERLE H. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. PARSONS xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. PODNAR xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP K. RADTKE xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES L. RINGGOLD xxx-xx-x...
ROY A. ROCKMAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN J. ROSS xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS A. RUNYAN xxx-xx-x...
GRETCHEN A. SCHACH xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS L. SLOPEY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. *. STRIDER xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE H. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
EDWIN A. TRIPP xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT H. *. VANDRE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. VOLZ xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW A. VORONO xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD WARRINGTON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. WITWER xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

RICHARD L. *. ALLEN xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS R. BABONIS xxx-xx-x...
VICTOR C. BELL xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. BLOUGH xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. BRIEN xxx-xx-x...
ALFRED B. *. BROOKS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. BROYLES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. *. BRUNDAGE xxx-xx-x...
ARTHUR B. *. BUCKNER xxx-xx-x...
TONY CARTER xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE A. COOK xxx-xx-x...
GERALD M. CROSS xxx-xx-x...
VIRGIL T. *. DEAL xxx-xx-x...
DAVID P. DEETER xxx-xx-x...
CALVIN B. *. DELAPLAIN xxx-xx-x...
ALBERT C. *. DIDDAMS xxx-xx-x...
BENEDICT M. *. DINIEGA xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. *. DUNCAN xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH E. DYER xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH E. *. DZIADOS xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE T. *. ETZKORN xxx-xx-x...
HENRY G. FEIN xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH FITZHARRIS xxx-xx-x...
JAMES L. FLEMING xxx-xx-x...
GARY L. FRANCIS xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD B. FREYFOGLE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN W. *. GARDNER xxx-xx-x...
JOHNNIE B. *. HALL xxx-xx-x...
MYRON *. HARASYM xxx-xx-x...
JAMES T. *. HARDY xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD T. *. HARPER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES E. *. HENLEY xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH L. HICKEY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES B. *. HICKS xxx-xx-x...
CHI K. HO xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. *. HOOVER xxx-xx-x...
JERRY W. *. HOPE xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE L. INNIS xxx-xx-x...
DARRELL C. JEWETT xxx-xx-x...
GAIL M. *. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT V. *. JONES xxx-xx-x...
RONALD J. JONES xxx-xx-x...
DONALD J. KASPERIK xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK C. *. KELLY xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD M. *. KIMES xxx-xx-x...
CHA O. *. KOO xxx-xx-x...
KURT K. KROENKE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. *. KUGLER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM N. LANE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID H. LEEPER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP G. *. LISAGOR xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS V. MAROLDO xxx-xx-x...
ARTHUR S. *. MASLOW xxx-xx-x...
ALLAN R. *. MAYER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL H. MAYER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL *. MCCAFFERY xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL *. MCDERMOTT xxx-xx-x...
THEODORE R. *. MCNITT xxx-xx-x...
HERNANDO MENA xxx-xx-x...
FRANK M. *. MOSES xxx-xx-x...
EVERETT W. *. NEWCOMB xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. *. NORBECK xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN G. *. OSWALD xxx-xx-x...
ALLAN L. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD H. *. PEARL xxx-xx-x...
STEVE E. PHURROUGH xxx-xx-x...
JAMES L. *. PITTMAN xxx-xx-xxxx
CAROLYN D. RANDLE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. *. REDFIELD xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW M. *. RICE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT *. SOLENBERGER xxx-xx-x...
KWEON I. *. STAMBAUGH xxx-xx-x...
DONALD L. *. STEINWEG xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW M. *. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
OYEWOLE M. TONEY xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH *. TORRINGTON xxx-xx-x...
FRANK T. WARD xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. *. WESLEY xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. WISWELL xxx-xx-x...
JEREL M. *. ZOLTICK xxx-xx-x...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE APPROPRIATE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AND THOSE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES INDICATED PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN INDICATED.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

ALAN M. AKERS xxx-xx-x...
JAMES D. ALLMAN xxx-xx-x...
LARRY D. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x...
BARRY J. BAIORUNOS xxx-xx-x...
MARVIN D. BELL xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. BOYTIM xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM P. CALDON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID F. CLAPP xxx-xx-x...
TERRELL COHEN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. CORLEY xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. CROOKS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD H. DAY xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS C. DIXON xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE B. DOUGLAS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. EAST, III xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD S. FINLAYSON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN A. FORSYTHE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. FOSTER xxx-xx-x...
GARY J. GOLDEN xxx-xx-x...
GARBETH S. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK G. GUERRA, JR. xxx-xx-x...
MARK S. HAGGE xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE K. HALL xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND G. KOEPPEN xxx-xx-x...
NICHOLAS J. LEVERING xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. MCDUFFIE xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS R. MENG, JR. xxx-xx-x...
MARION L. MESSERSMITH xxx-xx-x...
SHANNON E. MILLS xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY B. NEWLAND xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH C. PINKERTON xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE D. SCHMELTZER xxx-xx-x...
TYLER H. SLOCUMB, JR. xxx-xx-x...
DONALD M. SPRAGUE xxx-xx-x...
CLIFFORD B. STARR xxx-xx-x...
ALEXANDER J. WARSCHAW xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM W. WILSON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD F. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

JAY S. ADAMS xxx-xx-x...
RUDOLPH P. ARNOLD xxx-xx-x...
MELVIN A. BAYNE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. BEAR xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. BECKER, JR. xxx-xx-xxx...
JAMES M. BENGE xxx-xx-x...
WINSTON H. BLAKE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. BOST xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
JOSE B. BUENO xxx-xx-x...
MILDRED CALERO xxx-xx-x...
JULIETA M. CALZADO xxx-xx-x...
HORACE R. CARSON xxx-xx-x...
GLENN A. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
CHUN C. CHOY xxx-xx-x...
PAUL B. CHRISTIANSON xxx-xx-x...
TOMMIE G. CHURCH xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY G. CLOONAN xxx-xx-x...
JEAN C. COMEAU xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. CRIDDLE xxx-xx-x...
WADE A. CROWDER xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN E. EVANS xxx-xx-x...
MARC A. FRITZ xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES B. GREEN xxx-xx-x...
LILIANA Q. HALIM xxx-xx-xxx...
CHARLES R. HARRISON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x...
BERNARD F. HEARON xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH D. HIRSCH xxx-xx-x...
BRENT M. HJERMSTAD xxx-xx-x...
RONALD K. HOYT xxx-xx-x...
JAY P. JACOB xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY J. JAFFERS xxx-xx-x...
SUDHIR A. JAITUNI xxx-xx-x...
RENE G. JASO xxx-xx-x...
KIRBY E. KNOX xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL F. KOSLOFF xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL R. KUSKIE xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE I. KWIK xxx-xx-x...
DON A. LAWRENCE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL H. LILLY, JR. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM I. LUNDBERG xxx-xx-x...
ROGER L. MEHL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. MICHELS xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS H. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE A. OKSOL xxx-xx-x...
RELFORD E. PATTERSON xxx-xx-x...
HUBERT O. PLATT xxx-xx-x...
GARY C. PRECHTER xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH D. RASHID xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. RUFFER xxx-xx-x...
MONIQUE A. RYSER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. SCHALL xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. SCHENK xxx-xx-x...
KRIS M. SHEKITKA xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES L. SIMPSON xxx-xx-x...
KURT A. STONE xxx-xx-x...
FRANCIS A. STRATFORD, JR. xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE P. TAYLOR, JR. xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. THORPE xxx-xx-x...
EARL E. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
JAI C. WHANG xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
HENRY S. K. WILLIS, III xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE W. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
NELSON T. YAP xxx-xx-x...
GLADYS E. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN W. ABBOTT xxx-xx-xx...
JOHN L. ALONGE xxx-xx-x...
PETER C. ANTINOPOULOS xxx-xx-x...
JEFFERY F. BAKER xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT G. BERGH xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. BETTINESCHI, JR. xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN F. BLAIR xxx-xx-x...

ROBERT F. BLODGETT, JR. xxx-xx-x...
IRENE G. BOBERMOKEN xxx-xx-x...
GARY A. BRAUN xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY C. BROWNING xxx-xx-x...
ORSON P. CARDON xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS B. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. CHARLTON xxx-xx-x...
CEDRIC C. CHENET xxx-xx-x...
JAMES L. COCKLIN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. CONLAN xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN A. CONNOR xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. CORMAN xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER R. CULLITON xxx-xx-x...
CARY J. CUNNINGHAM xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES F. DEFREESE xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT S. DICKSON xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD O. ERKES xxx-xx-x...
MARK ESSICK xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN J. EXTERKAMP xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN C. FENZL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. FOLEY xxx-xx-x...
MELVIN L. FORD xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT Q. FRAZER xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS C. FUREY xxx-xx-x...
MARTHA L. GARITO xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. GILL xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. GILLEN, III xxx-xx-x...
BRENT L. GILLILAND xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS A. GILLMAN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. GORE xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT E. GRAY xxx-xx-x...
MARK R. GUILDER xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH G. HILL xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE C. HLUDZIK xxx-xx-x...
SPENCER N. HOPKINS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM G. HUGHES xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. HUTCHINGS xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND W. KAERCHER xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY A. KAMP xxx-xx-x...
TERENCE J. KINYON xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW R. KIOUS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN KUSSMAUL, JR. xxx-xx-x...
MAUREEN E. LANG xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH A. MARCHESE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD T. MCDONNELL xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW J. MESAROS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG E. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
MARK D. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
NICHOLAS J. MINIOTIS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD W. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
ELLIS J. NARCISSE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
RONALD G. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
ALAN E. PALMER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
DIANE S. PAXTON xxx-xx-x...
JON E. PICHE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM F. PIERPONT xxx-xx-x...
RONALD C. PRATT xxx-xx-x...
RHETT M. QUIST xxx-xx-x...
LISA D. RACKLEY xxx-xx-x...
JASON M. RAMPTON xxx-xx-x...
ODES B. ROBERTSON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
RIDLEY O. ROSS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT SABATINI xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x...
ROSS E. SETHMAN xxx-xx-x...
RANDY A. SHAFFER xxx-xx-x...
ALAN T. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
JAY C. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
KARL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
OTHA L. SOLOMON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
EMIL W. TETZNER xxx-xx-x...
DALE C. THAMES, JR. xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN J. THOMSON xxx-xx-x...
ERIK M. TJELMELAND xxx-xx-x...
LENDON K. TROIANI xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS N. WANAT, JR. xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN J. WHITNEY xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY P. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LAURENCE J. ADAMS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
RICARDO E. ALVILLAR xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. ANGSTADT xxx-xx-x...
RAMON A. ARROYOPADRO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID P. ASCHER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS F. BABSON xxx-xx-x...
MARK R. BARNETT xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. BEADLING xxx-xx-x...
CARL T. BERGREN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL K. BERRY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT N. BERTOLDO xxx-xx-x...
ALAN F. BITNER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. BLOOM xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. BOBBITT, III xxx-xx-x...
BRYAN C. BOMBERG xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN A. BRIETZKE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. BUCHSBAUM, II xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. BURTON, III xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT H. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x...
CAREY M. CAPELLI xxx-xx-x...
FRANCISCO CARRIONTORRES xxx-xx-x...
RONALD D. CATES xxx-xx-x...
WALTER R. CAYCE xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN L. CHAMBERS xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE W. CHRISTOPHER xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD E. COOK, III xxx-xx-x...
CLARENCE E. COTTON, JR. xxx-xx-x...
FRANK S. DAVIS xxx-xx-x...
BRADLEY J. DAWKINS xxx-xx-x...
DEAN DEBENEDICTIS xxx-xx-x...
KAREN C. H. DEERING xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. DERBY xxx-xx-x...
GLENN E. DICKEY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. DIXON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. DREW xxx-xx-x...
JAY S. ELLIS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK K. EMGE xxx-xx-x...
MARC I. EPSTEIN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID B. ETHIER xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD H. FAIN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY E. FARLEY xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH C. FARMER xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS K. FERNANDEZ xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN J. FINLEY xxx-xx-x...
MARK D. FORTE xxx-xx-x...
CLIFFORD D. FRIESEN xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS C. FULLER xxx-xx-x...
MARY E. GABRIEL xxx-xx-x...
CONLEY B. GAINER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. GARDNER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. GARRISON xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE J. GIBEILY xxx-xx-x...
PAUL R. GLOWIENKA xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES D. GOLDMAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES S. GREEN xxx-xx-x...
SPENCER D. GREENDYKE xxx-xx-x...
MARY L. GREENE xxx-xx-x...
ROLAND A. GRIEB xxx-xx-x...
LINDA J. GRIFFITH xxx-xx-x...
GARY S. GRONSETH xxx-xx-x...
RANDAL L. HAMRICK xxx-xx-x...
J. ALISON HANSON xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES K. HARDIN xxx-xx-x...
DONALD G. HILL xxx-xx-x...
ALFRED J. HOCKLEY, III xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA A. HOLCK xxx-xx-x...
ARNOLD B. HONICK xxx-xx-x...
MARK D. HOPKINS xxx-xx-x...
GARY M. HOROWITZ xxx-xx-x...
ROGERS G. HOWELL, II xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD H. ILLIONS xxx-xx-x...
MARK G. JANCZEWSKI xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. JANIK xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE P. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
JOE S. JONES xxx-xx-x...
DIANE L. JORDANWAGNER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD E. KARULF xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH L. KAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL P. KELLER xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH S. KIM xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. KINNE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID P. KISSINGER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP T. KLAZYNSKI xxx-xx-x...
VICTOR R. KNAPP xxx-xx-x...
TRISTAN E. KOHUT xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. KOROSCIL xxx-xx-x...
KIT D. KUSS xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP A. LAKIER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. LAURENTZ xxx-xx-x...
JANICE L. LEE xxx-xx-x...
JULIAN C. LEVIN xxx-xx-x...
ERNEST B. LINDELL xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH A. LOMBEIDA xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. MACKETT xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN F. MANCHESTER xxx-xx-x...
MARY L. MAROHN xxx-xx-x...
ALFRED W. MAZUR xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH E. MCGHEE xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY J. MEFFERT xxx-xx-xxxx
FRANK W. MEISSNER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL C. MERWIN xxx-xx-x...
CATHERINE T. MILBOURN xxx-xx-x...
GERHARD MOELLER xxx-xx-x...
RAMON G. MONTESGARCES xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL J. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. MUNSON xxx-xx-x...
KIM D. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA L. MURRAYZARZOUR xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. MYERS xxx-xx-x...
MARK T. NADEAU xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. NASH xxx-xx-xx...
WILLIAM D. NEAL xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. NEEL xxx-xx-x...
GUY M. NEWLAND xxx-xx-x...
PETER J. NIGRO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID S. NOLL xxx-xx-x...
KEITH D. NORD xxx-xx-x...
MARY A. ORZECH xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT OSTERICHER xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE V. PAGE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. PARKER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
SUBHASH R. PATEL xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS E. PAULL xxx-xx-x...
JON R. PEARSE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERTO A. PENNECASANOVA xxx-xx-x...
VAN E. PERRY xxx-xx-x...
ALTON W. POWELL, III xxx-xx-x...
MIGUEL A. RAMIREZCOLON xxx-xx-xx...
BRIAN H. REED xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY T. REHE xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL W. RESTEY xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE M. RIDDLES xxx-xx-x...
DANNY R. ROBINETTE xxx-xx-x...
LUIS R. RODRIGUEZCOLON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. ROSSIO xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. ROWAN, III xxx-xx-x...
JANICE M. RUSNAK xxx-xx-x...
DAVID K. SCALES xxx-xx-x...
KIM M. SCHOEFFEL xxx-xx-x...
JORGINA S. SCHREIER xxx-xx-x...
LEIGH A. SCHWIETZ xxx-xx-x...
JAY T. SEGARRA xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES W. SHAPARD xxx-xx-x...
GARY H. SHARP xxx-xx-x...
NAOMI N. SHIELDS xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL F. SHREEVE xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT D. SHUMAKER xxx-xx-x...
ANTONIA SILVAHALE xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE D. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
SANDRA E. SMITHPOLING xxx-xx-x...
TERESA J. SOMMESE xxx-xx-x...
WOO K. SONG xxx-xx-x...
MARVIN L. STANCIL xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY H. STANCIL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL S. STONER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
DIANE C. STROLLO xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. SWARTZ, III xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM S. SYKORA xxx-xx-x...
EDWIN C. TELFER xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE L. TJADEN xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS W. TRAVIS xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD R. UNGER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY J. VANGOOR xxx-xx-x...
DONALD R. VARNER, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JOHN H. WAGONER xxx-xx-x...
GARY M. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
JANET M. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. WATSON xxx-xx-xx...
KAREN K. WIES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH A. WINGET xxx-xx-x...
MARSHALL L. WONG xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL J. YASZEMSKI xxx-xx-x...
RAUL YORDANJOVET xxx-xx-x...
NANCY ZEFO xxx-xx-x...
PAUL R. ZIAYA xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

JOEL J. AIMONE xxx-xx-x...
KIRBY D. AMONSON xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. ARMSTRONG xxx-xx-x...
BRET A. AVRA xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN L. BARTEL xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD M. BEDINGHAUS xxx-xx-x...
TAMARA E. BLOCH xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY L. BRAY xxx-xx-x...
GARY L. BROOKS xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN K. CALENDINE xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS CARRERAS xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH A. CONNER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN J. CONROY xxx-xx-x...
RICKY D. COOK xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. DINSE xxx-xx-x...
JON M. DOSSETT xxx-xx-x...
BRYAN D. DYE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. GERLACH xxx-xx-x...
JAMES J. GIFT xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT L. GOLDSTEIN xxx-xx-x...
LORA D. GRAVES xxx-xx-x...
VANDANA GUPTA xxx-xx-x...
MARIANNE C. HARTUH xxx-xx-x...
TERRANCE L. HAUCK xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN R. HOLT xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN T. HOWARD xxx-xx-x...
CONSTANCE A. HUFF xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY P. JESSUP xxx-xx-xxxx
RAY S. JETER xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY S. KLEINHEINZ xxx-xx-xx...
MICHAEL J. KNOTT xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL M. LARSEN xxx-xx-x...
GERALD C. LEAKE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. LEIB xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE S. H. LEONG xxx-xx-x...
MIKE A. LUTZ xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. MACKEY xxx-xx-x...
CURTIS M. MARSH xxx-xx-x...
JANET Y. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
BRENT S. MCCLENNY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. MCPHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
KARL L. MEYER xxx-xx-x...
MARK E. MUTH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL P. NAJERA xxx-xx-x...
KYLE C. NUNLEY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. NUSSTEIN xxx-xx-xxxx
MICHAEL D. PETERSEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL H. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
RONALD K. RISINGER xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS L. RISK xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN J. ROURKE xxx-xx-x...
KENT A. SABEY xxx-xx-x...
JEAN M. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. SLABBEKOORN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY R. SLAVKOVSKY xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY A. STAPLES xxx-xx-xx...
ROSALIND K. VIOHL xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW T. WELLEJUS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. WELLS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN L. WHITTLE xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN D. WIGHT xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

JAMES G. ADAMS xxx-xx-x...
TURGUT ALAGOZ xxx-xx-x...
HARRY ALBERTI xxx-xx-x...
NANCY J. ALBRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND B. ALLEN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. ALLEN xxx-xx-x...
NORMA L. ALLGOOD xxx-xx-x...

ORLANDO M. ALVAREZ xxx-xx-x...
MARC O. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN G. ANEMA xxx-xx-x...
ALLISON A. ANGOTTI xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. ANISMAN xxx-xx-x...
FRANK J. ARCHER xxx-xx-x...
GARY I. ARISHITA xxx-xx-x...
MARY LOUISE AUCHUS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD J. AUCHUS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL B. AUSTIN xxx-xx-x...
ELEANOR E. AVERY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN MARK BAAR xxx-xx-x...
LEISA H. BAILEY xxx-xx-x...
KORNFELD JOHN M. BALBUS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. BALDAUF xxx-xx-x...
CONSTANTIN A. BALOURIS xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES L. BANE xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE BANKA xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG E. BARNES xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN L. BARNES xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS P. BARNETT xxx-xx-x...
DEBBIE LYNN BATTEIGER xxx-xx-x...
BRANTLY W. BAYNES xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW J. BEHNKE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL S. BEIGHLEY xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE A. BELECANECH xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM B. BELL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM BENINATI xxx-xx-x...
ERIC H. BENINK xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN J. BERCSI xxx-xx-x...
SVEN T. BERG xxx-xx-x...
GUY R. BIBEAU xxx-xx-x...
DAVID K. BILLMAN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. BJORAKER, JR xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT V. BLAKEBURN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. BLEDSOE xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD P. BLOUNT, III xxx-xx-x...
LUIS A. BOLANOS xxx-xx-x...
KEITH J. BOLYARD xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN D. BOMALASKI xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE V. BONVENTRE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL E. BOOR xxx-xx-x...
TOMASZ W. BOHOWIECKI xxx-xx-x...
EDGAR M. BOYD, JR xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN R. BRADSHAW xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE A. BREARLEY xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL S. BREM xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. BRENNER xxx-xx-x...
SIDNEY B. BREVARD xxx-xx-x...
DEAN A. BRICKER xxx-xx-x...
JACK L. BRIDGES xxx-xx-x...
IRVIN P. BROCK, II xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS R. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES P. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
LAURENCE B. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN R. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN A. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY R. BROWN xxx-xx-x...
JOEL E. BRUCE xxx-xx-x...
LESLIE R. BRYANT xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA R. BUCKNAM xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER BUDNY xxx-xx-x...
RITA A. BURR xxx-xx-x...
MARTIN G. BUTLER xxx-xx-x...
GERALD T. BYERS xxx-xx-x...
ROBIN W. CALDWELL xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. CAMBRIDGE xxx-xx-x...
MARK S. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. CARLSON xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW T. CARPENTER xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY J. CARR xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY T. CARTER xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY D. CASSIDY xxx-xx-x...
ANN C. CHILDRESS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. CHU xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. CIAROLLA xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL S. CITAK xxx-xx-x...
CAROLYN CLARKTILLEY xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. CLAY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. COGGINS xxx-xx-x...
ADAM J. COHEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID B. COHEN xxx-xx-x...
HARRY C. COLE, III xxx-xx-x...
JACK E. COLKER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN T. COLUMBUS xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. CONLEY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. COOK xxx-xx-x...
DON C. COONCE xxx-xx-x...
JANE E. CORNETT xxx-xx-x...
PAULA A. CORRIGAN xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY L. CRAWFORD, JR xxx-xx-x...
MANUEL O. CRESPO xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. CROWTHER xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN CULBERT xxx-xx-x...
MOIRA CURLEY xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN A. CURRIER xxx-xx-xxxx
RICHARD T. DAHLEN xxx-xx-x...
CLIVE G. DANIELS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. DAVENPORT xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. DAY xxx-xx-x...
BART J. DEBROCK xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. DECKER xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. DECOOK xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN C. DECOUD xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA A. DEGROOT xxx-xx-x...
MARC M. DEHART xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER A. DEMAIORIBUS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. DESKO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. DEVOID xxx-xx-x...
JAMES B. DICKEY xxx-xx-x...
LORRAINE A. DICKEY xxx-xx-x...
MARCEL V. DIONNE xxx-xx-x...

SUDHAKAR DIXIT xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN DOLAN xxx-xx-x...
MARY P. DOURGARIAN xxx-xx-x...
GAIL J. DUDLEY xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL D. DUMIRE xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA J. DURY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. DZIK xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. EARL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES D. EASON xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL C. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x...
LAURIE P. ELWELL xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. ERBICELLA xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS A. ERCHINGER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. ERTEL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. EVERSOLE xxx-xx-x...
SANDRA KAY FALKENHAIN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT G. FANTE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. FARRIS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. FAY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. FELLER xxx-xx-x...
CARMEN A. FERNANDEZ xxx-xx-x...
JEANNE M. FERRANTE xxx-xx-x...
KELSON M. FIGARO xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. FIKE xxx-xx-x...
PETER T. FILIPON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. FISCHER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES R. FISHER, JR xxx-xx-x...
MARCUS S. FISHER xxx-xx-x...
LES R. FOLIO xxx-xx-x...
LADONNA D. FORD xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES D. FOWLER, JR xxx-xx-x...
PETER E. FRASCO xxx-xx-x...
CLIFFORD B. FREDING xxx-xx-x...
PAMELA M. FRIEL xxx-xx-x...
SPENCER J. FRINK xxx-xx-x...
ANN S. FULCHER xxx-xx-x...
MITCHELL A. GARBER xxx-xx-x...
BARRY L. GARDNER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID GARRETT, JR xxx-xx-x...
LARRY DON GEE xxx-xx-x...
DIANE C. GEORGE xxx-xx-x...
ELENA M. GEOVANES xxx-xx-x...
GORDON M. GERSON, JR xxx-xx-x...
HOWARD E. GILL, III xxx-xx-x...
ARLA A. GILLILAND xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT T. GILSON xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL C. GINSBERG xxx-xx-x...
GUY G. GLATZ xxx-xx-x...
LEIGHANNE GLAZENER xxx-xx-x...
CARL D. GLIDDEN xxx-xx-x...
ROSE L. GLYNNE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN S. GOLDEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL S. GOLDSTOFF xxx-xx-x...
GEOFFREY H. GOLEMBIEWSKI xxx-xx-x...
GUILLERMO GONZALES xxx-xx-x...
HUBERT L. GOOCH, JR xxx-xx-x...
AUDREY L. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
MARK A. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x...
KENDALL E. GRAVEN xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN R. GREEN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID N. GREENBERG xxx-xx-x...
NED J. GROSS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. GUEVARA xxx-xx-x...
MAUREEN M. HACKETT xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL L. HAFFNER xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY S. HAGADORNFREATHY xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. HAGEN xxx-xx-x...
EUGENIE T. HAIGHT xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN A. HALL xxx-xx-x...
LEATON H. HALL xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT B. HALL xxx-xx-x...
JACQUELYN HALLDAVIS xxx-xx-x...
GLENN D. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE ROBERT HANSEN xxx-xx-x...
PAUL A. HANSLIK xxx-xx-x...
VAUGHN W. HANSON xxx-xx-x...
STUART A. HARLIN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFERSON H. HARMAN, JR xxx-xx-x...
SEAN P. HARNEY xxx-xx-x...
PAUL A. HEMMER xxx-xx-x...
BARRY A. HENCH xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL R. HENLEY xxx-xx-x...
LINWOOD J. HENRY xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE R. C. HENTSCHEL xxx-xx-x...
NEIL E. HERENDEEN xxx-xx-x...
SANDRA J. HERRINGTON xxx-xx-x...
DARRELL E. HESTER xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN M. HETRICK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. HEUSNER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. HICKEY xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY A. HILL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES B. HOER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. HOFFSTETTER xxx-xx-x...
LEWIS A. HOFMANN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. HOLCK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES S. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x...
DAG HOLMSEN xxx-xx-x...
TERRY M. HOMMEL xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK A. HONAKER xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL C. HOOD xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG HORNBARGER xxx-xx-x...
LAURA A. HOTCHKISS xxx-xx-x...
LESTER A. HUFF xxx-xx-x...
JON W. HUGHES xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN W. HUMBURG xxx-xx-x...
DARRYL C. HUNTER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. HUNTER xxx-xx-x...
BART O. IDDINS xxx-xx-x...
JANE Y. IKEDA xxx-xx-x...
VINCENT L. IMBRIAN xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK S. ISAAK xxx-xx-x...
JACQUELYN I. ISLAND xxx-xx-x...

VENKATARAO IYYALASOMAYAZULA xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP F. JACKSON xxx-xx-x...
ARTHUR M. JAMES xxx-xx-x...
LILLIAN S. JARDINE xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY J. JASLOWSKI xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. JENKINS xxx-xx-x...
DONALD H. JENKINS xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN P. JENSEN xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY T. JEX xxx-xx-x...
DONNA A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. JOHNSTON xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. JONES xxx-xx-x...
NEIL L. JORGENSEN xxx-xx-x...
KAREN E. JOYCE xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY J. JUCHAU xxx-xx-x...
EUGENE S. JUSTUS xxx-xx-xxxx
TERESA KANDAH xxx-xx-x...
JERROLD J. KARTZINEL xxx-xx-x...
ELIZABETH M. KEENE xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH E. KERPELMAN xxx-xx-x...
KEITH A. KERR xxx-xx-x...
MANSUR A. KHAN xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP G. KIELY, JR xxx-xx-x...
SIK K. KIM xxx-xx-x...
AZIZ A. KLAVON xxx-xx-x...
MARK R. KLINKER xxx-xx-x...
CAROL J. KOEBLE xxx-xx-x...
SHARI L. KOGAN xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD W. KOLAR, III xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER KONTOGIANIS xxx-xx-x...
ELIZABETH P. KORNEGAY xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN L. KORT xxx-xx-x...
SALLY A. KRONER xxx-xx-x...
DEBORAH A. KULLERD xxx-xx-x...
ROSEANNE C. LABARRE xxx-xx-x...
MOLLY F. LAIRD xxx-xx-x...
CHAD C. LAMB xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH R. LAMB xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. LANCASTER, JR xxx-xx-x...
LAURIE B. LANDEEN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. LANDGRAF xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN W. LANE xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN A. LANG xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY J. LANGENFELD, JR xxx-xx-x...
MARIO A. LANZA xxx-xx-x...
MARY R. LANZA xxx-xx-x...
MARK R. LAROSE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. LARRISON, JR xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP L. LATHAM xxx-xx-x...
SAMUEL S. LAU xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP J. LAVALLEE xxx-xx-x...
MAUREEN P. LAVIN xxx-xx-x...
LINDA L. LAWRENCE xxx-xx-x...
THEODORE S. LAWSON xxx-xx-x...
MYUNG MOO LEE xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH S. LEFFLER xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS S. LEHRER xxx-xx-x...
DOUG R. LEIGH xxx-xx-x...
PETER E. LETHIN xxx-xx-x...
LORI A. LEVI xxx-xx-x...
LOREN L. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
STACY K. LEWIS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. LEYENDECKER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. LINDNER xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. LISANTI xxx-xx-x...
KIM E. LOPEZ xxx-xx-x...
KARL F. LOVE xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. LOVELY xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. LOWRY xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. LUBKE xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP D. LUEBBERT xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM E. LYLES xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. LYNN xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM D. MACDONALD xxx-xx-x...
KATHLEEN C. MADDEN xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS J. MAGNER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. MAHA, JR xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT M. MAKEEVER xxx-xx-x...
IVAN A. MALAVE xxx-xx-x...
HARRY D. MALCOLM xxx-xx-x...
CARLOS E. MALDONADO, JR xxx-xx-x...
SUZANNE M. MALIS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. MANAKER xxx-xx-x...
CURTIS A. MANNING xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. MARCHESSEAULT xxx-xx-x...
JACOB C. MARSHALL, JR xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE A. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS V. MARTIN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. MARTINEZ xxx-xx-x...
MERIA G. MARTIROSIAN xxx-xx-x...
MARSHA MASSELINK xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN J. MASTERSON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN H. MATSUURA xxx-xx-x...
FRANK R. MATTIA xxx-xx-x...
MARK E. MAVITY xxx-xx-x...
KIMBERLY P. MAY xxx-xx-x...
NATALIE S. MAYER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM D. MAYER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. MCAFEE xxx-xx-x...
KURT D. MCCARTNEY xxx-xx-x...
RANDY A. MCCOOL xxx-xx-x...
LYNN S. MCCURDY xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE E. MCGEHEE xxx-xx-x...
SUZANNE E. MCGLOHN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. MCGRIFF xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL P. MCGUNIGAL xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH M. MCINTRYE xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL P. MCKELLAR xxx-xx-x...
JANET I. MCMAHON xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN E. MCMANIS xxx-xx-x...

ALAN G. MCNABB xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL G. MCNAMARA xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL P. MCNAMARA xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN E. MCNEIL xxx-xx-x...
PAUL D. MCWHIRTER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS D. MEACHAM xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA A. MEIER xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT W. MELANSON xxx-xx-x...
DALE A. MENARD, JR xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL MERCANDETTI xxx-xx-x...
GWENDOLYN MORE MERCER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN T. MEREDITH xxx-xx-x...
RAPPORT BARBARA J. MESSINGER xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY G. MICCIO xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL G. MILLER xxx-xx-x...
NORMAN MINDREBO xxx-xx-x...
JOHN MIRABELLO xxx-xx-x...
NANCY A. MIRANDA xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH P. MIRANTE xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH J. MISHARK xxx-xx-x...
JONAS O. MOEN xxx-xx-x...
MELISSA M. MOLLAN xxx-xx-x...
JON D. MOLIN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY S. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
PETER C. MORAN xxx-xx-x...
STEPHAN G. MORAN xxx-xx-x...
PETER J. MORELLI xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER W. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. MORGAN xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH A. MORHAIN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD P. MORSE xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN W. MORTENSON xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. NAEF, III xxx-xx-x...
DIANE C. NAPOLI xxx-xx-x...
PATRIC Y. NASSAUX xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY S. NEAL xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH A. NEWELL xxx-xx-x...
JENNIFER L. NEY xxx-xx-x...
MARGARET K. NICHOLS xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN J. NILES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. NOTARO xxx-xx-x...
DAIN NOVAK xxx-xx-x...
RUTH U. OAKS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID M. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x...
LORETTA M. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL M. OCKNER xxx-xx-x...
AMY ELIZABETH OKSA xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM J. OLIGMUELLER xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH N. OLIVIER xxx-xx-x...
MELANIE D. OLSON xxx-xx-x...
MARGRETTA A. OREILLY xxx-xx-x...
CARL L. OVERMILLER xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY R. OWENS xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH V. PACE xxx-xx-x...
KAREN L. PADDOCK xxx-xx-x...
TAMMY E. PANNELL xxx-xx-x...
LARRY W. PARSONS xxx-xx-x...
AUGUST C. PASQUALE, III xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG P. PATTERSON xxx-xx-x...
ALBERT W. PEARSALL, IV xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. PEARSALL xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY LEE PENDERGRASS xxx-xx-x...
KATHERINE A. PETERS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
KRISTIN K. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN D. PEYTON xxx-xx-x...
ROGER N. C. PHAM xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
ANDRE F. PICHON xxx-xx-x...
EDWIG K. PLOTNICK xxx-xx-x...
LEONARD A. PLUNKETT xxx-xx-x...
JON E. POPOVICH xxx-xx-x...
KIM A. PORTERFIELD xxx-xx-x...
ELISHA T. POWELL, IV xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH L. PRATT xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. PRINCE xxx-xx-x...
JOSE M. PUJOL xxx-xx-x...
JURIS PURINS xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY P. QUAM xxx-xx-x...
DAYLE QUIGLEYMALCOLM xxx-xx-x...
JAMES M. QUINN xxx-xx-x...
ARNALDO R. QUINONES xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM S. RAMBO xxx-xx-x...
PETER A. RAMIREZ xxx-xx-x...
LINDA E. RANGE xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS W. RATLIFF xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN V. REAMY xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE RECCOPPA xxx-xx-...
CHRISTIANNE M. RECKLEY xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. RESWEBER xxx-xx-x...

AUDRY G. RHODES xxx-xx-x...
RANDALL E. RHODES xxx-xx-x...
MARK W. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM R. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
JESSICA B. RICHMOND xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW R. RICKS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. RIGBY xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN C. RIGGS xxx-xx-x...
DIANE C. RITTER xxx-xx-x...
GERANT RIVERA xxx-xx-x...
EDGARDO J. RIVERARIVERA xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA LYNN ROACH xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH F. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x...
LYNETTE C. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x...
MARC S. ROBINS xxx-xx-x...
PAULA R. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY L. ROCHEN xxx-xx-x...
REBECCA D. RODIE xxx-xx-x...
GLISETTE RODRIGUEZ xxx-xx-x...
HILTON J. RODRIGUEZ xxx-xx-x...
JAMES K. RONE xxx-xx-x...
BRET A. ROSANE xxx-xx-x...
VALERIE H. ROSS xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH L. RUEGEMER xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN W. RUSS xxx-xx-x...
GARY D. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. RUSSI xxx-xx-x...
MARC S. RUSSO xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW H. RUZICH xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER W. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL S. SAENGER xxx-xx-x...
LINDA M. SAKAI xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH S. SAVAGE xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA H. SAWYER xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN P. SCHAFER xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTINE MICHELLE SCHAFER xxx-xx-x...
JONATHON C. SCHNITKER xxx-xx-x...
CATHY J. SCHOORENS xxx-xx-x...
HEATHER M. SCHULTE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN G. SCHULTE xxx-xx-x...
GLENN J. SCHULTES xxx-xx-x...
DON A. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT H. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. SCHUTZ xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL R. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN L. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN D. SCOTTI xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY S. SEAL xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. SEAY xxx-xx-x...
CURTIS M. SEITZ xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY M. SEIZYS xxx-xx-x...
GUSTAVO SERRANO xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES A. SHAPIRO xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. SHAPIRO xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD K. SHARP xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN P. SHEAHAN xxx-xx-x...
HEATHER ANN SHELTON xxx-xx-x...
PAUL E. SHINGLEDECKER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT D. SHUTT xxx-xx-x...
PATRICIA A. SILVIA xxx-xx-x...
BARBARA T. SITTON xxx-xx-x...
MARK E. SLAVEN xxx-xx-x...
NADIA C. SLYSH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
STANLEY G. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
TED R. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL R. SNEDECOR xxx-xx-x...
LISA R. SNOW xxx-xx-x...
JAMIE L. SNYDER xxx-xx-x...
ALBERT L. SOLOMITE xxx-xx-x...
LISA D. SOMERSON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. SORGE xxx-xx-x...
ALAN J. SORKEY xxx-xx-x...
THERESA B. SPARKMAN xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY A. SPENCER xxx-xx-x...
NEIL O. SPENCER xxx-xx-x...
BRUCE D. SPINZIG xxx-xx-x...
MARISS L. SRADERS xxx-xx-x...
CRAIG H. STAGG xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH E. STAGGS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. STAMATAKOS xxx-xx-x...
NICHOLAS W. STANEK xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. STANGLER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN L. STANLEY xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL B. STAPLETON, III xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY R. STAPLETON xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP J. STARCESKI xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW J. STASKO xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND M. STEFKO xxx-xx-x...

STEVEN R. STEINHUBL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. STEVENS, JR xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW B. STEVENS xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY P. STEVENS xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN A. STIERER xxx-xx-x...
TROY F. STOREY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. STREETER xxx-xx-x...
JOHNNIE W. STRICKLAND, JR xxx-xx-x...
ROBINSON H. STUBLEY, III xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE K. SUMPTER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN A. SUNDELL xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY J. SUTTON xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS J. SWANK xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. TABB xxx-xx-x...
COLLEEN C. TALLEN xxx-xx-...
WILLIAM S. TANKERSLEY xxx-xx-x...
MAUREEN C. TERRAZANO xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY J. THESING xxx-xx-x...
DAN E. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT A. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT S. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
KAREN S. THROWER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP T. THWING xxx-xx-x...
PAUL W. TOWNER xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK W. TOWNSEND xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. TRAUTH xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP TRIFFLETTI xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT T. TROIANI, JR xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM BRADLEY TROUTMAN xxx-xx-x...
ERIC C. TROYER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. TUREK xxx-xx-xx...
MICHAEL JOHN UHRIK xxx-xx-x...
HOEK TODD LEE VANDEN xxx-xx-x...
ELIZABETH A. VANDERBURGH xxx-xx-x...
MARK P. VANDERBURGH xxx-xx-x...
LORI L. VANHORN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. VATT xxx-xx-x...
WALTER D. VAZQUEZ xxx-xx-x...
JAY L. VIERNES xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN M. VOLTARELLI xxx-xx-x...
MARY J. WAGNER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN A. WAITES xxx-xx-x...
LANE L. WALL xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE S. WALMSLEY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN F. WALSH xxx-xx-x...
LAURENCE E. WALSH xxx-xx-x...
DIANE E. WALTER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. WALTER xxx-xx-x...
LINDA M. WANG xxx-xx-x...
KATHRYN C. WARREHALL xxx-xx-x...
BRYAN D. WARNER xxx-xx-x...
DENNA E. WASHINGTON xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS D. WEAVER xxx-xx-x...
PAMELA S. WEBBER xxx-xx-x...
BEVERLY F. WEDDA xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT A. WEGNER xxx-xx-x...
ERIC S. WEINSTEIN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. WELCH xxx-xx-x...
MATTHEW P. WICKLUND xxx-xx-x...
LORI ANN R. WILCOX xxx-xx-x...
GUSTAV C. WILDE xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN S. WILDER xxx-xx-x...
SHARI D. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
TRACY G. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
KRISTINE M. WILLS xxx-xx-x...
DOUGLAS R. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
JUERGEN G. WINKLER xxx-xx-xx...
BRIAN E. WINN xxx-xx-x...
JOE B. WISEMAN xxx-xx-x...
RICKY D. WOLFE xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD A. WOLFF, III xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. WOMACK xxx-xx-x...
ALLEN WONG xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW KI WONG xxx-xx-x...
KEVAN L. WONG xxx-xx-x...
KONDI WONG xxx-xx-...
MICHAEL T. WONG xxx-xx-x...
JOHN B. WOOD, III xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. WRAY xxx-xx-x...
GARY D. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
SUSAN K. WYNNE xxx-xx-x...
WAY YIN xxx-xx-x...
GAVIN S. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
PAUL A. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. YOUSIF xxx-xx-x...
VINCENT CHAIWAN YU xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. ZENN xxx-xx-x...
MARY L. ZOZULIN xxx-xx-x...

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING WEEK

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative VUCANOVICH and myself, I am pleased to introduce legislation designating January 2, 1994 through January 8, 1994 as "National Law Enforcement Training Week."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help call attention to, and promote, the vital role law enforcement training plays in ensuring that our police officers are able to perform their duties at the highest level possible. Our society has grown increasingly complex, and unfortunately more violent. These changes have placed a tremendous burden on our law enforcement officers. Police officers are now called upon to deal with encounters ranging from domestic disputes to gang warfare and hostage situations. These situations too often involve confronting heavily armed criminals.

Because of the dangerous nature of today's law enforcement duty, it is critical they have the finest training available. This training is provided by experienced professionals who educate their colleagues on the most effective and up-to-date techniques available for combating crime and protecting the public's safety.

To honor these training professionals and to call attention to their efforts, it is my hope Congress will designate the week of January 2, 1994 as "National Law Enforcement Training Week." In the past, Congress and the President have seen fit to honor these fine professionals and I strongly recommend that my colleagues do so again for 1994.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CA CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. ALFRED A. (AL) McCANDLESS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, as part of historic Riverside County, CA, Centennial Celebration, the centennial board foundation has arranged a river-to-river ride, which will take place from April 3 to 17. A pony express style relay will originate on the banks of the Colorado River in Blythe, in the 44th Congressional District that I have the honor to represent. It will traverse one of the most interesting and beautiful counties in this Nation—Riverside—and culminate at the county parks headquarters on the Santa Ana River.

On the way, volunteer citizen riders will follow the historic Bradshaw Trail, through the San Gorgonio Pass, through Banning and the Gilman Ranch, and on through Moreno Valley to Riverside.

Not only will the riders see some interesting sights, but surely they will also hear the echoes of all those Riverside Countians who settled in 100 years before. Were our ancestral neighbors able to ride along, they would be stunned by the growth and progress of our area. But they would be comforted by the fact that our present-day riders are much like they were: Looking for opportunity, a good place to raise a family and to put down roots in a changing world.

While the rumor that I was at the founding celebration of Riverside County in 1893 is not true, I will certainly be at its centennial. The ride's half-way point will be in Indio, in the heart of the 44th Congressional District, where one and all will celebrate with a wild west show, exhibition and BBQ—Riverside County style. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Riverside County on its first 100 years.

THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORMATION ACT

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the National Park System Reformation Act, which I hope will provide some direction to this body's tendency to create new parks it cannot afford. My bill is companion to a similar measure, S.471, introduced by Senator MALCOLM WALLOP of Wyoming a few weeks ago.

For the past 2 years, I have been a member of the House Committee on Natural Resources. A recurring theme during those 2 years has been the Park Service's backlog on construction, maintenance, and acquisition. This backlog is usually estimated by the Park Service to run around $6 billion. Although the Parks Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. VENTO, questions that figure, no one can argue that the Park Service has fallen far behind in its repair work. The roof on Independence Hall was leaking, many other park facilities had health or safety shortfalls, and operational funds were so limited that the Park Service proposed to close the Skyline Drive for 6 months out of the year.

A few weeks ago, the Parks Subcommittee held a hearing on the subject of the $6 billion backlog. I can't say it was ever fully resolved whether the backlog was lower or even higher, but one statement was made—our desire for new parks is sapping our ability to care for existing ones and, in many cases, has outstripped our ability to fund these new ones. The acting director of the Park Service admitted that parks have been created which do not meet the criteria of national significance. Some of the new ones somehow run for years with no operating budgets to speak of.

Secretary Babbitt has stated that new parks are the purest expression of popular desires but, as was stated many times in the past presidential campaign, we can no longer satisfy everyone's desires. We aren't Santa Claus. It's time for us to develop basic requirements for national parks, to ask the Park Service what holes need to be filled in the park system, repair what we have and, finally, to cut loose those properties that do not belong there in the first place.

My bill would establish a 2-year, 13-member National Park System Strategic Planning Commission to develop such a comprehensive plan. The commission, which would include experts in science, history, architecture, law, and land use, among others, would study and hold hearings on Park Service needs, then issue a report of its findings.

The report would likely include recommendations for the termination of Park Service management at nonessential areas. These recommendations would be made after consultations with various State and local authorities and with private entities that have shown an interest, in operating these facilities. In this way, my bill follows the example of the military and the base-closing commission. The Pentagon has recognized the need to prioritize in a time of changed circumstances; my bill suggests the Park Service should do the same.

The bill establishes a criterion for the establishment of new parks. If, as one historian stated, our national parks "are the Nation's history book," then we should aim toward a full text. The Park Service should be directed to develop a plan of what is needed to present as comprehensive a view of the Nation's natural and cultural history as is reasonably and fiscally possible, then issue specific recommendations for carrying out that mission.

Finally, the bill establishes the American Heritage System, a new partnership between the National Park Service and those resources which do not necessarily belong in the National Park System. Under this, matching grants and technical assistance would be provided to those areas which show a willingness to preserve sites on their own, but need some financial and technical help.

Before closing, I would like to recognize the efforts of our former colleague, Robert Lagomarsino, who first developed this bill in the last Congress. As many of you know, Bob served for years as ranking member on the National Park Subcommittee, was responsible for creation of the Channel Islands National Park and cared as much about our Parks System as any man. But he knew, from personal experience, that we have to set priorities. He spent much of last year trying to get money to prevent the degradation of the Channel Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt there's anyone who doesn't like the Park System. They are fascinating places, our crown jewels, as it were;

great places to take our families to learn and to recreate. But they won't be able to maintain that standard unless we set some limits. I hope this bill will do that and I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort by cosponsoring this bill

H.R. —

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 "National Park System Reformation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the National Park Service was created in 1916 and is charged by Congress to provide for protection and management of nationally significant natural, cultural, and recreational resources throughout the country;

(2) the National Park System has now expanded to incorporate over 360 diverse units and is continuing to expand;

(3) in the 75 years since the National Park System was established, certain units have been added to the System which have resulted in permanent financial commitments on behalf of the Federal Government for areas which lack national significance, suitability, or feasibility and diverting funds from deserving units of the National Park System;

(4) while the National Park Service has completed a number of broad natural and cultural theme studies as well as numerous site-specific studies, it has no systematic plan or program to ensure that the most important areas are considered for addition to the National Park System; and

(5) in addition to refinement of the National Park System, there exists a serious need to strengthen National Park Service programs with respect to providing assistance in the management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources which do not belong in the National Park System.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Commission" means the National Park System Strategic Planning Commission established by section 101.

(2) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

SEC. 101. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the National Park System Strategic Planning Commission whose purpose shall be to develop a long-term plan to outline a direction for the National Park System.

(b) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall consist of 13 members appointed by the Secretary based on consultation with constituencies representing each of the areas of expertise referred to in paragraphs (1) through (12). Each of the Commission members shall have substantial experience in the member's area of expertise and understanding of the National Park System and shall be free of economic conflict of interest in terms of employment or other economic benefit which the member would expect to receive solely by virtue of the member's service on the Commission. Of the members of the Commission—

(1) one shall be a recognized expert in botany;

(2) one shall be a recognized expert in wildlife ecology;

(3) one shall be a recognized expert in the field of natural systems;

(4) one shall be a recognized expert in geomorphology;

(5) one shall be a recognized expert in American history;

(6) one shall be a recognized expert in archaeology;

(7) one shall be a recognized expert in historical architecture;

(8) one shall be a recognized expert in anthropology;

(9) one shall be a recognized expert in social science with expertise in outdoor recreation;

(10) one shall be a recognized expert in protection of private property rights;

(11) one shall be a representative of a national conservation group;

(12) one shall be a representative of park recreational users; and

(13) one shall be the Director of the National Park Service, ex officio.

(c) CHAIR.—The Commission shall elect a chair from among its members.

(d) VACANCIES.—Vacancies occurring on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members of the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be promptly filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) QUORUM.—A simple majority of Commission members shall constitute a quorum.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at least quarterly or upon the call of the chair or a majority of the members of the Commission.

(g) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. Members of the Commission, when engaged in official Commission business, shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in government service under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission established pursuant to this section shall terminate 90 days after the transmittal of the report to Congress as provided in section 104.

SEC. 102. STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) LIMITATION ON NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STAFF.—The Commission may hire staff to carry out its assigned responsibilities. Not more than one-half of the professional staff of the Commission shall be made up of current employees of the National Park Service.

(b) STAFF OF OTHER AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—Subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Commission, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates determined by the Commission to be advisable.

SEC. 103. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall for the purpose of carrying out this title hold such public hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission deems advisable.

(b) BYLAWS.—The Commission may make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, consistent with this title, as it considers necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) DELEGATION.—When so authorized by the Commission any member or agent of the Commission may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(d) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 104. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) PREPARATION OF PLAN.—The Commission shall prepare a plan to outline the direction of the National Park System. The plan shall be designed to guide the National Park System for the next 10 to 20 years. This plan shall include the following:

(1) A statement of goals and objectives for use in defining the role of the National Park System in preserving our national heritage, relative to other efforts at the Federal, State, local, and private levels.

(2) Detailed criteria to be used in determining which natural and cultural resources are appropriate for inclusion within the National Park System.

(3) Identification of what constitutes adequate representation of a particular resource type and which aspects of the American heritage are adequately represented in the existing National Park System or in other protected areas.

(4) Identification of appropriate aspects of American heritage not currently represented in the National Park System.

(5) Priorities of sites which should be added to the National Park System in order to provide more complete representation of our Nation's heritage, including an outline for completion of the National Park System with respect to natural areas.

(6) The role of the National Park System with respect to such topics as preservation of industrial America, preservation of nonphysical cultural resources, and provision of outdoor recreation opportunities.

(7) Identification of those areas which are more appropriately managed outside the National Park System based on such factors as duplication within the National Park System, better representation of a particular resource type under management of another entity, lack of significance, lack of management feasibility, cost, and lack of visitor accessibility.

(b) CONSULTATION.—During the preparation of the plan under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior, the Governors of affected States, the National Park System Advisory Board, affected units of local government, State and local resource management and recreation organizations, scholarly organizations, park inholders, and such other interested parties as the Commission deems advisable. These consulations shall also include appropriate opportunities for public testimony and comment.

(c) TRANSMITTAL TO THE SECRETARY AND CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date that funds are made available to carry out subsection (a), the Commission shall transmit the plan developed under this section simultaneously to the Secretary and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 105. TERMINATION OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGEMENT AT NONESSENTIAL NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS.

(a) TERMINATION OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall—

(1) terminate National Park Service Management at all park areas as recommended by the Commission in the report transmitted to the Secretary pursuant to section 104;

(2) initiate all such actions not later than 2 years after completion of the report and shall complete termination of National Park Service management at all areas no later than 5 years after completion of the report;

(3) before taking any action with respect to disposal of any surplus real property or facility located at any park, consult with the Governor of the State and the heads of the local governments and any interested nongovernmental entities for the purpose of considering any plan for the use of such property by State or local governments or nongovernmental entities; and

(4) carry out this title without regard to any provision of law restricting the use of funds for purposes as outlined in section 105 as may be included in any authorization or appropriation Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not carry out any action under section 105 if, within the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the Commission submits its report to Congress, a joint resolution rejecting all recommendations of the Commission for termination of National Park Service management of park areas is enacted. The days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days shall be excluded in the computation of such 60-day period.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—(1) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to—

(A) the actions of the Commission, including selecting the parks which the Commission recommends for termination of National Park Service management under this title and making its report to the Secretary and the committees under section 104; and

(B) the actions of the Secretary in establishing the Commission and in transmitting the report to the committees under this section.

(2) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall apply to the actions of the Secretary during the process of terminating National Park Service management of a park after such park has been selected by the Commission. In applying the provisions of such Act, the Secretary shall not have to consider—

(A) the need for terminating National Park Service management at a park which has been selected by the Commission; or

(B) alternative parks other than those selected.

(3) A civil action for judicial review, with respect to any requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to the extent such Act is applicable to this title, may not be brought later than the 60th day after the date of such action or failure to act.

(d) DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.—(1) The Administrator of General Services shall delegate to the Secretary, with respect to excess and surplus real property and facilities located at a park identified in section 105—

(A) the authority of the Administrator to dispose of surplus property under section 203 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 484); and

(B) the authority of the Administrator to grant approvals and make determinations under section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)).

(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall exercise authority delegated to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) in accordance with—

(i) all regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of this title governing utilization of excess property and disposal of surplus property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

(ii) all regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of this title governing the conveyance and disposal of property under section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)).

(B) The Secretary, after consulting with the Administrator of General Services, may issue regulations that are necessary to carry out the delegation of authority required by paragraph (1).

(C) The authority required to be delegated by paragraph (1) to the Secretary by the Administrator of General Services shall not include the authority to prescribe general policies and methods for utilizing excess property and disposing of surplus property.

(e) REPORTS.—As part of each annual budget request for the Department of the Interior, the Secretary shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a schedule of actions to be carried out under this title in the fiscal year in which the request is made and an estimate of the total expenditures required and cost savings to be achieved by each such closure and of the time period in which these savings are to be achieved in each case, together with the Secretary's assessment of the environmental effects of such actions.

SEC. 106. TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM PARK AREAS WHERE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGEMENT IS TO BE TERMINATED.

All funds appropriated or otherwise made available for operation of park areas identified in section 105 shall remain available for allocation to other units of the National Park System.

SEC. 107. LIMITATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW AREAS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

Until the Commission transmits its report to Congress in accordance with section 104 of this title, the Secretary may not implement any legislation establishing new units of the National Park System, except for areas studied by the National Park Service pursuant to a specific congressional authorization enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—NEW AREA ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 201. NEW AREA STUDIES FOR UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall undertake and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress reports of such new area studies as are herein or may hereafter be authorized by Congress for the purpose of determining the feasibility and suitability of designating areas for addition to the National Park System and any feasible alternatives to such action. The Secretary shall undertake both site specific and thematic studies. All such studies shall be made in consultation with affected agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels, public and private organizations and concerned landowners and users. Each study shall be completed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and with an appropriate level of public involvement, including public meetings in the vicinity of the study area.

(b) FACTORS.—All new area studies referred to in this section shall consider each of the following—

(1) whether the resource is nationally significant in that it represents one of the most important examples of a particular resource type in the country,

(2) whether similar resources are already protected in the National Park System or in other Federal, State, or private ownership,

(3) whether the unit is of appropriate configuration to ensure long-term resource protection and visitor use,

(4) whether any other management entity would be more appropriate,

(5) public use potential,

(6) resource integrity,

(7) cost-effectiveness of such designation associated with both acquisition and annual operation, and

(8) socioeconomic impacts of any designation.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY.—When submitting testimony or other recommendations to Congress regarding any potential addition to the National Park System, the Secretary shall specifically address all factors required to be considered under subsection (b).

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Within 18 months after the date that funds are made available for the study of an area designated pursuant to subsection (d), the President shall transmit to the Congress a report of such study. Each such report shall indicate the suitability and feasibility of authorizing the area as a unit of the National Park System and any feasible alternative to such action. The report shall identify a preferred alternative and also discuss any contentious issues related to each alternative considered.

SEC. 202. PRIORITY LIST OF POTENTIAL PARK SYSTEM ADDITIONS.

(a) LIST.—The National Park Service shall develop and maintain a single list of units in order of their numerical priority for potential addition to the National Park System. This list shall be initially comprised of areas for which the agency has completed adequate new area studies which are consistent with the plan developed under section 104. The list shall be updated and republished periodically.

(b) ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES.—In addition to the factors referred to in section 201(b), the Secretary shall consider each of the following in establishing priorities for inclusion of new areas in the National Park System—

(1) imminence of any threats to the resource or nature of ongoing degradation,

(2) extent to which similar resources are protected by the National Park Service or by another entity,

(3) cost escalation factors,

(4) level of local and general public support, and

(5) any other factors deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) TRANSMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST TO CONGRESS.—At the beginning of each Congress, the Secretary shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate, a copy of the most recent numerical priority list prepared under this section. In addition, the Secretary is encouraged to periodically transmit any recommendations for new area studies which he deems appropriate. Such recommendations should be based on an objective preliminary review of such proposals.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY.—When submitting testimony or other recommendations to Congress concerning any new additions to the National Park System, the Secretary shall include the priority ranking of the area on the nationwide priority list.

SEC. 203. REPEAL OF EXISTING STATUTE.

Section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to improve the Administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior,

and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes", approved August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5), is amended by striking out the first through the seventh sentences of subsection (a).

SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this title. Half of these funds shall be allocated for planning purposes and the other half shall be allocated for expansion of the congressional support services. These funds shall be in addition to any funds authorized by Congress for specific studies directed by Congress.

TITLE III—ENHANCED NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL, CULTURAL, AND RECREATION SITES

SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE SITE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to better protect natural, cultural, and recreational resources of national or State significance which do not belong in the National Park System, there is hereby established the American Heritage System. This program is intended to provide recognition for a diversity of special places of American Heritage. These American Heritage Sites will range in complexity from relatively small sites comprised of a single historic structure to geographic regions and landscapes. In these larger landscapes, the pursuit of economic opportunity and enhancement of the quality of life of residents will often be at least as important as stewardship of natural and cultural resources.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—These sites would be administered by State and local governments as well as private entities in partnership with private landowners and community organizations, with technical assistance from the Federal Government. Federal funds will be available on a matching basis only, but shall not be used for either land acquisition or for day-to-day operations and management. The Secretary shall establish broad criteria and guidelines governing the selection and management of American Heritage sites.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS.—The National Park Service shall establish a grant program to conduct studies of sites for potential designation as American Heritage sites as follows:

(1) When the National Park Service receives a request for funding by a project proponent, the agency shall conduct a preliminary investigation of the site, in conjunction with other State and local entities, to determine if any further Federal involvement is appropriate.

(2) If the site is found to merit further consideration for potential designation, the Secretary shall provide a grant to the project proponent to carry out the study. The National Park Service may provide technical assistance during the study process upon the request of the State or local government.

(3) Based on a review of the study, the Secretary shall periodically submit proposals for designation of American Heritage sites to Congress.

(d) PLAN OF OPERATIONS.—After designation, the primary managing body (identified in the legislation designating the site) shall prepare a plan of operations which shall be transmitted to the Secretary.

(e) ASSISTANCE.—As part of the plan implementation, special Federal technical and financial assistance would be granted during a specified period (not to exceed 10 years), after which time the project would be expected to rely on other funding sources, including other existing Federal assistance programs. In addition, the Secretary shall periodically conduct on-site evaluations of the site to ensure its continued operation in conformance with guidelines of the Secretary.

(f) DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM.—The American Heritage Program shall be under the direction of a Deputy Director for Non-Federal Conservation and Recreation.

SEC. 302. DEFINITION OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

Section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to facilitate the management of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that System, and for other purposes", approved August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a)(1) The 'National Park System' shall include both designated areas and affiliated areas which are administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service in accordance with a specific Act of Congress.

"(2) Designated areas of the National Park System are those areas with Federal land ownership and where the National Park Service has primary responsibility for the management and protection of the site.

"(3) Affiliated areas are those areas which are administered on a partnership basis with Federal and non-Federal funds. Federal involvement typically includes technical assistance and may also include Federal support for daily operation of the area and Federal land acquisition authority for a specified period of time.".

IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICIES ON DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as we continue debate on administration policies and legislation impacting our Nation's domestic oil industry, I commend to my colleagues the following article by Mr. C. Grady Drago in the February issue of the Lincoln Heritage Institute's "The Address":

KEEP YOUR EYES ON YOUR FRIENDS

(By C. Grady Drago)

In the past fifteen years, the domestic oil industry has lost from 600,000 to 700,000 jobs, depending on the study you choose to believe. In either case, it is the largest loss of domestic jobs suffered by any sector of our economy.

During this period, the domestic oil industry has been negatively impacted, not only from a combination of pricing and production policies by OPEC nations, but to a greater degree by overzealous and oppressive federal regulations and non-productive tax policies. Instead of supporting an industry that is vital to our nation's defense, industry, and economy, the federal government has once more taken the opposite tack and forced U.S. oil companies to invest their capital in foreign lands.

Shortly after the oil crisis in the seventies and early eighties, our importation of foreign oil dropped from approximately 42 percent to about 30 percent. However, because of OPEC's dominance of the world market and because of restrictive federal regulatory and land leasing policies, we are now close to importing 50 percent of our oil. In the process, we are becoming more dependent for our oil on the most volatile area in the world: Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia control over 50 percent of the worlds produceable oil. The result is an inadequate and unstable source of domestic oil and gas, as well as a shortfall of identified and produceable oil and gas resources. The losers, as usual, are the American citizen, industry, and economy.

Industries vital to domestic oil and gas development (such as the all but defunct steel fabricating plants that produce exploration and production platforms) are disappearing. The infrastructure that is needed to explore and produce oil and gas in the U.S. is now beginning to wane.

Exploration and development of oil and gas are very expensive. Several millions of dollars are spent simply to prepare to bid for mineral rights; several millions more are spent to prepare for exploratory drilling. Only one in sixteen wells drilled in frontier areas contain enough resources to be produced, and it can cost up to $50,000,000 to drill one frontier exploratory well. Add this to existing and ever-changing federal and state regulatory policies and you have an industry that is stifled and in doubt that it will be allowed to produce the resources it discovers.

Is it any wonder that domestic oil companies (particularly the majors) have been decreasing their investment in the U.S. and are instead investing heavily in foreign nations just for the opportunity to explore for oil? Today it is not unusual for 70 percent of a U.S. oil company's exploration and development budget to be invested in foreign countries. Even non-majors are investing in countries such as Peru, where governments are unstable but where there exists a predictable investment atmosphere.

The ability of the U.S. oil industry to respond to national emergencies is beginning to fade. It takes five to fifteen years to go from exploration to production of oil and gas in a new field. If trends are not reversed, we may face a national crisis equaled only by the great depression and WW2.

This need not be, particularly when you consider that the major restraints on industry and its ability to produce oil and gas are the result of conscious and deliberate acts on the part of the federal government and its regulators.

Hundreds of safety and environmental laws and regulations are in place to provide for the safe and orderly exploration and production of billions of barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of gas. As is the case with the passage and enforcement of regulations, the refusal to lease mineral rights on public lands also is a conscious and deliberate decision on the part of the federal government. It is astounding that approximately 60 percent of this nation's estimated oil and gas resources are located on lands under the control of the federal government and are being deliberately withheld from lease.

What would the consequences be if our government curtailed their restrictive policies? First, we would be less dependent on foreign oil. Second, we would develop a secure and stable source of oil and gas for the nation. Third, we would create hundreds of thousands of jobs. Fourth, we would generate billions in tax revenues. Finally, the oil industry would have to pay the U.S. Treasury billions in oil and gas royalties. The issue of en-

vironmental and safety regulations and their impact on industry and jobs in this nation is the subject of an investigation and study the Lincoln Heritage Institute will shortly undertake.

Keep your eyes on your friends; you know where your enemies are coming from.

THE COMMUNICATIONS COMPETITIVENESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1993

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. OXLEY, in introducing the Communications Competitiveness and Infrastructure Modernization Act of 1993.

Our bill provides telephone companies with the economic incentives to modernize the telecommunications infrastructure and opens the way for competition in the cable television market by lifting the restriction contained in the 1984 Cable Act which prevents telephone companies from offering cable TV service in their telephone service areas.

There has been a great deal of talk lately about building an information superhighway—an interactive communications network capable of delivering voice, video, and data simultaneously and serving every home and business in America. Just about everyone agrees that the building of this network should be a national goal. The question is how do we get there? The Federal Government should not build this network. Government's role is only to fund research and development of advanced networking technologies and to set standards and protocols.

The telephone industry should build the network. Our legislation will create the financial incentives necessary to encourage the telephone companies to build a fully interactive state-of-the-art network consisting of fiber optics and other broadband technology. The passage of our bill will result in the rapid deployment of such a broadband network into homes and businesses nationwide.

Japan expects to have a nationwide fiber optic network serving every home and business by 2015. Businesses in the United States need the same high speed data transmission capabilities which that deployment will give to their Japanese counterparts. Our telephone industry will deploy a broadband network nationwide during the next 20 years if it has the financial incentive which the right to offer cable television service will provide. Our legislation will, therefore, ensure broadband deployment in the United States within approximately the same timeframe as is contemplated by the Japanese.

A second benefit of our legislation is that it will allow telephone companies to provide head-to-head competition to cable TV operators. Today, only one company provides cable TV service in virtually all American localities. By virtue of their monopoly status, cable operators were able to raise their rates three times as fast as inflation from 1986 to 1991.

While the recently enacted cable law will allow governmental regulation of the price of basic cable service, defined as over-the-air stations and public access channels, it does not permit regulation of the price for premium channels. Moreover, immediately after the passage of the new law, cable companies across the Nation announced significant increases in the price of basic service and began to move program offerings out of the basic tier and into a higher priced tier.

Only truly effective competition will bring cable rates down. Our legislation will lead to consumer savings, a more rapid response to repair requests, the provision of cable service in currently unserved rural areas, and improvements in both the quantity and quality of the programs that are offered to subscribers.

It is time for us to lift the cable-telco cross-ownership restriction. The Federal Communications Commission [FCC] concurs. In its video dialtone order, the FCC recommended that Congress amend the Cable Act to permit the local telephone companies to provide video programming directly to subscribers in their telephone service areas, subject to appropriate safeguards.

In addition, it is clear that cable companies are getting into the telephone business. They are investing in competitive access providers [CAP's], planning full service networks, preparing to offer personal communications services [PCS], and buying cellular systems. As cable companies offer telephone service, it is indefensible to keep telephone companies out of cable service.

In addition to lifting the restriction contained in the 1984 Cable Act which prevents telephone companies from offering cable TV service in their telephone service areas, our bill establishes a series of consumer safeguards.

It is essential that telephone companies be prohibited from cross-subsidizing the provision of cable television service. To allow such a cross-subsidy would be unfair both to telephone ratepayers and to the telephone companies' cable competitors. Accordingly, our legislation contains a statutory prohibition against cross-subsidization.

In order to ensure that there is no cross-subsidization, we require a common carrier that wants to provide video programming directly to subscribers in its telephone service area to establish a video programming affiliate that is separate from the carrier, and that will maintain separate books, records, and accounts.

In addition, a common carrier providing video programming through an affiliate will be required to establish a basic video dialtone platform, so that competitors will have access to the telephone company's network on the same terms that the telephone company uses the network for video programming delivery. The FCC and the States will establish regulations to ensure that unaffiliated program providers gain access to the basic video dialtone platform on a nondiscriminatory basis with regard to rates, terms, and conditions for access. A telephone company's video programming affiliate which offers its programming will be required to make available to unaffiliated program providers up to 75 percent of the equipped capacity of its basic video dialtone platform.

The bill prohibits telephone companies from purchasing existing cable systems within their telephone service areas, but would allow them to obtain a noncontrolling interest in an incumbent cable system. In order to expedite the provision of video programming by telephone companies to residential customers, the bill permits a telephone company to use for a limited period that part of the transmission facilities of an incumbent cable system extending from the last multiuser terminal to the premises of the end user—in other words, from the curb into the home.

The bill also prohibits telephone companies and their video programming affiliates from jointly marketing telephone and video programming services. While I believe that this prohibition makes sense in the current environment, as cable operators begin providing both telephone and video programming services and jointly marketing those services this prohibition will unfairly disadvantage the telephone companies. Although we provide the FCC with the authority to waive this requirement if doing so is in the public interest, a more specific provision is needed to assure equality of joint marketing opportunities for telephone companies as cable companies achieve greater entry into the telephone market. We are in the process of drafting that language.

The bill contains no language addressing the issue of franchise requirements for telephone companies offering cable service. There are ongoing discussions between the telephone industry and local government representatives on the best means of protecting the interests of municipalities and their residents, placing comparable requirements upon telephone companies offering video programming as are placed on incumbent cable operators, and not unduly limiting the ability of telephone companies to compete with incumbent cable operators or the ability of consumers to select the provider of their choice. I plan to facilitate these discussions to ensure a timely and equitable resolution.

While I have not included any language in the bill so as not to prejudice these discussions, it is my intent that local government maintain its current role in protecting consumers' rights, regardless of the identity of the cable service provider. At a minimum, we anticipate adding language requiring telephone companies offering cable service to pay a fee comparable to the franchise fees paid by cable companies and to require comparable financial support for public, educational, and governmental channels.

The bill we have introduced today represents one part of a three-part strategy designed to build a national telecommunications infrastructure policy. In addition to passing this measure, we should enact legislation (H.R. 1312) to ensure the broad availability of an advanced telephone network by permitting joint network planning and infrastructure sharing among telephone companies. In addition, we should pass legislation to provide Federal support for applications of computing and networking technologies in areas with broad public benefits, such as medical imaging and the creation of digital libraries. Taken together, these measures will ensure that the United States has the world's foremost telecommunications network.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these measures.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the Earth Summit provided the world with an unparalleled opportunity to build a global consensus around critical environmental issues. Implementation of the Earth Summit agreements is the key to the summit's ultimate success.

Last year, the House passed the Earth Summit Environmental Leadership Act, which I introduced, along with all of the House delegates to the Earth Summit, upon my return from Rio. Today, I will introduce similar legislation, with 33 original cosponsors, to implement Agenda 21 and Senator PELL, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will join me in introducing identical legislation in the Senate.

The Earth Summit Environmental Leadership Act outlines a comprehensive national strategy for sustainable development, in accordance with the principles of Agenda 21, to be coordinated under the leadership of a specific office and the direction of a high-level government official. It also urges the United States to identify and initiate further agreements to protect the global environment, and for the President to report to Congress on progress toward achieving a national strategy to implement Agenda 21.

It is critical that the United States set an example of sustainable consumption and production patterns. My legislation outlines a number of steps to attain this goal, including the elimination or reduction of subsidies for the exploitation of natural resources, and to design a policy framework for sustainble consumption patterns.

Environmental protection is not only a national issue; it is a challenge for every individual to make a difference. The principles embodied in Agenda 21 present a framework for environmental action that should be pursued at all levels of society—in our schools, local communities, governments, and in our lifestyles. The concept of sustainable development should be realized in all the major decisions affecting the future of our environment and the preservation of its species. The Hopi Indians practiced a land-use policy based on the 7th generation—that their relationship with the land would not have adverse effects on future generations of Hopis. We should attempt to do no less.

Senator PELL has demonstrated a forceful leadership on global environmental issues and I look forward to working in partnership with him on this important initiative to achieve sustainable development in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Earth Summit Environmental Leadership Act to continue the progress of the Earth Summit.

IN MEMORY OF THE LATE DR. W.J. MANGOLD ON THE OCCASION OF THE RENAMING OF LOCKNEY GENERAL HOSPITAL

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Dr. W.J. Mangold on the occasion of the renaming of Lockney General Hospital. On April 3, 1993, Lockney General Hospital will officially change its name to the W.J. Mangold Memorial Hospital in recognition of the outstanding service Dr. Mangold provided west Texas during his lifetime.

Dr. W.J. "Bill" Mangold was born May 25, 1919 in Rio Vista, TX. Bill's father died before he was born leaving his mother to raise two children on her own. Living in a home where the importance of education was stressed, Bill graduated from high school in Meridian, TX and graduated from the University of Texas in Austin in 1941. In 1942, Dr. Mangold married Martha, his lifetime sweetheart and friend.

Always proud to be an American and ever dedicated to his country, Bill joined the Navy in 1942 and became a test pilot. He resigned from his commission 4 years later at the rank of lieutenant senior grade.

Along with his wife, and two small children, Bill went to the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School in Dallas where he mastered his trade. In 1950, Bill Mangold received his M.D. degree. He had achieved one of his goals in life—that of becoming a doctor.

In today's terms a doctor diagnoses, prescribes and charges, but Dr. Mangold demonstrated something far more important—he cared. He cared for people whether they were his patients, his community, or his church. It did not matter what time of the night it was, Bill responded to each emergency call with the speed and attention as if a life was in danger in every instance. He also gave undivided attention to each of the 6,000 children he delivered into this world.

Remembered mostly for his kindness and devotion to his work, it is only fitting to see an institution such as Lockney General Hospital being renamed in his honor. A hospital stands for life, caring and love. All of these traits Dr. Bill Mangold lived daily in his 73 years with us. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring this outstanding American as Lockney, TX renames its hospital to the W.J. Mangold Memorial Hospital.

PREVAILING WAGE RATE ADJUSTMENT REFORM ACT OF 1993

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, in the 102d Congress I introduced a bill, the Prevailing Wage Rate Adjustment Reform Act, to address a serious problem for the Federal blue-collar work force. An appropriations pay cap on the annual salary increase allowed in the Federal wage system [FWS] has denied Federal blue-collar employees across the Nation wage parity with their occupational counterparts in the private sector. Today I am reintroducing legislation that will correct this injustice.

This legislation, the Prevailing Wage Rate Adjustment Reform Act of 1993, will lift the unfair wage cap and base future pay adjustments on the annual local wage surveys of private industry. The intent of the Congress in establishing the Federal wage system was to pay Federal blue-collar workers according to the private sector wages in each of the 135 geographic wage grade survey areas across the country. However, since 1979 the appropriations pay cap has limited the annual adjustments in the FWS pay to the percentage increase received by General Schedule [GS] employees in that same year. Because of this restriction, pay for FWS workers no longer reflects the local prevailing rate paid in the private sector.

Nationally, FWS worker salaries lag from between 10 and 28 percent behind those paid in private industry. Not only does the pay lag create hardship for the FWS employee, but it continues to produce recruitment and retention problems for Federal Government agencies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support for pay parity for our Federal blue collar work force.

TRIBUTE TO CAMPBELL MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Campbell Memorial High School Red Devils, the 1993, division III, Ohio State basketball champions.

Mr. Speaker, the Red Devils became only the third State champion from Mahoning County, in Ohio history, and they did it against a team with a towering height advantage. Undaunted by 6'2", 6'5", and 6'2" line of defense, senior forward Kevin Dill spurred the Red Devils, who proceeded to take control of the tempo and the game. Dill was named the tournament's most valuable player.

Mr. Speaker, my district has been through some unusually tough times. Yet, in the face of all this, the citizens of these communities continue to triumph. Campbell's State championship is testament to this courage and drive.

Thank you, Campbell Memorial, I am grateful you are in my district.

HONORING MIND BUILDERS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor an organization

from my district, the Mind Builders Creative Arts Center, which is celebrating 15 years of service to the community this week.

Mind Builders began in 1978 as a dance class for 40 neighborhood youngsters in the basement of a local church in the northeast Bronx. Today, it is a multiservice agency that benefits more than 1,000 children, teenagers, and adults.

Although its main focus is professional instruction in the arts, Mind Builders also offers an array of educational and cultural programs for individuals and families. The programs developed by Mind Builders are both creative and effective. For example, the Positive Youth Troupe is a traveling theater ensemble that performs plays dealing with adolescent themes such as teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, and family relationships. The World Leaders 2001 program is a collaboration with the New York Youth-at-Risk group which inspires and enhances leadership among young people.

It is programs like these that enable our urban youth to realize their potential and develop their creative abilities. I have helped Mind Builders identify funding sources for their programs, and I can attest to the fact that this is money well spent. We need more programs of this nature, and Mind Builders stands as a role model for groups that wish to become vital neighborhood institutions.

I commend all the people who have dedicated themselves to making Mind Builders a success, and I pledge my support to help the center continue its efforts to meet the diverse needs of the community.

ST. LOUIS MOURNS THE LOSS OF A GIANT, NATHAN B. YOUNG, JR.

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I, as hundreds of other St. Louisans, mourn the loss of Judge Nathan B. Young, Jr., who died on March 24, 1993 at the age of 98. Judge Young has been a solid pillar in the St. Louis community, having had a long and prestigious legal career beginning with his arrival in St. Louis in 1923.

He reached the zenith of his career in 1965 when he was appointed to serve as a judge of the municipal court of St. Louis. He was the first black person to serve in that capacity. Prior to his appointment, he had spent 7 years as prosecutor in the city courts.

Judge Young, however, did not confine himself to the world of law libraries and court rooms. He founded the St. Louis American newspaper in 1928 as a weekly publication. He also always maintained a serious interest in history, especially black history and the history of black music. He was known locally as an authority on these subjects.

While attending Yale Law School, where he graduated in 1918, he became involved in the famous Harlem Renaissance Movement, contributing stories and a novella. In 1937 he published "Your St. Louis and Mine," a story of black St. Louis that is still regarded as a primary source book in the local public libraries.

After retiring from the bench in 1973, the judge, a self-taught artist, concentrated on painting and produced more than 200 paintings depicting various aspects and periods of black history. Some of his paintings have been exhibited at the old courthouse and at St. Louis University. He leaves this legacy to the generations who follow him.

Judge Young served as devoted friend and adviser to me and I will always cherish our association. His many contributions to the life and culture of St. Louis should never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO DICK GREEN

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor a giant in the labor movement and my longtime friend, Mr. Richard C. Green. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this remarkable citizen and in congratulating him on his upcoming retirement from the General Motors Corp. on March 31, 1993. I also want to extend my personal best wishes to his wife, Connie, and their six children, Cynthia, Michael, Patrick, Greg, Denise, and Brad.

Richard Green has dedicated his life to improving the standard of living for all Americans, and symbolizes fairness in the workplace and our society. His long record of distinguished service and his contributions to the Michigan labor movement are truly deserving of our recognition and praise.

Richard's list of union and political involvements are numerous. He has served as a coordinator for the UAW employee assistance program for Lansing Local 652 since 1971. He has served on the UAW community action program executive board for almost a decade and as the chairman for the past 7 years. He has served as a delegate to various conventions including two UAW constitutional conventions, the 1976 Democratic National Convention and as a delegate to the Democratic State Central Committee for the past 32 years.

His service in the area of substance abuse spans over more than two decades. He is a board member of the House of Commons and the Holden House. He is the past chairman of the Association of Labor Management Administrators and Consultants on Alcoholism. He serves on the board of directors for the Lansing Regional Area National Council of Alcoholism, the Michigan Alcohol and Addiction Association, the Ingham County Mental Health Advisory Board, and the Meridian Psychological Consultants Advisory Board.

However, more significant than all Richard Green's official achievements is the spirit of community service he represents. His legendary willingness to help individual community members and the area as a whole is what makes him truly deserving of our recognition and praise. The spirit of service he actively portrays is something we see far too little of in this society, and we all would do well to follow the shining example that Richard has given us.

I know that Richard Green will continue to play an important role in our community for decades to come, and I look forward to his continued guidance and advice. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding man and in applauding him for all he has done and for all he has meant to those of us whose lives he has touched.

TRIBUTE TO NICK G. PARRAS MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the teachers and staff of Nick G. Parras Middle School in Redondo Beach, CA. Parras Middle School is being reviewed for nomination to the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program. There are many reasons for it being singled out for this recognition; but the key element, according to the principal, Kathy Tellez, is that Parras has been proactive. A unique partnership between the school and the community has been built, and every possible resource is being called upon.

Parras, like most public schools in California today, is facing serious challenges. According to Ms. Tellez, over the last 3 years the limited-English-proficient student population has increased 63 percent. The community has also undergone significant demographic changes. Many students now live in single-parent households and are experiencing financial difficulties. Many parents are employed by local aerospace industries and face job insecurity or loss. In the last year, there has been a 47-percent increase in the number of students participating in the free lunch program.

Parras is meeting these challenges head on. Its mission statement mandates that students develop the skills, the knowledge, and the understanding necessary to become successful contributing members in a complex global society. The teachers and staff of Parras are committed to meeting the needs of all students, including the gifted and talented and those at risk. they are determined to expand, not contract, the scope of extra curricular programs and to increase communication between school and home.

To do this, Parras is engaged in a full partnership with the local business community. This partnership enables Parras to offer the following programs to its students: Career education activities, for example, career days, visits to local industries; local professionals, for example, engineers and physicists working collaboratively with teachers; Drug Abuse Resistance Education [DARE]; Adolescent Coping Educational Series [ACES]; crisis intervention; health and fitness days sponsored by community agency; project excellence, after-school mentor/tutoring; Shakespeare festival for students; student artists creating centennial mural for city; and numerous competitions to highlight student talents.

As a product myself of public secondary schooling, with two of my children currently in the public schools, I am very proud to represent the staff, parents, and students of

Parras Middle School. They are a shining example of what we must do as a nation to put our children first.

RETIREMENT OF C. EMERSON MURRY

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of his retirement, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding service of C. Emerson Murry to the people of North Dakota. Mr. Murry is the former project manager of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District.

Mr. Murry has a distinguished and lengthy record of service to his country and his home State. A native son, who returned from World War II a decorated veteran, he began his career in law after his discharge, and through his work with the legislative council in Bismarck, witnessed the very beginnings of the Garrison project. Later, after service as adjutant general of the North Dakota National Guard, he brought his years of experience and insight to the conservancy district, where for the past 7 years, the project has greatly benefited from his wise counsel.

Mr. Murry has been a tireless supporter of Garrison diversion. He has been a staunch advocate of an environmentally sound and economically feasible water delivery system which will benefit all North Dakotans, and he has faced difficulties and numerous challenges along the way. But like a good soldier, he has kept the faith and fought a good fight.

Now, as he takes his well-earned retirement, we publicly salute his dedication to improving the quality of life for all of our citizens and we wish him well in all his endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO PATRICK PARRY

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a special tribute today in memory of Patrick Parry of El Dorado, KS. Patrick was killed in a hunting accident on January 22, 1993, and his untimely death has been a tragic loss to his family and friends.

Patrick was an excellent student, and was just beginning his second semester at Butler County Community College. It was typical of Patrick that he was enjoying a winter afternoon hunting with his friends when the accident occurred. Patrick was extremely popular and had stayed in close contact with his friends at El Dorado High School. He was well known as someone who loved to hunt in the Flint Hills around El Dorado and was a sportsman who loved and respected the wildlife and environment of the tallgrass prairie.

Patrick has just voted for the first time in November. His grandmother, Sarah Butcher, tells me that he volunteered to work on local political campaigns and loved the chance to work for something he believed in very strongly. Patrick was a determined and disciplined young man with a bright future before him.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my condolences to the family of Patrick Parry. I know their loss cannot be replaced, but I hope they will find comfort in the thoughts and prayers of his many friends.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KUSCH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once every generation or two, an individual comes along who helps to revolutionize a particular field. Dr. Polykarp Kusch, a Nobel Prize winning physicist, was one of those revolutionary individuals. Dr. Kusch, at age 82, passed away March 20, in his north Dallas home; he is survived by his wife, Betty. Not content with the traditional approaches and theories that prevailed during the 1940's, Dr. Kusch discovered the magnetic movement of the electron, an innovative discovery that served as an impetus to the now-dominant theory of quantum electrodynamics. As an instructor and researcher at the University of Texas at Dallas, Dr. Kusch was on the cutting edge of the physics field, as he continued to bring groundbreaking research and nonconventional approaches to the curriculum.

Dr. Kusch's administrative abilities were also well-acknowledged. When Dr. Kusch arrived at UTD, in 1972, the university only offered graduate degrees; with the assistance of Dr. Kusch, the university developed into a full-fledged institution. His colleagues and students described him as a pioneer, a frontiersman, and a person who never refused a challenge nor resisted a change.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE O'BRIEN

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Eugene O'Brien, an outstanding asset to my district, who is retiring after 31 years of faithful service to the Pittsfield public school system. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend him.

Mr. O'Brien served as a teacher and administrator in the Pittsfield public schools from 1962–72. He was then appointed as an elementary school principal, serving with distinction at Highland, Pomeroy, and Crosby elementary schools. In 1988, he was again appointed as principal of Highland school where he served until his retirement in February 1993.

In addition to his service as a facilitator and educator, Eugene O'Brien served as president of the Pittsfield Teachers Association and the Pittsfield Educational Administrators Association. He was a lifetime member of the National Education Association and Massachusetts Teachers Association. In addition, Mr. O'Brien was politically active on behalf of education at the State and national level. He was very instrumental in enacting the first collective bargaining law in Massachusetts which passed in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting Mr. Eugene O'Brien for his 31 years of dedicated service to his community and to the public schools in Pittsfield, MA.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. MICHAEL R. McNULTY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians all over the world are celebrating the 75th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

This event also marks the second anniversary of Russia's recognition of Lithuania as a sovereign state.

I salute the Lithuanian people on having achieved these historic milestones.

For 50 years, the Soviet Union occupied this great nation. But the spirit of freedom, inherent in the heart and soul of this gallant nation, triumphed over communism. And Lithuania, now a democracy, is striving to create a new society for her people—a free market society, rooted in freedom and dedicated to the principles of human rights.

But there are still many obstacles for Lithuania to overcome—not the least of which is the presence of Russian troops on Lithuanian soil.

Last September, a tentative agreement was reached by Russia and Lithuania for the withdrawal of Russian troops. By the end of 1992, there were reports of Russian troop withdrawals from Vilnius, but an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 Russian troops still remain outside the Lithuanian capital.

This vestige of military occupation must be removed, so that the Lithuanian people will indeed be free to pursue their democratic destiny without let or hindrance.

MSHA INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES ACT

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1992, my district suffered a great tragedy when eight miners were killed by an explosion in a coal mine near Norton, VA. I represent the only coal producing counties in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and while the explosion in December was the worst mine disaster in the State in 34 years, mine explosions have,

unfortunately, not been uncommon. The Mine Safety and Health Administration [MSHA] conducts investigations into the cause of mine accidents with the purpose of preventing recurrences, and, indeed, the Nation has seen a reduction in the number of fatal mine accidents partially as a result of MSHA proceedings.

The legislation I am introducing today will fine tune the procedures employed by MSHA during its accident investigations. While it is not my intention to be critical of MSHA, I believe changes are necessary to ensure that the greatest amount of information possible can be obtained from important sources that will help prevent future accidents.

Under current law, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act requires that MSHA conduct an investigation to determine the cause of mine accidents. The act does not require MSHA to follow any particular procedure, and MSHA's own rules provide its investigators with broad discretion in arranging witness interviews. While the investigators have complete discretion over who will be interviewed and who may participate in the interviews, the MSHA manual on accident investigations states that "in most cases, witness interviews conducted with the participation of the mine operator, the representative of the miners, and the state inspection agency result in the most complete investigation."

The participation of the mine operator during the inspection of the accident site and the overall investigation can provide crucial information. However, I believe that allowing the mine operator to be present during interviews of miners they employ can result in a chilling effect on those miners questioned. Indeed, in many recent accident investigations, MSHA has refused to allow company officials to sit in on interviews, and an MSHA spokesperson defended these decisions by saying that they wanted "to get the greatest amount of information possible from these people in the least-threatening environment * * *. When you're sitting across the room from your boss, you may not be as forthcoming on a voluntary basis."

Given such statements by MSHA officials in the past, it was certainly a surprise to learn that during its investigation of the December 7 mine explosion in my district, MSHA allowed company officials to sit in on interviews with miners. That practice was strongly opposed by the families of the deceased miners. The legislation I am introducing today will change the accident investigation procedures employed by MSHA by prohibiting the operator of a mine involved in an accident or his representative from being present during the post-accident interviews of any miner employed by that operator.

I believe this change is necessary to ensure that MSHA's post-accident investigations provide the most information possible to help prevent such accidents in the future, and to eliminate even the appearance of an intimidating atmosphere during witness interviews.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN JEROME A. AMBRO

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

HON. GEORGE J. HOCKBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise to reflect on the passing of a distinguished former Member of the Congress, Jerome A. Ambro. We pay tribute to a truly intelligent, dynamic, and respected gentleman from Long Island, NY.

Congressman Jerome Ambro was a tenacious fighter who served in the Army military police during the Korean war. He unquestionably loved both America, and the political arena which he entered as a young man. He spent 6 years of his life serving as the Huntington Town Supervisor and led the Democratic Party to its first sweep of town elections in 35 years. Under Mr. Ambro's vigorous leadership, the town of Huntington was the first city to ban the use of the pesticide, DDT. Mr. Ambro's intense and caring efforts to help senior citizens resulted in the construction of the Paumanack Village housing project. After presiding as his town's supervisor, Jerome Ambro was elected to three consecutive terms in the U.S. House of Representatives.

While serving his first term, Jerome A. Ambro was elected president of his 82-member freshman class. While holding this prestigious title, Mr. Ambro played a major role in changing congressional seniority rules and campaign financing. During his praiseworthy congressional career, Mr. Ambro served on the Public Works and Transportation Committee. In addition, Congressman Ambro was elected chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee Subcommittee on Natural Resources and the Environment. In this capacity, Mr. Ambro played a major role in winning the preservation of wetlands in Massapequa, and having Brookhaven National Laboratory designated as the site of a high-energy reactor.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ambro was a fine gentleman. Striving for excellence, Mr. Ambro served his district, and our country, with our citizen's best interests at heart. I cannot express how fortunate we were to know Mr. Ambro, and we want to thank him for the positive and lasting impact he had on both of us, and on those blessed with the opportunity of meeting him. We would like to take this time to ask our colleagues to pause for a moment of silence in respect for the memory of the Honorable Jerome A. Ambro, a former Member of Congress from New York.

CONGRATULATING JAMES J. KENNEY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF AMVETS

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to congratulate fellow Long Islander James J. Kenney on becoming National Commander of American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, better known as AMVETS.

Since receiving its congressional charter in 1947, AMVETS has provided superior leadership to a great number of veterans in our Nation. Among AMVETS' goals are to protect the rights of those in uniform and assist their orderly transition to civilian life, to work with all duly recognized veterans organizations to further veterans' aims, to act as a liaison between veterans and the government, and to keep alive the memory of the sacrifices made by American veterans. In addition, for the past 7 years AMVETS, along with Disabled American Veterans [DAV], Paralyzed Veterans of America [PVA], and the Veterans of Foreign Wars [VFW], has formulated and presented to Congress a detailed and very useful budget proposal designed to meet veterans' needs through programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. James Kenney of Long Island, NY became national commander of AMVETS on August 29, 1992. A U.S. Air Force veteran, Mr. Kenney has been a member of AMVETS Post 18, located in East Islip, NY, since 1967. Throughout his membership, Mr. Kenney has shown his dedication and devotion to veterans and AMVETS by holding a variety of leadership positions on all levels of the organization. His long list of accomplishments for AMVETS include commander of Post 18 and Department of New York commander. He has served on the board of trustees of Post 18 since 1970 and as its finance officer since 1975. In addition, Mr. Kenney has served as district commander, national executive committeeman, second vice commander for programs, and first vice commander for membership.

Judging by his many accomplishments, it is clear to see that Mr. James Kenney is well deserving of this honor. I commend him on a job well done, and I look forward to working closely with him and this outstanding organization during the 103d Congress and in the future.

TRIBUTE TO CARROLL MELBIN OF NAPA

HON. DAN HAMBURG

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding community activist from the First District of California, Mr. Carroll Melbin.

Carroll Melbin moved to Napa in 1959. For the last 33 years he has immersed himself in local politics and community services. He was the first chair of the Senior County Advisory Committee, and has been involved in a plethora of aging groups, from Seniors in Retirement to a 20-year involvement with the County Commission on Aging. He has been an active member of the Sierra Club for 50 years.

Carroll Melbin represents the very best of the volunteer spirit that has made our Nation great. As a man in his nineties, Carroll finds the time and energy to help improve the lives

of citizens in our community. He has not just seen the changes Napa has gone through, he has been an active participant in them. We are all better for his actions.

As Representative, I would like to extend my profound gratitude to Carroll Melbin for all he has done and continues to do for our community. He is truly an outstanding citizen.

HONORING THE AMARILLO HIGH SCHOOL LADY SANDIES BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Amarillo High School Lady Sandies for their victory in the 1993 Texas Class 5A State Championship game. Their outstanding record of 34 wins to only 1 loss, along with the championship title is something of which all of the city of Amarillo, and the panhandle of Texas should be proud.

This championship is the first for any girls' basketball team in the history of Amarillo High School. They have had an impressive season, and there is no question the Lady Sandies are blessed with talented young women. Most of them returned from last year's close but disappointing loss to Mansfield in the semifinals. This loss burned inside them for months, and seemingly contributed to the bolt of energy and fight they put forth in this season.

Under the direction of Coach Dale Blaut, the Lady Sandies drew on the strength and friendships of their teammates each step of the way to the top. Those glorious and golden Lady Sandies are: Jan Ruzowski, Michelle Maxwell, Pam Amerson, Kristen Paris, Natalie Waugh, Kim Linder, Stefanie Andrus, Stephanie Jones, Brandi Williams, Tracie Swayden, Farrah Stuart, Christy Kirkland and Amy Adams.

The Lady Sandies beat out Tascosa High School, also of Amarillo, in the final four. They went on to hammer Deer Park 50–33 in the State semifinals, setting a record for the fewest points allowed in a 5A State tournament game. In the 36th game of their season, they battled it out with Corpus Christi King for the gold. The final in the championship game was Amarillo 68—Corpus Christi 65.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Lady Sandies for a very successful season.

TRIBUTE TO GIRARD HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Girard High School, the 1993 Ohio State Division II basketball champions.

Mr. Speaker, the Girard Indians were the Cinderella team in Ohio this past season, with conventional wisdom predicting a thwarted trek to the State tourney. Furthermore, the odds were against them. Girard had never won a title and, for that matter, neither had any school from the entire county.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Indians would not be denied, winning by 21, 9 and 7 points down the stretch. Standout Philip Huyler propelled the team, burning heralded defenses for 22 and 34 points in the final two games. Senior Kris Kelly complemented Huyler's play with staunch defense and a string of long-range bombs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Principal Joseph Cochran, Athletic Director Ed Matkovich, Head Coach Bob Krizancic and the entire Girard Indian basketball squad for their efforts this season. Their 22–6 record and the State crown are evidence of their diligence and tireless work to make not only their dreams, but the dreams of an entire county, come true. Thank you for the terrific season.

TRIBUTE TO BILL WHATLEY

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1993

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to the distinguished service of Bill Whatley on the occasion of his retirement as vice president and general manager of Huntsville Aviation.

Mr. Whatley began his career with Montgomery Aviation in 1954 as secretary to the firm's chairman of the board. When Montgomery Aviation opened a second general aviation facility in Huntsville in 1965, Whatley was chosen to run it. He built an enviable reputation for integrity and courage. His sharp skills, business savvy, and personal high standards took the company from an idea to an over $2 million operation.

Avoiding all temptation to shave safety margins, Mr. Whatley led Huntsville Aviation to establish one of the most impressive safety records in the industry. In 27 years of operation the facility was associated with only one fatal crash. In 1990, he was recognized by a national aviation magazine as one of the top 25 operators in the country. By keeping abreast of technological advances, he was responsible for a number of aviation innovations. He was appointed by Gov. Guy Hunt to be chairman of the State Department of Aeronautics, the agency responsible for the maintenance and safety of every airport in the State.

Few people can match Bill Whatley's civic involvement. A devoted 20-year member of the chamber of commerce, he has served as chairman of the board of the Better Business Bureau, president of the Sales and Marketing Club, and twice chairman of the Huntsville Rehabilitation Center. He has served National Industries for the Severely Handicapped and had a 20-year involvement with the Explorer Scouts. His most recent award is the coveted Rotary International Vocational Award, given "in recognition of high ethical standards and exemplification of service in the workplace and community."

At 62, Bill Whatley is believed to be the oldest active person with spina bifida in the State of Alabama. The disease frequently leaves its victims bedridden, paralyzed from the waist down. For years, Mr. Whatley managed with the aid of only a cane. Only recently has he resorted to a motorized cart. He has endured the pain and discomfort of 21 major surgeries and requires 1½ hours of physical therapy daily. "You just play with the deck the good Lord gave you," Mr. Whatley says simply of his disability.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Bill Whatley as one of my constituents and I salute him for his outstanding achievements.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 30, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the implementation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (P.L. 102-240).

SD–138

Armed Services

To resume hearings to examine the military policy concerning the service of gay men and lesbians in the armed forces, focusing on the role of unit cohesion in developing combat effectiveness.

SH–216

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine Federal and State relations in implementing United States environmental laws.

SD–406

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of James Lee Witt, of Arkansas, to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD–342

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, the Veterans of World War I, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Non-Commissioned Officers Asso-

ciation, and the National Association of Uniformed Services.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Winston Lord, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.
SD-419

1:30 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the cost and other factors affecting the health care choices of veterans.
SR-418

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

2:15 p.m.
Judiciary
Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 540, to improve the administration of the bankruptcy system, address certain commercial issues and consumer issues in bankruptcy, and establish a commission to study and make recommendations on problems with the bankruptcy system.
SD-226

4:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH-219

APRIL 1

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of the North American Free Trade Agreement on the American workforce.
SD-342

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Defense, and to review the future years defense plan.
SH-216

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to health care fraud.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the National Science Foundation.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Commerce.
SR-253

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine proposals to abolish the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD-406

Finance
To hold hearings to examine health care budget reductions in the Administration's proposed economic stimulus proposal.
SD-215

10:45 a.m.
Joint Organization of Congress
To resume hearings to examine congressional reform proposals.
S-5, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to examine corruption in the professional boxing industry.
SD-342

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Regulation and Government Information Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine how the Medicare program can improve its information system so that payments are made correctly.
SD-342

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for March.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Cemeterial Expenses (Army), National Credit Union Administration, Selective Service System, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Resolution Trust Corporation.
SD-138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the United States Postal Service, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.
SD-116

APRIL 20

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance, focusing on sustainable development goals and strategies.
SD-138

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Department of Transportation.
SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the competitiveness of the U.S. aerospace industry, and on S. 419, to provide for enhanced cooperation between the Federal Government and the United States commercial aircraft industry in aeronautical technology research, development, and commercialization.
SR-253

APRIL 22

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on opportunities and barriers to commercialization of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.
SD-366

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine environmental problems in the Federal Government.
SD-342

MAY 4

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and U.S. international economic and commercial interests.
SD-138

MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the Federal Aviation Administration, focusing on procurement reform.
SD-138

MAY 11

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and U.S. foreign policy and security interests.
SD-138

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the U.S. Coast Guard, focusing on marine safety.
SD-138

MAY 18

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine foreign assistance and transnational issues, focusing on population, environment, health, narcotics, and anti-terrorism issues.
SD-138

MAY 25

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on foreign assistance and the transition to democracy in the former Soviet Union and eastern Europe.
SD-138

MAY 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, focusing on drunk driving.
SD–138

JUNE 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1994 for foreign assistance.
SD–138

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 30

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 447, to facilitate the development of Federal policies with respect to those territories under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.
SD–366