HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 20, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

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

Remind us, gracious God, that You have created all the people of the world and have blessed every person with gift of life. We confess, O God, that we have not always been respectful of other peoples and have discriminated against others in many and sometimes violent ways and we have not demonstrated the unity we have been given by Your hand. Forgive us, renew us, strengthen us and remind us that we are all creatures of Your hand and destined by Your good will to live together in peace and harmony. May Your blessing that is new every morning encourage us to be Your people and to respect each other in grace and in truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 137, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (TN)
Furse
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Roemer
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NAYS—137

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

NOT VOTING—51

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Carr
Clay
Conyers
Deutsch
Dornan
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Eshoo
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gekas
Gephardt
Henry
Hoke
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Johnson (CT)
Kingston
Lantos
Machtley
Morella
Pickett
Quillen
Quinn
Ravenel
Richardson
Rostenkowski
Sanders
Scott
Shaw
Sisisky
Sundquist
Torres
Towns
Unsoeld
Waters
Williams
Yates

□ 1223

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. INGLIS 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.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on vote No. 136, because I was attending the commemoration of the U.S. Holocaust Museum.

Had I been present, I would have voted to approve the House Journal for April 19, 1993.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 17–24, 1994, as "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week".

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102–429, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, announces the appointment of John F. Welch, Jr. of Connecticut and William A. Reinsch of Maryland, as members of the Selection Panel for the John Heinz Competitive Excellence Award.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 98–183, as amended by Public Law 101–180, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, appoints Cruz Reynoso of California, to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of the official results received from the Secretary of State, State of Mississippi, indicating that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on March 30, 1993 the Honorable Bennie G. Thompson was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District, State of Mississippi.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Jackson, MS, April 19, 1993.

Mr. DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk of The House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The special election to fill the vacancy created in Mississippi's Second Congressional District for the U.S. House of Representatives was held March 30, 1993, and in accordance with state law, the runoff election was held April 13, 1993.

Official and certified returns, a copy of which is attached, show Mr. Bennie Thompson to be the winner. The official returns reflect the following vote totals for the two candidates:

Bennie Thompson—72,561.

Hayes Dent—58,995.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. Our telephone number is (601) 359–6357.

Sincerely yours,

DICK MOLPUS.

CERTIFICATION

I, Dick Molpus, Secretary of State of the State of Mississippi, in accordance with Mississippi Code Annotated, Section 23–15–605 (1972), do hereby certify that the attached is an accurate compilation of the whole number of votes cast for each candidate in the April 13, 1993 Special Run-Off Election to fill the unexpired term in the office of United States Representatives, Second District.

Given under my hand and seal of office this the 19th day of April, 1993.

DICK MOLPUS,
Secretary of State.

STATEWIDE ELECTIONS SUMMARY—SPECIAL RUNOFF ELECTION—OFFICE: HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

County	(R) Hayes Dent	(D) Bennie Thompson
Attala	693	920
Bolivar	4,568	6,206
Carroll	2,096	954
Claiborne	847	2,505
Coahoma	3,618	3,579
Grenada	2,984	1,778
Hinds	1,735	12,817
Holmes	1,998	3,764
Humphreys	1,839	2,086
Issaquena	311	380
Jefferson	643	2,694
Leake	390	826
Leflore	4,991	4,575
Madison	2,857	4,857
Montgomery	1,127	744
Panola	867	1,544
Quitman	1,415	1,469
Sharkey	1,053	1,031
Sunflower	3,782	3,340
Tallahatchie	821	1,290
Tunica	596	1,032
Warren	7,883	4,664
Washington	6,950	6,256
Yazoo	4,931	3,250
Totals	58,995	72,561
Percent	44.8	55.2

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE BENNIE G. THOMPSON, OF MISSISSIPPI, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the distinguished dean of the House and dean of the Mississippi delegation, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the members of the Mississippi delegation, present and former, please escort the Member-elect from the Second District of Mississippi, BENNIE G. THOMPSON, to the well for the purpose of taking the oath of office?

Mr. THOMPSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the House.

The Chair takes great pleasure in recognizing and presenting to the House the Member of Congress from the Second District of Mississippi, the Honorable BENNIE G. THOMPSON.

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION FROM NEWLY ELECTED MEMBER

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a number of individuals who afforded me the opportunity to come here, and the fact about it is, it is 71,330, I accept the oath of office. I acknowledge the individuals who come here today in support of my position and oath of office as well as my daughter and wife who are also present.

I look forward to representing the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, as well as working on the problems of this country. I look forward to working on specific legislation that can bring the Second Congressional District off the bottom. We are the second poorest district in the United States, and I need the help of the membership to change that.

Our Secretary and other people have acknowledged that support and pledged his support, so again let me thank all the individuals who came.

I pledge 100-percent cooperation and participation on their behalf.

□ 1230

THE BRANCH DAVIDIAN TRAGEDY

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Nation witnessed an immense human tragedy in my district near Waco, TX.

I doubt if anyone can adequately put into words the emotion of watching over 80 men, women, and innocent children perish in a cruel and brutal fire apparently set by the Branch Davidians.

The loss of life anytime for any reason is tragic. The loss of small, innocent children because they were pawns in David Koresh's delusions was senseless tragedy at its worse.

Along with every parent who can comprehend the profound grief of losing a child, along with the families of killed and wounded ATF agents, along with millions of citizens throughout America and the world who can genuinely share the sorrow of losing loved ones, I extend my deepest thoughts and prayers.

Yesterday, we hoped for a peaceful conclusion.

Today, we express heartfelt prayers to all.

Tomorrow, each of us in our own way must make some sense out of this seemingly senseless loss of life.

My plea to the Nation is this: Let us be more committed to saving lives in the future than in laying blame in the past.

Before the ashes even cooled at Mount Carmel, some have blamed Waco, the FBI, the ATF, Attorney General Reno, and even the President.

Monday morning quarterbacks and instant experts have drawn conclusions of blame before the facts are even gathered.

To my colleagues in Congress and members of the media, my plea is this: Let us be guided by a genuine interest in finding the facts rather than by sound bites, sensationalism, and politics. Nothing could be more sickening than for anyone to seek political gain from the loss of human life.

Now that the siege is over, I think it is appropriate for Congress to review the actions of the ATF and FBI. In doing so, I hope we ask: Were the process and decisions reasonable at the time, not were they perfect in hindsight.

If unreasonable mistakes were made, let there be accountability and lessons learned, but let us also not forget the sacrifice and heroism of many Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials. Nobody cared more about a peaceful solution than the agents whose lives were on the line for 51 days.

Finally, I would hope that we can find a means, within or outside of Government, to thoroughly examine this event and the question of how can we save lives in similar situations in the future. We may not find an answer, but we must try in a bipartisan, nonpolitical forum. We cannot bring back the lives already lost, but by dealing responsibly with this tragedy, perhaps we can save the lives of others.

THE TAX MAN

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the President is inspired by that old Beatles song, "The Tax Man," Remember the words, "If you want to drive, he'll tax the street, if you want to walk, he'll tax your feet," and so on. This song came to me on April 15, when the President acknowledged he is thinking of more ways to get his hands on our money.

If you think you're safe, he'll tax your VAT. If you scream too loud, he'll tax your cat. If you drink a bit, he'll tax your beer. If you think too much, he'll tax your fear. If you take tobacco, he'll tax your smoke. If you think it's funny, he'll tax your joke. If you want to drive, he'll tax your gas. If you want to cry, he'll tax your past.

Bill Clinton is the tax man, and he is coming to take your money away.

LET US HAVE A VOTE ON THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, as some of my friends know, I have been working my way through the Truman book, about 1,000 pages of it. I am down to the last 25, and frankly I somewhat regret getting to the end, it has been such a good and educational experience.

What strikes me is that while some people in this institution and the one across the hall are fighting a $16 billion stimulus package, 45 years ago, Harry Truman saw Europe in need at the end of the hot war and he proposed a $16 billion Marshall plan that saved Europe from communism and started their economies again.

When Americans are laid off, we hear $16 billion is too much. Well, let me tell you something: That $16 billion in today's dollars is over $400 billion.

The problem of the stimulus package in my district is not that it is too big; it was not large enough. But it is a minimum of what we should do to put Americans back to work and give them the dignity of bringing a paycheck home. Enough of these speeches and stopping the will of the people. Let the President have a vote. Let us move on with this and put Americans back to work.

□ 1240

PRESIDENT CLINTON AND TAXES

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, Will Rogers once said that he never met a man he did not like. It would seem President Bill Clinton never met a tax he did not like.

In his tax bill that we will consider next month, President Clinton will tax the rich, he will tax the poor, and he will tax the vast middle class. He will tax Social Security, and he will tax energy; but he is not content to stop there, apparently.

No, the President is now considering a value added tax to complement his other tax schemes, announced, ironically, on April 15, Tax Day.

So, President Clinton not only wants to raise marginal income tax rates, he wants to increase taxes on alcoholic beverages, levy a broad-based energy tax, and now he contemplates putting a new tax on all consumer goods.

During the Easter work period, I received an overwhelmingly strong message from my district. Cut spending first. Taxes can wait.

Mr. Speaker, I hope President Clinton will listen to the people and heed their voice.

MOVE THE STIMULUS PACKAGE AND GET ECONOMY MOVING

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear the opponents coming out again today. They are complaining about the President's stimulus package.

Well, it is interesting to hear them talk. What they are not telling you are a few things like this.

Do you remember who brought us in the last 4 years the lowest economic growth period since World War II? That is right. The opponents of the President's stimulus package.

Do you remember who brought us the worst recovery out of a recession at any time since the Great Depression? That is right. The same folks we are hearing today opposing the President's stimulus package.

Just yesterday I heard Michael Boskin come out against the President's stimulus package. He was the one who headed up the gang who could not shoot straight for the last 4 years, and advised the President to the mess we are in, the previous President, that is.

Now, I note also that Japan has just announced a $117 billion stimulus package. Other nations are planning a stimulus package for the Russian economy. Every other nation knows we are in a worldwide recession and there is a need to stimulate their economies, and yet the opponents would come out against those measures which would provide some jobs for our people.

Mr. Speaker, let us move this stimulus package and get this economy moving.

"THAT AIN'T ALL, FOLKS"

(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, talk about the gang that cannot shoot straight. President Clinton has proposed an economic stimulus package that is costing the taxpayers $16 billion for swimming pools, parking garages, movie theater renovation. That is a jobs bill?

That is pork for big city mayors and politicians that he is paying off from his campaign. It is not good for America. It is bad for America.

But "that ain't all, folks." He has got $328 billion in new taxes, almost double the largest tax increase in history. But "that ain't all, folks."

There is $74 billion in hidden fees and taxes, like the $29 billion they are adding on to Social Security recipients. But "that ain't all, folks."

On April 15, he came out with a great thing for America, a value added tax,

or a national sales tax or whatever you want to call it, that is going to hit every single American. If you add them all together, that is almost half a trillion dollars, almost triple the largest tax increase in history.

And that is going to get us jobs? Baloney.

It is going to cost 1½ to 2 million jobs in the next 5 years.

And what does he want to give America? Pork, pork, pork, and more pork.

THE PRESIDENT'S JOBS AND INVESTMENT COMPROMISE

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's jobs and investment stimulus package offers us a chance to get America working again. One of the reasons that it will get America back to work and that it is widely supported by communities across the country is because it will begin immediately. This summer our teenagers will have a chance to get jobs. But "that ain't all, folks."

Small businesses will have a chance to receive assistance. But "that ain't all, folks."

Our Community Development Block Grants Programs will bring work to the cities. And "that still ain't all, folks."

I cannot emphasize strongly enough how critically important this jobs and stimulus package is to all of our country, and especially to the State of Illinois.

While some Members of the other body are preventing communities everywhere from receiving this greatly needed relief, unemployment continues. And "that ain't all, folks."

Small businesses are still continuing to fail. And "that ain't all, folks."

Teenagers are approaching another summer vacation where long days are still likely to be filled by loitering in play lots and on street corners, and perhaps even doing crimes. And "that ain't all, folks."

America wants jobs now. "That's all, folks."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair would advise all Members that remarks should not be critical of Members of the other body.

TAXOPHILIA

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I think I have discovered what is ailing the administration.

It has taxophilia. Like hemophilia, this disease is very serious. Every time the Clinton administration gets into trouble, it needs more taxes.

That is the only way I can explain the President's need to talk about a VAT tax on the April 15. As the American people are giving the Government money, the administration can only think of getting more.

So, along with plans to increase sin taxes and energy taxes and all the other taxes, the President wants a tax on all consumer products.

This must be taxophilia. I can think of no other explanation.

OLD WAYS IN WASHINGTON DIE HARD

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, in less than 1 year, America has chosen a new President and 111 new Representatives to the House. Throughout this Nation, people have challenged the old ways of governing, and are rightfully expecting their legislators to do the same.

But in the last 3 weeks, we have learned that the old ways in Washington die hard. The Senate Republicans have taken it upon themselves to carry the banner of George Bush and Dan Quayle. In the face of a flat economy, they still say, "Do nothing." In the face of criticism, they blame the other party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The gentleman will suspend. The Chair would advise all Members that such references to Members of the other body should not be made.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, those who are objecting to the President's economic package are the same ones who were telling us last year there was no recession. Last year their goal was to support the Republican President. This year it is to frustrate the Democratic President. Their goals have never been to advance the interests of the people of our Nation.

North Dakotans are demanding that Congress confront the economic challenges that face this country. Like all of us elected to Congress with the charge of ending business as usual, they are tired of partisan gridlock. With the economic package, we have an opportunity to take constructive steps that will help our unemployed, our small businessmen, our farmers, and our children.

For this reason, I call upon our colleagues to put aside partisanship and politics, and work with the President to pass an economic package.

TROUBLE IN RIVER CITY

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we have trouble in River City.

President Clinton has got a plan. But his plan starts with P, which rhymes with T, and that means taxes. More taxes here in River City.

His plan, he says, will stimulate the economy. But economy starts with E, which rhymes with T, and that means taxes. More taxes here in River City.

He wants a VAT. And VAT starts with V, which rhymes with T, and that means taxes. More taxes here in River City.

He will press for a Btu. And Btu starts with B, which rhymes with T, and that means taxes. More taxes in River City.

But more taxes means more spending. And more spending means more deficits. And deficits starts with D, which rhymes with T, and T means trouble. Trouble here in River City.

THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the vast majority of the people want to see the President's stimulus package approved.

The recovery they hear about has yet to show its presence in their communities. In fact, of the 16 counties I am privileged to represent, 15 of them have experienced increased unemployment since January. In five of them, the unemployment rate is in double figures, up an average of 0.3 percent since January.

Does this sound like a State in recovery? I do not think so.

There are anxious men and women in my district, and throughout America, who want to work, who want to feel a part of this great experiment called America.

They want to feed, clothe, and educate their children. They want to feel the security that only a decent job can render.

They want to look to the future with hope. They want this Congress to let this new President try his remedy for our Nation's ills.

The minority party of the other body has made its point. Now is the time to get to the point. And the point is that Americans want to work, and they want their Government to work. They want an end to gridlock and the beginning of a new era.

□ 1250

APRIL IS THE CRUELEST MONTH

(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, T.S. Eliot wrote in 1922 that April is the cruelest month. It is unlikely there was veiled reference intended in "The Waste Land" to the IRS back then. But in April 1993, the month when Americans wrote sizable checks to Uncle Sam, this refrain rings especially true. It would not be taking excessive poetic license to read T.S. Eliot's words and think of promises yet unfilled—a reading that describes the first 100 days of the new administration. President Clinton was viewed by many as a President of promise upon his election. Today, the media, the pundits, and many Americans refer to him as a President of promises broken. While we all applaud him for trying to tackle our difficult national challenges, a feeling of increasing anxiety unmistakably pervades the Nation about the economic directions he has chosen. Even while paying their taxes, Americans heard of plans for the so-called value added tax. And that comes on top of higher income taxes, higher Social Security taxes, and a whopping energy tax. All for what? Rising deficits after 5 years and an almost $6 trillion debt! Now that is a cruelty America must avoid.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a comprehensive urban agenda and urban policy for America.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle come up and make mockery of this issue. They have made it into what we can call alphabet soup with p's, and t's, and d's. Well, the "p" stands for pain, and the "t" stands for trouble, and, if they are not aware of it, they should have looked at the news over the weekend and what happened in Los Angeles. I was there.

Yes, we dodged a bullet this weekend, Mr. Speaker, but America has many bullets to be dodged in the upcoming months. There has been no economic recovery in America. We are still waiting on it.

Mr. Speaker, we find $20 billion to send to Russia to get them recovered. We find money to send to Bosnia to recover them. We find money to do everyone justice but this country and the Americans in the urban communities.

We need jobs now. Those of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and those of us who are out of touch need to get in touch. I say to my colleagues, "I don't know about your communities, but my communities are asking for jobs. They are asking for jobs. They are asking for jobs. They are asking for jobs now."

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues who this week remind us of the victims of the Holocaust. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council deserves our thanks for organizing a number of events during the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust, April 18–25, 1993. I also congratulate the Council on the successful completion and opening of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, this week. The museum will certainly serve the purpose of reminding coming generations of the unbelievable crimes against humanity committed during the Holocaust.

Needless to say, my generation remembers first hand the vile atrocities committed by the Nazis in Germany and throughout Europe. Many of us have family or know individuals who barely survived with their lives from those dark days. It is therefore our duty to remember those victims today and declare our commitment to protest and fight against political, religious, racial or ethnic persecution at home and abroad.

Anti-Semitism is raising its diabolical head again in many countries including those in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Far too often there are also examples of anti-Semitism in the cities of this Nation. Our world must grow to overcome various ancient hates. The people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh are also struggling to survive. It is hard for those of us who enjoy the security and freedoms of this nation to imagine such situations, but as we sadly know, they exist even today in much of Yugoslavia.

The Days of Remembrance of the Holocaust serve as a timely reminder to the United States that all Americans who believe in justice must continue to be vigilant and fight the evils of violence and hate wherever they arise, particularly during these important days of global political change.

THE HOUSE MUST INVESTIGATE BATF TACTICS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly question the tactics which has resulted in the death of 17 to 24 children near Waco, TX. Prior to February 27, 1993, the followers of David Koresh were citizens that to my knowledge had caused no problems of any kind in their community. On February 28, 1993, following what appeared to be a staged for TV assault by BATF on the compound they were living in, they all became heinous killers, according to BATF. For many years I have observed the Gestapo-like tactics of BATF, as they have gone beyond normal police procedure and instead staged dangerous assault type raids on individuals' homes and businesses. If, as some believe, BATF fired the first shots on February 28, did in fact those inside the compound have a right to defend themselves? At the very least the reason for the assault, purported illegal weapons, would not have resulted in a death sentence. Why after 51 days was yesterday's action deemed necessary? Why were family members never allowed to talk to their loved ones in an attempt to persuade them to come out?

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the crimes committed by those in the Davidian compund that called for the extreme action of BATF on February 28, and the tragic final assault yesterday. It is my understanding we will not have the opportunity to review the official search warrant complaint that started this whole tragedy as the search warrant and complaint have been sealed and are not to be unsealed.

I call on the House to investigate this matter as well as the tactics of BATF in many other similar raids around the country.

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY RAIDERS—1993 NCAA WOMEN'S BASKETBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, how about those Lady Raiders? Today I rise to pay tribute to the Texas Tech University Lady Raiders on capturing the 1993 NCAA women's basketball national championship. The Lady Raiders, led by talented head coach Marsha Sharp and her coaching staff, defeated Ohio State 84–82 at the Omni in Atlanta to bring home Texas Tech's first ever NCAA national championship in any sport.

Described as the finest hour in women's college basketball, Texas Tech's all-American senior forward Sheryl Swoopes—that rhymes with hoops—shattered 10 tournament records and tied two others while gathering every honor from MVP of the final four to NCAA national player of the year. Quite simply, she is the best that's ever played the game.

In the last 11 recordsetting seasons at Tech, head coach Marsha Sharp has taken this program to a new level. She has coached the Lady Raiders to the NCAA tournament on six different occasions and captured back-to-back Southwest Conference championships. This year alone, she was named Southwest Conference Coach of the Year for

a third unprecedented time and named national coach of the year by two national organizations. And, the Lady Raiders currently enjoy a 19-game winning streak.

As we say in Lubbock, TX, we love ya Lady Raiders.

EQUITY FOR CONGRESS ACT

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, over 200 years ago, James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers: "Congress can make no law which will not have its full operation on themselves and their friends * * *."

A bill I will soon be introducing, the Equity for Congress Act, will finally achieve the goal that Madison stated so long ago.

My bill will require Congressional compliance with the following laws: Civil Rights Act, Age Discrimination In Employment Act, National Labor Relations Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Occupational Safety and Health Act [OSHA], and Family Medical Leave Act.

Enforcement will be by administrative or civil action if Congress or any office of Congress is not in compliance.

In the history of the Congress, dating back to 1789, only two Members have ever been expelled from the Congress excluding the Civil War period.

Congress and its Members will be subject to the independent counsel provisions of the Ethics in Government Act.

This bill will send a clear signal across the Nation that Congress recognizes that, it too, is subject to the rule of law. New Members from both sides of the aisle endorse this concept.

I encourage Members to sign on as cosponsors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MEMBERS OF THE OTHER BODY FIGHTING FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the other body, the Senate, for making their strong stand on fiscal responsibility. Their opposition to the President's spending package, which he calls a stimulus package, is based upon a real commitment to deficit spending, and we have not entirely seen that from the administration.

There are three important reasons why the Senate has opposed the President's stimulus or spending package. First, we are already facing a huge Federal deficit that demonstrates that excessive Federal spending is a drag on the economy and not a stimulus.

Second, while some of the programs in the spending package are worthwhile, the President has included a great deal of pork, and he has not cut spending enough.

Finally and third, Mr. Speaker, the President is ignoring real stimulants that he himself says he favors such as a capital gains tax reduction and enterprise zones.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1636 to give the President these five important tools, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, these are in his book, "Putting People First." The President needs to drop his demand for increased spending and work with Congress to reduce the deficit now.

DAVID KORESH AND UNCLE SAM SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FOR WACO TRAGEDY

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, as a former sheriff, I believe the massacre in Waco, TX, could have been avoided. I believe it was unnecessary for 90 people to die, including 24 children and 4 Federal officers.

Let us check it out. To start with, in February, David Koresh was informed he would be attacked. No. 2, until this very day the Justice Department tells us they had a well-thought-out plan.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree. When you have 100 TV crews but not one firetruck, that is not a well thought out plan. That is box office, pure and simple. It got the Feds into this mess.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: When law enforcement gives us a soap opera, real people die. Do not get me wrong, David Koresh is responsible for this massacre in Waco, TX, but Uncle Sam is not without fault.

MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the beginning of the 50th anniversary of one of history's most tragic and heroic events—the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

In 1943, the Jews of Nazi-occupied Warsaw had been herded into the ghetto. There, the savagely persecuted Jews were decimated by the twin scourges of starvation and disease while they awaited certain doom in the jaws of the Nazi's grimly efficient death machine.

In April 1943, faced with forced transfer to death camps, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto rose up against their oppressors and bravely fought for their lives. Although poorly armed, the heroic Jewish freedom fighters withstood highly trained and well-equipped Nazi forces in a desperate struggle.

The heros of the Warsaw ghetto were eventually overcome by a massive application of armed might, but their brave stand echoes through history. Their example will shine as an inspiration to oppressed people throughout the ages.

During this session I introduced a measure to commemorate the gallant stand in the Warsaw ghetto which received a wide measure of bipartisan support in the House. This week throughout the world—in Poland, in Israel, and the United States—ceremonies and observances are being held to mark this anniversary.

We should never forget the Holocaust or the brave freedom fighters of the Warsaw ghetto, but I am deeply saddened, that during these days of remembrance, the same evil forces of oppression, tyranny, and death are again at work in Europe. By turning our backs on the people of Bosnia and ignoring Serbian aggression, we are shaming the memory of those who died in the Holocaust and ignoring the lessons of history.

WORK AND JOBS, THE KEY INGREDIENTS TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, many Republicans seem to be acting as though work is a naughty four-letter word. I think most Americans would totally disagree with them. They think work is how we honor ourselves and what this great country was built on.

It is very frustrating for many Americans to see the Japanese, when their unemployment rate hit a little over 2 percent, run out and put together a $115 billion stimulus package to create jobs in all sorts of areas we have hoped to move into. Meanwhile, this country, with twice as many people as the Japanese, cannot even get a multimini program, a $16 billion program, passed. I think many Americans feel there are certain people here who look like Nero, who fiddled while Rome burned. We have many people talking while Americans want action.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope we can get this stimulus package out because I think jobs are the way we work our way out of this recession. It is the only way that I know how to do it.

THE SHIRTS OFF OUR BACKS COME WITH MESSAGES

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, this week I was at home in my district, and the creative people of United We Stand America presented a very clear message to me. They presented it in a very creative way, and that was this: Realizing that they represent many of the taxpayers of America who realize that the problem is not that we are taxed too little but that the Government spends too much, they decided to take the shirts off their backs and give us messages here in the Congress.

In other words, if the President and this Congress are bent on taking the shirts off their backs, their idea is to use those shirts to communicate their messages. Let me tell the Members what a few of those messages are here.

First, here is one that says very plainly, "Make Cuts First." Those folks, the taxpayers of America, also know where those cuts should start. They should start right here in this House, so they tell me, "Roll Back Congressional Perks."

Those people also realize that in order to really get change in this place, we need to do some things like limiting terms and passing a balanced budget amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, from the smallest little one in our district, there is this very simple message: "Read My Shirt, No New Taxes."

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS DENIED EQUAL ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, an injustice has been perpetrated, for too long in this country, against a community of American citizens. The injustice has been the denial of equal access to all U.S. citizens to the benefits provided by the Nation's health care program. The community of American citizens that have suffered this injustice are my constituents.

Access to adequate health care, for all American citizens, must be recognized as a right, not as a privilege. We have not been alone in suffering this unfair treatment. And we are not alone in calling for it to be redressed.

This injustice has been recognized by the Congressional Black Caucus and the congressional Hispanic caucus. They, along with me, are asking, what possible justification can there be to deprive equal access to health care to 3,600,000 Puerto Rican Americans, 80,000 African-Americans in the Virgin Islands, and to the American ethnic minorities in Guam and American Samoa?

I ask for your support, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, to make sure that equal access to health care for all Americans, without exception, is an essential part of President Clinton's national health care reform.

REMOVAL OF THE STATUE OF FREEDOM

(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, it is a sad day when one Federal agency cannot help out another branch of Government. I am certainly not an advocate of the Federal Government competing with the private sector in the free enterprise system, but the matter of removing the Statue of Freedom from the dome of this Capitol is a very unique and one-time deal.

Air National Guard units from Alabama, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania have been involved in detailed consultations with the Architect of the Capitol for months on exactly how the statue removal will be accomplished. These units have also been conducting extensive training exercises on how this mission will be carried out. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi National Guard actually performed a nearly identical mission for the Texas Legislature; but only after bailing out a private crane company who got in over their heads.

The recent decision by William Perry, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, to disallow the Guard from performing the mission because of a DOD policy that forbids competing with private industry misses the point. This is a one-time government mission.

I have been informed that the Architect of the Capitol has sent a letter of intent to a company accepting their bid to remove the statue for $60,000. This bid was unsolicited and noncompetitive.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are confusing the ceremonial and historical aspects of restoring the Nation's Capitol with a Federal construction contract. It seemed perfectly logical and appropriate for the National Guard to remove the Statue of Freedom at the beginning of the restoration project, and it still makes perfect sense today. Let us save the taxpayer some money for a change—let the Guard do it.

□ 1310

LESSONS FROM THE HOLOCAUST

(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, three separate events this week remind us of how perversely, how monstrously, and how barbarously human beings can treat one another.

The first event is one from which I just returned: the 13th annual commemoration in the Capitol Rotunda of the Days of Remembrance to remember the victims of the Holocaust. Also, this week we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the uprising in the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw, and this Thursday is the official opening of the memorial museum on the Capitol mall honoring the Holocaust.

These separate events, Mr. Speaker, remind us again of the raw, unadulterated evil which marauds the world and about which we have to be watchful even today. They also remind us, Mr. Speaker, of the grace and the courage and the fortitude and beauty exhibited by the Jewish people a half century ago in the face of dire and difficult circumstances. The lessons they have taught us, Mr. Speaker, reverberate down through history and are as inspirational to us today, 50 years later, as they were then.

GWINNETT COUNTY TOWN HALL MEETING

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, NEWT GINGRICH and I participated in a town hall meeting in Gwinnett County, GA, to give the people of Georgia's Fourth and Sixth Congressional Districts the opportunity to express their views on President Clinton's proposed economic plans.

Not one person in the crowd of over 500 stood to say that he or she believes that they are not paying enough taxes and that our Federal Government spends too little. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the people with whom I spoke were very concerned that our new President has already proposed the largest tax increase in our Nation's history.

To add insult to injury on April 15, tax day, the administration announced that, despite earlier denials, it was considering an entirely new tax: the value added tax [VAT]. The VAT tax is essentially a stealth tax that allows politicians to levy large taxes on manufactured goods without being held immediately accountable. Because the tax is levied on the value added to a product at each stage of production, the final cost of the tax is hidden in the price the consumer pays to purchase the good.

I would also like to add that the preliminary results of the Gwinnett County town hall survey show that 98 percent of the people surveyed oppose the value added tax.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever the slightest doubt in my mind that President Clinton's tax increasing plan is wrong for America, it was put to rest last Saturday. It is abundantly clear that the people of Gwinnett County, GA, and all over America want less taxes, less spending, less government. It is equally clear that the Clinton program offers exactly the opposite.

NCAA VICTORY FOR THE TAR HEELS

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the University of North Carolina tar heel basketball team, the 1993 NCAA national champions. With coach Dean Smith at the helm, the tar heels defeated the University of Michigan Wolverines 77–71 in one of the most exciting final four finishes in the history of the championship.

The consistency of Donald Williams from three-point range, the leadership of senior George Lynch, the drive of Derrick Phelps and Brian Reese, and the prowess and sportsmanship of Eric Montross combined with the reliability of seniors Henrik Rödl, Scott Cherry, Matt Wenstrom, and Travis Stephenson to overpower the capable "fab five" from Ann Arbor proving the skies above New Orleans are indeed Carolina blue.

I congratulate Coach Smith on his second NCAA title and on the discipline both on and off the court he instills in his players. And I look forward to a repeat next year.

H.R. 5—UNION TRUMP CARD

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5—a measure that would rob our current labor laws of balance and fairness. Those in support of H.R. 5 would have us believe that making permanent replacements illegal would increase fairness. In reality, making this change would be like dealing labor unions a huge trump card, thereby guaranteeing victory in every dispute.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a ploy by the already too powerful unions to increase their faltering membership and their political power. These unions represent only 12 percent of the private working force in America, leaving nearly 80 percent of private sector American workers unrepresented by this legislation. Even more important to this body, the people who elected us oppose this type of legislation by a 2-to-1 margin.

Mr. Speaker, the decision before us is whether we will stand in defense of mainstream America, or whether we will succumb to the clamoring of a vocal union minority who are asking this Congress to do for them what they cannot do for themselves. I urge my colleagues to stand on the side of fairness and vote with me in opposition to H.R. 5.

THE HEALTH OF AMERICA

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the three biggest issues in the country today are, No. 1 health. If you do not have your health, you have nothing. If you have no health insurance and have no job, your health deteriorates.

Mr. Speaker, No. 2 is the economy. If you do not have any industry and do not have any jobs, your health continues to worsen.

Mr. Speaker, No. 3 is the infrastructure, without which you have no jobs, your environment gets worse, and your health continues to deteriorate.

Thousands of communities throughout the United States and tens of millions of people are caught in this squeeze, but I think that rural America is hit the hardest. Rural America in the past has gotten the short end of the stick, and that has to be reversed. Government response to these issues must bring into focus rural America's neglect of the past, and we cannot continue to allow that to happen.

AMERICA BEING MANEUVERED BY UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this House will consider a resolution to keep American forces in Somalia for a year or even longer. The other body has already passed such a resolution which would leave young Americans stranded there for who knows how long.

Mr. Speaker, when American forces were sent into Somalia, they were promised that they would be out in a couple of months. Remember? They will be out by January 20, Inauguration Day. After some of us started asking questions, that promise dissolved, and we were promised, well, within 6 months our troops will be out of Somalia.

Now this promise is dissolving very fast. The American taxpayers have paid for this exercise to the tune of $800 million so far.

The reality is that America is allowing itself to be maneuvered into taking on a burden in a situation that we cannot solve. We are getting the bill for this U.N. action.

Where is the United Nations? Recall that when we went into Somalia, we did it at the behest of the United Nations. To allow American forces to be incarcerated in Somalia for much longer is not fair to them nor to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member of this House to carefully consider this resolution when it comes up next week.

GUNS, WACO, AND COLUMBIA HEIGHTS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much will it take before we all come to our senses about guns? The people of the Nation's Capital are stalked by a random killer with a shotgun. He was caught yesterday only after he had killed his third victim and wounded four others. At about the same time, the true believing Waco, TX, fanatics, barricaded with enough ammunition for a small army, incinerated themselves.

Last year rampant gunfire in the Nation's streets was not enough to get the Brady gun control bill out of the White House. Last year the Filene, TX, massacre was not enough to spur passage of assault weapon legislation. In fact it was defeated the day after the Filene massacre. This year has brought mass murder and suicide to Waco and random killings and terror to the doorstep of the Capitol. I have had enough. I hope Congress has.

COMMENDING THE MEMBERS OF THE 118TH AIRLIFT WING

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we have grown accustomed to the rights and liberties we are guaranteed in this great democracy. All too often we take these freedoms for granted. Each day the men and women of the Armed Forces are out there quietly serving, protecting our interest, so that the rest of us can confidently go about our business, free of worries.

The men and women of my State, Tennessee, the Volunteer State, have a proud tradition of military service. Whether its John Sevier in the Revolutionary War, Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans, Davey Crockett, Sam Houston, and a host of others at the Alamo, Sergeant York at the Argonne Forest, or the thousands more in WWII, Korean conflict, Vietnam war, the Persian Gulf, and most recently in Somalia, Tennesseans have always served with great distinction.

Members of the 118th Airlift Wing of the Tennessee Air Guard are the latest to continue this great volunteer tradition. Without fanfare or hoopla, the members of the 118th have put themselves in harm's way to promote our interests and the interests of our democratic way of life.

Since April 10, 60 personnel and 3 C–130 aircraft out of Nashville—members of the 118th Airlift Wing of the Tennessee Air National Guard—have been bravely flying relief missions into war torn Bosnia. We have all heard the hor-

rifying stories and seen the horrible pictures of the atrocities committed in the name of ethnic cleansing. The selfless acts of the military units, such as the 118th, have helped deliver desperately needed food and supplies to the men, women, and children suffering in the former Yugoslavia.

So today, to the members of the 118th Airlift Wing, I say you are not forgotten. We are aware of your action and we appreciate your service. Our thoughts and prayers are with you all. Good luck and God bless.

AMERICAN TAX MONEY GOING TO RESETTLE IRAQI SOLDIERS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some criticism of some of us on this side of the aisle who are questioning the way President Clinton and his administration are spending money. Let me give the Members one example why we are concerned.

There was a recent newspaper article indicating that we are now in the process of paying welfare benefits to Iraqi soldiers who are being quietly resettled into this country at taxpayer expense. Already 1,000 of them have been resettled. There are 4,000 more awaiting, and maybe 10,000 after that.

What are we giving to these folks? We are giving them Medicaid, welfare payments, including Aid to Dependent Families, cash assistance for employment and language training programs, prepaid medical screening, health assessments, and other continuing health care services. We are doing all of that at taxpayer expense to Iraqi soldiers.

We are being told by the administration that we must go deeper into debt in order to stimulate the economy. Yet the way they are spending the money is to provide welfare benefits to Iraqi soldiers and their families. Strange, very strange.

BIG TROUBLE FOR "U"

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, when we consider the President's tax bill later next month, there will be one provision that will cause great heartache for the American people.

That provision is the Btu or energy tax. What does Btu stand for?

In my mind, it means big trouble for "U."

The Btu tax will increase the prices for all products. It will increase the price of food because of its impact on farmers.

It will increase the price on users of electricity, on users of natural gas, and on almost every other form of energy.

It was interesting how the President floated the idea of a VAT tax on April 15, income tax day.

We haven't even had the time to think seriously about the effects of one tax acronym before he throws another one at us.

The American people should be allowed to concentrate first on the chilling impact of the President's tax bill before we worry about his other tax schemes.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1991 annual report on the Administration of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, pursuant to section 211 of the Act (45 U.S.C. 440(a)).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

SUNDRY REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1991 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes on the first two bills, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules; the remaining votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

□ 1330

SPRING MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ACT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 63) to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 63

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 "Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) NATIONAL FOREST LANDS.—The term "National Forest lands" means lands included in the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))).

(2) RECREATION AREA.—The term "Recreation Area" means the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area established by this Act.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) preserve scenic, scientific, historic, cultural, natural, wilderness, watershed, riparian, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, and other values contributing to public enjoyment and biological diversity in the Spring Mountains of Nevada;

(2) ensure appropriate conservation and management of natural and recreation resources in the Spring Mountains; and

(3) provide for the development of public recreation opportunities in the Spring Mountains for the enjoyment of present and future generations.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF RECREATION AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada.

(b) BOUNDARIES AND MAP.—The Recreation Area shall consist of approximately 316,000 acres of federally owned lands and waters in the Toiyabe National Forest, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Spring Mountain National Recreation Area—Proposed", numbered NV-CH, and dated August 2, 1992.

(c) MAP FILING.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map of the Recreation Area with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(e) DISCREPANCIES.—In the case of any discrepancy between or among the acreage referred to in subsection (b) and the map described in subsection (b), the map described in subsection (b) shall control any question concerning the boundaries of the Recreation Area.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall manage the Recreation Area in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System and this Act to provide for—

(1) the conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, cultural, and other values contributing to public enjoyment;

(2) the conservation of fish and wildlife populations and habitat, including the use of prescribed fire to improve or maintain habitat;

(3) the protection of watersheds and the maintenance of free flowing streams and the quality of ground and surface waters in accordance with applicable Federal and State law;

(4) public outdoor recreation benefits, including, but not limited to, hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, horseback riding, backpacking, rock climbing, camping, and nature study;

(5) wilderness areas as designated by Congress; and

(6) the management, utilization, and disposal of natural resources in a manner compatible with the purposes for which the Recreation Area is established.

(b) HUNTING, TRAPPING, AND FISHING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall permit hunting, trapping, fishing, and habitat management within the Recreation Area in accordance with the laws of the United States and the State of Nevada.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Nevada Department of Wildlife, may designate zones where and periods when hunting, trapping, or fishing shall not be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.

(c) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock may be permitted to continue pursuant to Federal law and subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers necessary.

(d) PREVENTIVE MEASURES.—Nothing in this Act shall preclude such reasonable measures as the Secretary considers necessary to protect the land and resources from fire or insect or disease infestation in the Recreation Area.

SEC. 6. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 3 full fiscal years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a general management plan for the Recreation Area as an amendment to the Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Such an amendment shall reflect the establishment of the Recreation Area and conform to the provisions of this Act, except that nothing in this Act shall require the Secretary to revise the Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. The provisions of the national forest land and resource management plan relating to the recreation area shall also be available to the public in a document separate from the rest of the forest plan.

(2) CONTENTS.—The management plan described in paragraph (1) shall be developed with full public participation and shall include—

(A) implementation plans for a continuing program of interpretation and public education about the resources and values of the Recreation Area;

(B) proposals for public facilities to be developed, expanded, or improved for the Recreation Area, including one or more visitor centers to accommodate both local and out-of-State visitors;

(C) plans for the management of natural and cultural resources in the Recreation Area, with emphasis on the preservation and long-term scientific use of archaeological resources, with priority in development given to the enforcement of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.) and the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) within the Recreation Area;

(D) wildlife and fish resource management plans for the Recreation Area prepared in consultation with appropriate departments of the State of Nevada and using other available studies of the Recreation Area;

(E) recreation management plans for the Recreation Area in consultation with appropriate departments of the State of Nevada;

(F) wild horse and burro herd management plans for the Recreation Area prepared in consultation with appropriate departments and commissions of the State of Nevada; and

(G) an inventory of all lands within the Recreation Area not presently managed as National Forest lands that will permit the Secretary to evaluate possible future acquisitions.

(3) CONSULTATION.—The plans for the management of natural and cultural resources described in paragraph (2)(C) shall be prepared in consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established by title II of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470i et seq.) and the Nevada State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

(b) WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.—

(1) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The general management plan for the Recreation Area shall include the recommendations of the Bureau of Land Management as to the suitability or nonsuitability for preservation as wilderness of the 89,270 acres identified as the Mt. Stirling, La Madre Mountains, and Pine Creek Wilderness Study Areas on the Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Status Map, dated March 1990.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Pending submission of a recommendation and until otherwise directed by Act of Congress, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall manage the lands and waters within the wilderness study areas referred to in paragraph (1) so as to maintain their potential for inclusion within the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 7. ACQUISITION OF LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, bequest, or otherwise any lands, or lesser interests therein, including mineral interests, water rights, and scenic easements, which the Secretary determines are needed for the purposes of this Act.

(b) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LANDS.—Any lands, waters, or interests in lands or waters located within the Recreation Area that are acquired by the United States or administratively transferred to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act shall be incorporated into the Recreation Area and managed in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the National Forest System and the provisions of this Act.

(c) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*-9), where such boundaries are established for units of the National Forest System, such established boundaries shall be treated as if they were the boundaries of the National Forests as of January 1, 1965. Money appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund shall be available for the acquisition of lands, waters, and interests therein in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 8. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except for lands described in subsection (b), all Federal lands within the Recreation Area and all lands, waters, and interests in lands and waters within the Recreation Area that are acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act are withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are described as follows:

W½E½ and W½, Sec. 27, T23S, R58E, Mt. Diablo Meridian.

SEC. 9. COORDINATED MANAGEMENT.

The Secretary shall coordinate the management of the Recreation Area with the management of all proximate lands in a manner that best meets the present and future needs of the people of the United States.

SEC. 10. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

In order to encourage unified and cost-effective management and interpretation of natural and cultural resources in southern Nevada, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal, State, and local agencies, and with nonprofit entities, that provide for the management and interpretation of natural and cultural resources in southern Nevada.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] 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 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, H.R. 63, the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area Act, was introduced by Mr. BILBRAY. The legislation is very similar to a measure passed by the House in the 102d Congress but on which action was not completed prior to adjournment.

The bill before us today would designate a 316,000-acre national recre-

ation area in the Spring Mountains of southern Nevada. The national recreation area would encompass all of the lands of the Spring Mountains unit of the Toiyabe National Forest.

Located near two rapidly growing populations centers, Las Vegas and Pahrump, the area receives approximately 5 million visitors a year. It is the only area readily accessible to southern Nevadans with forests and snow. At that hearing of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, on March 3, 1993, we learned that the resources of the Spring Mountains are impressive. Dominating the area is Mount Charleston which, at 11,918 feet, is the third highest mountain in Nevada. Vegetation includes ancient bristlecone pines, which are the oldest living things on Earth, five vegetative life zones and 48 plants species found nowhere else in the world. Wildlife includes elk, deer, wild turkey, bighorn sheep, golden eagles, wild horses and burros, and the Palmers chipmunk, which is found only in the Spring Mountains. Threatened species include the desert tortoise and Lahonton cutthroat trout. The Spring Mountains are also the beginning of the water aquifer for the city of Las Vegas.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will protect and enhance this beautiful mountain range.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of H.R. 63 which will create the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area near Las Vegas, NV.

H.R. 63 is supported by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], who represents the district wherein the Spring Mountains lie, and it also has the support of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

This legislation is an appropriate way to preserve the natural resources of the Spring Mountains while respecting valid existing rights and allowing a wide variety of access and recreational uses by the public.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 63.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY], who is the sponsor of the measure, along with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area legislation. Last year, this same bill passed the House.

Unfortunately, in the final days of the 102d Congress, time ran out before the Senate could take action on this legislation. This year Nevadans can usher in the Earth Day festivities by celebrating the creation of the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area.

I stand here with the full endorsement of the Nevada delegation, the Nevada Mining Association and the Nevada State Legislature's committee on public lands to advance this legislation.

The legislation to create the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area could not have come about without the devotion and vision of the southern Nevada community.

For more than 5 years, teams of Nevadans have worked tirelessly to coordinate the widely diverse interests represented by the many users of the Spring Mountains—to sport hunt, fish, hike, and camp. Offroaders, bikers, and ranchers all share in the benefits from this magnificent resource.

The Spring Mountains contain outstanding outdoor recreation opportunities in the immediate vicinity of the burgeoning urban population of Las Vegas.

Over 20 million visitors are known to come to the Mt. Charleston area. For the 900,000 inhabitants of Las Vegas, the Spring Mountains offer our only forest experience.

As more and more people visit the Spring Mountains, ensuring the protection of these resources is critical.

By providing trailheads and roads for RV's, backpackers, hikers, offroaders, and hunters, passage of this measure will provide great enhancements to Nevadans' existing recreational use of our public lands.

There are nearly 1 million residents in southern Nevada.

As one of the Nation's fastest growing communities, that figure is sure to grow. At present, there are only 10 campgrounds and picnic sites to meet the needs of the entire community.

The goal of this legislation is to increase everyone's access to the Spring Mountains without sacrificing the quality of the outdoor experience.

With this legislation in place, the entire community can protect and preserve these natural resources from the encroachment of both man and the growing metropolitan areas directly to the west and east of this magnificent forest and range of mountains.

I would like to reiterate and clarify to all Nevadans, our hikers, hunters, horseback riders, off-roaders, and campers, that this new status will, by no means, keep them from enjoying these lands.

It will eventually increase and improve the access for all of our outdoor enthusiasts to this local treasure.

By creating the Spring Mountains National Recreational Area, the Spring Mountains will gain their deserved, national recognition. This elevated status will secure for this unique area the necessary Federal funds to effectively manage the area.

Under the present management methods, these valued resources will not be adequately preserved for future generations.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman VENTO, and his excellent staff, for all their efforts and their hard work which has enabled this bill to come before the House so expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank all of the Members on this bill, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the rest of the minority in this group, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], who worked very closely with me to get rid of problem areas in the bill. But particularly I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, as well as the people of southern Nevada who worked so many hours. As I mentioned, for years they have been working on this recreation area to make sure that all of the areas are protected.

These are pristine areas. They are beautiful. They have running streams and creeks and some of the oldest known trees in the world. There are trees that are 3,000 years old. The bristlecone pine is in this area. In fact, I was out there the other day and it was amazing. I saw a bristlecone a little taller than I am and was told that it was 60 years old. They pointed out that if I came back in about 300 years from now, it might be about 3 feet taller, and if I came back 3,000 years from now it might be a full-grown tree.

In fact, this is a very unique area. I know people in southern Nevada appreciate the help they have had from both sides of the aisle on this bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask support of the Members for what I think is a sound policy path.

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 bill, H.R. 63, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES IN GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 328) to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 328

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

SECTION 1. MARINE ACADEMY AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to further the revitalization, rehabilitation, and utilization of Fort Hancock within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into an agreement with the Monmouth County Vocational School District or a successor (referred to in this Act as the "District"), to permit the use by the District of properties situated along Gunnison Road and Magruder Road for the purpose of developing and operating, without cost to the National Park Service, a secondary school program to be known as the Marine Academy of Science and Technology.

(b) DESIGN OF FACILITIES.—The design of new facilities and landscape improvements, and the rehabilitation of existing facilities for school and administrative use, shall be subject to the approval of the Director of the National Park Service. In determining whether to approve the design and rehabilitation, the Director shall use standards for rehabilitation and National Park Service guidelines and policies that are approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. REVERSION.

If the properties, facilities, and improvements referred to in section 1 are not used by the District for a secondary school program, the agreement authorized by section 1 shall be terminated and all use of the properties, facilities, and improvements shall revert, without consideration, to the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) REHABILITATION.—As a condition of entering into the agreement authorized by section 1, the Secretary of the Interior may—

(1) accept reimbursement expenses, of not more than $500,000, to cover the cost of rehabilitating other property within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area for park uses that are displaced from facilities used by the District under the agreement authorized by section 1; or

(2) require the District to rehabilitate other property for the park uses—

(A) under the direction of the National Park Service; and

(B) at a cost of not more than $500,000.

(b) FEES FOR SERVICES.—The Director of the National Park Service may collect and retain reasonable fees for services provided to the District by the National Park Service, including alarm monitoring, permit compliance, fire and police protection, and snow removal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] 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. 328 provides for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey. The bill was approved by the Senate on March 17, 1993, and is identical to legislation approved by the House of Representatives in the 102d Congress.

The Fort Hancock District of the Sandy Hook Unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area in New Jersey contains over 200 historic buildings constructed by the U.S. Army in the 1890's for coastal defense purposes. For the past decade, the Monmouth County Vocational School District has used four of these otherwise unoccupied buildings to house the district's Marine Academy of Science and Technology, a 4-year program for students in grades 9 to 12.

S. 328 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to continue this arrangement with the Monmouth County Vocational School District. Design of new facilities, landscape improvements, and rehabilitation of existing structures by the district are subject to the approval of the National Park Service and revert to the National Park Service if they are not used by the district for a secondary school program.

The Secretary may accept funds for rehabilitating other properties within the park for park uses displaced by the district and is authorized to collect reasonable fees for services provided to the district.

I believe this is the type of partnership we should be encouraging. Allowing the school district to rehabilitate and use otherwise vacant buildings in the park benefits both the school and the National Park Service. The Park Service has not had the resources to address this neglected area, and the school district has found this a prime location for the school. Passage of this bill will result in improvements to the park and will provide the school with necessary facilities, and I urge my colleagues' support.

□ 1340

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

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

I rise in support of S. 328. This legislation just makes good sense. It is refreshing to see that we are finding creative ways of improving our local school districts while rehabilitating the existing historical assets of the Sandy Hook Unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area. S. 328 will allow the Monmouth School District, who has already spent over $2 million on rehabilitation, to continue to use and rehabilitate these historic buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 328.

Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 328 is critically important to the town of Taos and Taos County, NM. This legislation will convey the Forest Service's old Taos ranger station to the town of Taos, NM. I note that companion legislation, S. 275, was passed by the Senate on March 17.

For many years the town of Taos has tried to obtain the old Forest Service ranger station building in hopes of converting it into a children's library and adult literacy center. Because the condition of the building makes it no longer suitable for use by the Forest Service, the building would be ideal for the town's purposes.

However, because of Taos' meager financial resources, this has not been possible. For the fiscal year 1992, the town of just over 4,000 people raised $186,932 from property taxes. The median family income is approximately $13,000, and 26 percent of families in Taos live below the poverty line. Like the rest of Taos County, which is consistently one of the poorest in the Nation, the unemployment rate hovers around 20 percent. In addition, the town recently received a preliminary construction cost estimate of over $400,000 for the renovations necessary to make the building suitable for use as a children's library.

H.R. 328 will allow the town to obtain the building, at fair market value, under terms that won't impose financial hardship. The town of Taos maintains strict preservation requirements for buildings in the downtown area, ensuring that the historical and cultural integrity of the building will be protected.

Mr. Speaker, transfer of the old Forest Service building to the town of Taos is a logical and practical move for everyone involved. More importantly, it will serve as an invaluable resource for the town of to help educate future generations. I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. HANSEN. 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 (Mr. MFUME). 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. 328.

The question was taken.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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.

GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Bill (S. 326) to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 326

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

SECTION 1. ADDITION TO NATIONAL MONUMENT.

The boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument (hereinafter referred to as the "National Monument") are hereby modified to include the area comprising approximately 12 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "George Washington Birthplace National Monument Boundary Map", numbered 332/80,011A and dated September 1992, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITIONS OF LANDS.

Within the boundaries of the National Monument, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, or interests therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENT.

In administering the National Monument, the Secretary shall take such action as is necessary to preserve and interpret the history and resources associated with George Washington, the generations of the Washington family who lived in the vicinity, and their contemporaries, as well as 18th century plantation life and society.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] 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 S. 326, the Senate bill now 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, this bill does in fact extend the site of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument in the State of Virginia, the location of his birth. It includes land that is to be donated as well as provides the opportunity on a willing-seller basis to purchase additional lands which separate various parts of that monument today.

This is similar to legislation that had passed in the most recent Congress last year and was not acted upon by the Senate.

It is introduced and brought to us by our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], and again, he has sponsored it, and it is, of course, now before us with the name of the Senate sponsor on the measure, Senators ROBB and WARNER.

This is a noncontroversial matter. The Park Service owns 538 acres in the two contiguous parcels located along Poke's Creek and Dancing Marsh and the Potomac River. Located between the two parcels is the Horner property which includes a loblolly pine forest and eagle-nesting site.

The Horner family has offered to sell the property to the National Park Service today. This Tidewater Virginia farm still remains in much the same historical qualities that existed at the time of our Nation's formation, and more importantly at the time of the birth of then George Washington who later became, of course, the President of our Nation after a distinguished career which we are all aware of.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would add 12 acres, owned by a willing seller, to the existing park commemorating George Washington's birthplace. It is my understanding that acquisition of these lands would cost about $50,000–$100,000, and that the measure is viewed as desirable by the National Park Service to resolve existing park management concerns.

I commend Mr. BATEMAN for championing, again this Congress, this measure to better protect this park area.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also want to commend him, Chairman VENTO and his subcommittee for bringing this legislation before the House in such an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 326 which is the companion bill to H.R. 819 which I introduced in the House on February 4, 1993. These bills would expand the boundaries of the George Washington National Monument in Westmoreland County on the historic northern neck of Virginia. I introduced this legislation to better enable my constituents and local National Park Service officials to preserve and protect an important part of America's heritage.

In 1991, I introduced almost identical legislation which was approved unanimously by the House on November 21. Although the Senate also passed a bill to expand the monument's boundaries last year, the House was precluded from agreeing to the Senate's minor change because of the rush to adjourn the 102d Congress.

The First Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent, includes many points of historic significance. Although the origins of this great Nation are found and skillfully interpreted in Williamsburg, Jamestown, Yorktown, and other historically significant parts of what I like to call America's first district, it is only on the northern neck of Virginia that we can trace the early footsteps of the Father of our Country.

Pope's Creek Plantation, birthplace of George Washington in 1732, is located on the Potomac River in Westmoreland County, VA. The Washington family first settled here in 1656 when John Washington, great-grandfather of George Washington, acquired the land as a wedding present. Here, George Washington spent his early childhood. Although he later moved to Mount Vernon from Pope's Creek, George Washington returned periodically to his birthplace. To this day, Washington family descendants continue to live in the area. In fact, I am proud to note that the park's superintendent, Dwight Storke, not only is a descendant of George Washington, but was recognized recently by his peers in the National Park Service as Superintendent of the Year.

Two hundred years after Washington's birth, Congress established the George Washington Birthplace National Monument to memorialize and commemorate the life of the foremost of our Founding Fathers. The National Park Service now owns 538 acres in two contiguous parcels located along Pope's Creek, Bridge's Creek, and the Potomac River. The monument's landscape consists of fields, forests and marshlands. The National Park Service makes full use of this beautiful landscape by maintaining a reconstructed homestead and operating a working colonial farm which recreates 18th century plantation life.

Located between the National Park Service's two parcels are 125 acres of privately owned land. The Horner family owns 12 acres and the Muse family owns the remaining 113 acres. Currently, these private lands are woods, wetlands and agricultural fields which complement and enhance the monument's historic character and cultural setting.

The purpose of S. 326 and H.R. 819 is to revise the monument's boundaries to include the 12-acre Horner family property. This 12 acres is one of the best examples of mature loblolly pine woodlands in the area and is within 400 yards of a bald eagle nesting site. The Horners have exercised excellent stewardship of their land and are to be commended. Because of their property's location relative to the monument's current boundaries, the Horners, local officials, civic organizations and others are concerned with the potential for adverse, nonagricultural development near the monument given the trend of waterfront development in the region.

Although the Muse family initially supported inclusion of their property within the monument, last summer they indicated that they no longer wanted their land officially included within the monument's boundaries. It is my understanding that the Muses became concerned about some of the legal requirements and conditions associated with having their property formally included within the monument. Nevertheless, it is my hope and understanding that the National Park Service will continue to work with the Muses to ensure long-term protection of this beautiful land which has been farmed and well-cared for by the Muse family for over two centuries.

The boundary expansion I am advocating is a logical improvement of the monument's overall configuration. While responding to my constituents' request, this legislation will also improve the National Park Service's ability to

ensure the proper and adequate protection of this small, but important part of America's heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to introduce and support legislation to help my constituents and the National Park Service. I believe enactment of this measure will be another important and appropriate step taken by Congress to ensure the continued preservation and commemoration George Washington's birthplace deserves. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support S. 326.

Mr. HANSEN. 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. 326.

The question was taken.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 proceeding on this motion will be postponed.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO TAOS, NM

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 328) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, NM, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 328

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

SECTION 1. TAOS RANGER DISTRICT.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quit-claim deed to the town of Taos, New Mexico, subject to the terms and conditions stated in subsection (b), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land and improvements thereon described as follows:

That property locally referred to as the "Old Taos Ranger District Office and Warehouse" located in the town of Taos, Taos County, New Mexico, containing approximately 0.633 acres, specifically described in that certain warranty deed dated January 22, 1937, by William T. and Mary E. Hinde, husband and wife, to the United States, as recorded on January 23, 1937, in book A-34, page 415, of the Record of Deeds of Taos County, New Mexico.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be in consideration of the amount of $360,000, payable in full within the 6-month period referred to in subsection (a), or, at the option of the town of Taos, in 20 annual payments of $18,000 due on January 1 of the first year following enactment of this Act and annually thereafter until the total amount due has been paid, as agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture. The cash so received shall be deposited into a special fund in the Treasury which will remain available, subject to appropriations, until expended by the Secretary for the purpose of acquiring, within the State of New Mexico, lands or administrative facilities on National Forest System lands. The town of Taos shall not be charged interest on amounts owed the United States for such conveyance.

(2) RELEASE.—On transfer of the property under subsection (a) the town of Taos shall release the United States from any liability for claims relating to the property.

(3) REVERSION.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be a conveyance of fee simple title to the property, subject to reversion to the United States if the property is used for other than public purposes or if the compensation requirements described in paragraph (1) are not met.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] 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 H.R. 328, the bill now 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, H.R. 328, introduced by Mr. RICHARDSON, would convey to the city of Taos, NM, the old Taos Ranger District Office and Warehouse. This building is currently owned by the Forest Service, but is no longer needed by the Agency, which has vacated the building and is now leasing it to the city. Under the provisions of the bill, the United States will receive fair market value for the property. The legislation also provides that if the building is used for nonpublic purposes it will revert back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office has notified the Committee on Natural Resources that there was a potential pay-go problem with H.R. 328. While the amount in question is very minor, totaling only $18,000 annually, the legislation at the desk has been amended to address this matter. With this change, the CBO has now told the committee there is no problem with pay-as-you-go procedures.

H.R. 328 is nearly identical to a bill that passed the House in the 102d Congress but on which action was not completed prior to adjournment. This is a noncontroversial measure and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 328 and applaud the efforts to transfer the old Taos Forest Service district office building to the town of Taos, NM.

H.R. 328 is an excellent opportunity to enhance the cultural and educational aspects of the town of Taos, NM. The children's library and adult literacy center will be a great asset for the citizens of Taos.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 328.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Members support this legislation.

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 bill, H.R. 328, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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.

JEMEZ NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 38) to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 38

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) PURPOSE AND ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to conserve, protect, and restore the recreational, ecological, cultural, religious, and wildlife resource values of the Jemez Mountains, there is hereby established the Jemez National Recreational Area (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "recreation area"), to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary").

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The recreation area shall be comprised of approximately 57,000 acres of lands and interests in lands within the Santa Fe National Forest as generally depicted on the map entitled "Jemez National Recreation Area—Proposed" and dated September 1992. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, District of Columbia. The Secretary may from time to time, in consultation with local tribal leaders, make minor revisions in the boundary of the recreation area to promote management effectiveness and efficiency in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(c) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the recreation area with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and with the Committee on Energy and Natural Re-

sources and the Select Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate. Such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made. Such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(d) NO ADDITIONAL LANDS.—No lands or interests therein outside of the boundaries of the recreation area may be added to the recreation area without specific authorization by Congress.

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the recreation area in accordance with this Act and the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to National Forest System lands in a manner that will further the purposes of the recreation area. Management of the natural resources within the recreation area shall be permitted only to the extent that such management is compatible with and does not impair the purposes for which the recreation area is established. Recreational activities within the recreation area shall include (but not be limited to) hiking, camping, hunting, fishing, skiing, backpacking, rock climbing, and swimming.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall, no later than 5 years after the enactment of this Act, develop a management plan for the recreation area, as an amendment to the Santa Fe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, to reflect the establishment of the recreation area and to conform to the provisions of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall require the Secretary to revise the Santa Fe Forest Land and Resource Management Plan pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. During development of the management plan for the recreation area, the Secretary shall study newly designated land within the recreation area, and adjacent national forest land.

(c) CULTURAL RESOURCES.—In administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall give particular emphasis to the preservation, stabilization, and protection of cultural resources located within the recreation area in furtherance of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Act of August 11, 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1991) (commonly referred to as the "American Indian Religious Freedom Act").

(d) NATIVE AMERICANS.—(1) In recognition of the historic use of portions of the recreation area by Indian peoples for traditional cultural and religious purposes, the Secretary shall, in consultation with local tribal leaders, ensure the protection of religious and cultural sites and provide access from time to time to those sites by Indian peoples for traditional cultural and religious purposes. Such access shall be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Act of August 11, 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1991) (commonly referred to as the "American Indian Religious Freedom Act"). The Secretary, in accordance with such Act, upon request of an Indian tribe or pueblo, may from time to time temporarily close to general public use one or more specific portions of the recreational area in order to protect the privacy of religious activities and cultural uses in such portion by Indian peoples. Any such closure shall be made so as to affect the smallest practicable area for the minimum period necessary for such purposes.

(2) In preparing and implementing management plans for the recreation area, the Secretary shall request that the Governor of the Pueblo of Jemez and the chief executive officers of other appropriate Indian tribes and pueblos make recommendations on methods of—

(A) assuring access to religious and cultural sites;

(B) enhancing the privacy and continuity of traditional cultural and religious activities in the recreation area; and

(C) protecting traditional cultural and religious sites in the recreation area.

(e) WILDLIFE RESOURCES.—In administering the recreation area, the Secretary shall give particular emphasis to the conservation and protection of wildlife resources, including species listed as sensitive by the Forest Service, within the recreation area and shall comply with applicable Federal and State laws relating to wildlife, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(f) HUNTING.—The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within the recreation area in accordance with applicable Federal and State law. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, such activities will not be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies such designation by the Secretary under this subsection shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agencies responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

(g) TIMBER HARVESTING.—The Secretary may permit timber harvesting in the recreation area for commercial purposes, including (but not limited to) vigas, latillas, the gathering of fuelwood, and for purposes of public safety, recreation, wildlife, and administration, insofar as the harvesting is compatible with the purposes of the recreation area. Trees damaged or downed due to fire, disease, or insect infestation may be utilized, salvaged, or removed from the recreation area as authorized by the Secretary in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the timber sales under contract on the date of enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to effect the Los Griegos timber sale in the Los Griegos Diversity Unit number 0322 as shown on the West Half Diversity Unit map of the Santa Fe National Forest dated November 1991; except that the Secretary shall manage such sale using uneven aged management including the individual tree selection method.

(h) GRAZING.—The Secretary may permit grazing within the recreation area in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Riparian areas shall be managed in such a manner as to protect their important resource values.

(i) TRANSPORTATION PLAN.—(1) Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a transportation plan that provides for the most efficient use of roads and trails to accomplish the purposes of this Act. The plan shall provide for a comprehensive trails system that provides for dispersed recreation while minimizing impact on significant archaeological and religious sites.

(2) The Secretary shall construct, maintain, and close roads within the recreation area after consultation with local tribal leaders and only in accordance with such plan.

(j) RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall provide for recreational facilities within the recreation area. Such facilities shall be constructed so as to minimize impacts on the scenic beauty, the natural character, and the archaeological and religious sites of the recreation area.

(k) VISITOR FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall establish a visitor center and interpretive facilities in or near the recreation area for the purpose of providing for education relating to the interpretation of cultural and natural resources of the recreation area.

(l) POWER TRANSMISSION LINES.—In accordance with Federal and State laws and regulations, the Secretary may permit a utility corridor for high power electric transmission lines within the recreation area only when the Secretary determines that—

(1) there is not a feasible alternative for the location of such corridor;

(2) damage to the recreational and scenic quality and to the archaeological and religious sites of the recreation area will not be significant;

(3) it is in the public interest that such corridor be located in the recreation area; and

(4) a plan to minimize harm to the resources of the recreation area has been developed.

(m) SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS.—The Secretary may permit scientific investigations within the recreation area upon the Secretary's determination that such investigations are in the public interest and are compatible with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. MINERALS AND MINING.

(a) LIMITATION ON PATENT ISSUANCE.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no patents shall be issued after May 30, 1991, for any location or claim made in the recreation area under the mining laws of the United States.

(2) Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or similar restriction otherwise applicable, any party claiming to have been deprived of any property right by enactment of paragraph (1) may file in the United States Claims Court a claim against the United States within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act seeking compensation for such property right. The United States Claims Court shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any such claim in accordance with section 1491 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, after the date of enactment of this Act, lands within the recreation area withdrawn from location under the general mining laws and from the operation of the mineral leasing, geothermal leasing, and mineral material disposal laws.

(c) RECLAMATION.—No mining activity involving any surface disturbance of lands or waters within such area, including disturbance through subsidence, shall be permitted except in accordance with requirements imposed by the Secretary, including requirements for reasonable reclamation of disturbed lands to a visual and hydrological condition as close as practical to their premining condition.

(d) MINING CLAIM VALIDITY REVIEW.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall undertake and complete within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act an expedited program to examine all unpatented mining claims, including those for which a patent application has been filed, within the recreation area. Upon determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that the elements of a contest are present, the Secretary of the Interior shall immediately determine the validity of such claims. If a claim is determined to be invalid, the Secretary shall promptly declare the claim to be null and void.

(e) PUBLIC PURPOSES.—The Secretary may utilize mineral materials from within the recreation area for public purposes such as maintenance and construction of roads, trails, and facilities as long as such use is compatible with the purposes of the recreation area.

SEC. 4. ADJOINING LANDS.

The Secretary may evaluate lands adjoining the recreation area for possible inclusion in the recreation area and make recommendations to Congress, including (but not limited to) that area authorized for study by section 5 of Public Law 101-556 (104 Stat. 2764), known as the Baca Location Number 1. The Secretary, in consultation with local tribal leaders and the National Park Service, shall, no later than 2 years after enactment of this Act, submit recommendations

with respect to future boundaries for the recreation area.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] 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 H.R. 38, the bill now 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, H.R. 38, introduced by Mr. RICHARDSON, is a modified version of legislation that was passed by the House in the 102d Congress. The bill before us today would establish a 57,000-acre Jemez National Recreation Area within the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico.

The national recreation area created by H.R. 38, would encompass a portion of the Jemez Mountains that includes steep canyons with brilliantly colored rimrocks and rich biological diversity. The largest elk herd in New Mexico migrates through the area and the mountains are home to many Federal- and State-listed threatened, endangered, and sensitive species.

The Jemez also contains one of the highest densities of archeological and cultural sites in North America, estimated at approximately 15 sites per square mile and totaling approximately 30,000 sites. Large, ancient Pueblo Indian village sites are particularly abundant. Many of these sites have been nominated and placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Easy access and scenic surroundings make the Jemez a popular recreational area. National forest figures show that almost 300,000 people a year visit the Jemez Mountains. Within the area is the east fork of the Jemez River, 11 miles of which have been designated as a national wild and scenic river.

The legislation, in addition to enhancing the public's use and enjoyment of the area, will also protect the resources of the Jemez by withdrawing the area from mineral entry and providing that timber harvesting would have to be compatible with the purposes of the national recreation area.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will protect and enhance the Jemez Mountains.

□ 1350

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

Mr. VENTO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions of the chairman. How much will this cost in tax dollars?

Mr. VENTO. Well, this area—I appreciate the gentleman's concern—the area now is managed by the Forest Service as general forest lands. This does not ask for any additional authorization in the bill. I think that some of the cost for general forests would be transferred over to the recreational management of these lands. So that the focus is different.

There is, of course, we estimate that the bill, under the CBO, will increase Federal spending by some dollars in 1994 and over a 6-year period by $6 million. Of course, that means that the Committee on Appropriations would have to appropriate such moneys.

So it is an authorization for that, not necessarily appropriated by this measure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further. So that it will cost about $6 million over the next 5 years if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to appropriate those moneys.

Mr. VENTO. If the committee appropriates the necessary funds, yes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, I understand it also allows condemnation of lands surrounding this area.

Mr. VENTO. Well, it does not allow it. Under the general law that is the authority, any time you are in a national forest, they have such authority. So it is wrong to suggest that this bill allows that. It is general forest lands. It does not extend or expand the boundaries of the forest. So that would be a misinterpretation of what takes place here.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further. Do the surrounding property owners have any objection to this at all, or does the gentleman know?

Mr. VENTO. I have received no adverse testimony. The largest landholders, the largest group that was interested, are the Native American groups. Although this is all national forest land, there is a high mesa in the center of it, and that was excluded from the recreation area because it is used for religious purposes. But the land is not privately owned, as far as we know. We have received no testimony; I cannot speak for people being silent on this. But as I said, it does not change the authorities of the Forest Service in the sense of, with regard to private property rights, that the gentleman had questioned earlier.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. All right. But it does authorize up to $6 million over the next 5 years.

Mr. VENTO. Well, it does authorize—there are numerous facilities there. As I say, it is an area where we have 300,000 people entering the area on an annual basis. It is, as I said, a noncontroversial measure in most respects. It does, obviously, take the designation of this land in different directions.

I might point out that obviously there is money to be raised in some sense, too, in terms of these public lands in terms of how they are utilized. We are looking at those features as we deal with other bills in terms of entrance fees and other matters.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 38 which has been fully explained by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

This legislation, which began as an agreement between Mr. RICHARDSON and Senator DOMENICI, is a big improvement over the bill that was initially approved by the House last session but did not become law.

However, there is one major improvement that still needs to be made in this legislation. H.R. 38 currently allows the Forest Service to acquire lands within the NRA through condemnation. Since nearly one-sixth of the proposed NRA is private property, this is a significant issue.

Although some will try to comfort me by pointing out that the Forest Service only condemns private lands as a last resort, the fact remains that the mere threat of condemnation by high-powered attorneys in Washington, DC, is the hammer that turns many small landowners into willing sellers. Most of these folks do not have the time and money to fight city hall and win.

Fortunately, Senator DOMENICI's companion bill contains a ban on condemnation of private property. I am hopeful that he will be able to get the other body to send this legislation back to the House with his condemnation provision intact.

I rise in support of H.R. 38 with the hope that the condemnation issue will be corrected by the other body.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not have in-depth knowledge of this issue, it is my understanding, after having talked to some of the staff people, that many of the people who own surrounding lands, who may be involved in mining, would rather just go ahead and sell this, rather than having to go ahead with the

business decision of mining it, because of Federal regulation restrictions and mining laws and so forth. If there are minerals—and I was trying to find this out a moment ago—of course, this would be negotiated, the value of the land and the sale price.

So, probably one of the reasons we have not heard a lot of opposition to this $6 million over 5 years is because the people who surround that area, who are going to sell it, would just as soon get money from Uncle Sam rather than go ahead and mine that land and go through all the problems they are going to have with the Federal Government regulations and so forth.

So this is $6 million, it is not an awful lot of money in the overall scheme of things, but it is $6 million and something that I think every Member of this body ought to look at very hard.

We have a huge deficit right now and a huge debt. We have to start prioritizing spending. If we authorize this and they appropriate the money for it in the next 2 years, that is another $6 million that will be added to the problem instead of solving the problem. I am not sure that this is a real priority at this time.

With that I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment that I think what the concern is with regard to the valid, existing claims or patented mining activity that might be taking place in this instance is, of course, a reasonable concern. I think I would just appeal to Members again that we are going to be faced constantly with this type of problem, and I think hopefully we will have the right policy in terms of mineral entry on lands. It is a very controversial issue, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], my friend and colleague on the committee, understand. But I just suggest we ought to try to deal with that because increasingly we are going to see this type of pressure and problem come forth.

Clearly, the elements here are, in terms of what is being mined, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has long had a concern about, strategic minerals and so forth. Here we are talking about block pumice, where its principal use, besides being used by the woodworkers, with which I was familiar as a woodworker, is for stonewashed jeans.

So, we have had this issue before us. This bill really is a compromise of what Congressman RICHARDSON had had before the committee before. As I said, it is a long-time interest; it is a very sensitive area, and it is an area that is used by the public. There is a lot of demand in the gentleman from New Mexico's State, and I would hope there would be some understanding on the part of the Members, as to the work that has been done on it.

I therefore support the measure.

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

Mr. VENTO. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

I just want to make sure I understand one thing. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] said that there are a lot of visitors, I believe he said 30,000.

Mr. VENTO. 300,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 300,000 that come there.

Mr. VENTO. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, they already come to the park area.

Mr. VENTO. It is not a park. It is a forest.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is a forest, not designated as a national park?

□ 1400

Mr. VENTO. It is not designated a national recreation area. It does not use the word "designated."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But the fact of the matter is that they already come there, 300,000 without this being designated.

Mr. VENTO. Well, yes. The gentleman is correct. They do, but there are also other interests in the land in terms of development of the mineral interests and so forth, which obviously would be largely in conflict with the recreational use.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if we do not spend the additional $6 million in additional land, that will not prevent people or discourage people from coming, because they already come anyhow.

Mr. VENTO. Well, just reclaiming my time, the point is, I think, there are some inherent conflict in the types of uses that are going on. By designating this national recreation area, we hope to treat it differently in the Forest Service. A visitor's center would be there, campgrounds and other things would be established that would further facilitate the use for that particular purpose.

So inherently we have some conflicts here in terms of mineral use which is not compatible with the types of recreational qualities for which this area is so reveried in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to belabor this, but I want to make one more brief comment. I want to ask a question, and that is, I know this is not a lot of money in the overall scheme of things, but if you have got 300,000 people coming already and you are going to spend $6 million over the next 5 years for something that is really not going to enhance the ability of people to come to this area, I do not see why we should ask the taxpayers to spend it.

Mr. VENTO. Well, just reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think in essence the dollars spent, if they are spent, if the Appropriations Committee appropriates and does develop a visitors' center and we do deal with boundaries, some of the costs incidentally will need to be made.

But the point is that indeed these tax expenditures, this type of designation does enhance and does in essence protect the type of experience there that has been available on a de facto basis.

If we do not move ahead, we are going to have further mineral claims. We are going to have further sales that are not compatible with the recreation area in terms of timber sales. This does not ban timber sales, but it does impact and does guide them along the use of this area.

So what we are trying to do here is have a balance between utilizing this on a multi-purpose basis and dealing with the other issues.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it sounds like after listening to the discussion that we are talking about some environmental concerns, about the minerals coming out of there, and possibly some environmental concerns about the forest; but that has not been raised until the last minute or minute-and-half in this discussion.

My concern is that you already have 300,000 people who utilize this area. They come there already without a recreation center. These recreation centers and parking garages and movie theaters around the country are in that so-called economic stimulus package that the President has.

There is a lot of concern, if you have been back to your district, about this money being spent when it is really not absolutely necessary with the huge deficits this country is facing.

So I would just like to say to my colleague, and he is a very fine chairman of the subcommittee, does a good job, but the problem is that we have to prioritize spending around here. It just seems to me that to authorize $6 million over the next 5 years which will lead to another expenditure of a convention center of some kind of center in this forest area for possible environmental concerns really concerns me.

We do not have the kind of money just to be able to come up with these projects one after another. We have to prioritize spending. We are facing a national economic disaster if we do not start cutting into this deficit and the debt.

So for that reason, I will call for a vote on this and I will urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. VENTO. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just in terms of reclaiming my time

point out that when you have a mineral entry and claims are made and when land is patented, basically the ownership of that land and under the laws with a small fee paid does transfer to private individuals. So once that happens in the Jemez National Recreation Area, we end up then with inholdings and the types of conflicts that destroy the type of multiple use that we would like to personify under this national recreation area, which is designated by this bill.

It is a tough choice. Obviously, I would hope that there would not be the types of claims that are invading this area, are causing disruption, are causing the type of damage to the resource. We are at a point where we have to choose. We have to choose whether we want this area. It is obvious for us that come from different States and maybe not using this area in the southwest, it would be a different matter.

But I would just suggest to the gentleman that in the subcommittee at least we tried to go over these very carefully, all the details of it.

I appreciate the gentleman's question, because it gives me an opportunity to talk more in depth about these topics.

This is going through the authorizing committee in the appropriations process and considered in the regular order. So we have had the regular debates basically for years on this, and I would hope that when we do that, I know there may be honest difference but that we would receive a better response from Members on the floor with regard to positive action. It is a good measure and it ought to pass. It does I think put out some of the choices we have.

Mr. Speaker, without further request for time, I would urge Members to support this.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering H.R. 38 to establish a national recreation area in the Jemez Mountains of the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico. During the last hours of the 102d Congress, I had great hope that we could pass this bill. However, despite tremendous local support and bipartisan support in the House and Senate, time ran out on this legislation at the end of the last Congress. It is important that we act on this measure and abate the assault on the Jemez Mountains by the reckless strip mining of pumice. The protection of these mountains is one of New Mexico's top environmental priorities.

These volcanically formed mountains and valleys, mixed conifer and deciduous trees, streams, small ponds, steep canyons, and brilliantly colored rimrocks make up one of the most spectacular areas of the country. They are one of the country. They are one of the richest areas of biological diversity in the Southwest. The largest elk herd in New Mexico migrates through the area, and the mountains provide critical habitat for many Federal- and State-listed threatened and endangered species as well as sensitive species including the peregrine falcon, goshawk, Jemez Mountains salamander, and others.

The Jemez also contain one of the highest densities of archaeological and cultural sites in North America, estimated at 15 sites per square mile and totalling approximately 30,000 sites. This includes large ancient Pueblo Indian villages sites, the largest of which contains over 1,800 rooms. The Jemez Pueblo Indians regard these mountains as the breath of life of their existence, and continue to use numerous religious sites in the Jemez.

The Jemez is also a very popular public recreation area. National forest figures show that approximately half a million people a year visit the area to camp, hike, fish, hunt, backpack, rock climb, and cross-country ski. Citizens from New Mexico and all around the country enjoy the Jemez. The area is truly a recreation mecca.

Unfortunately, the cultural, biological, and recreational value of the Jemez Mountains is threatened by the irresponsible strip mining of pumice, a material used to stone wash jeans. In fact, the major pumice mining operator in the Jemez, who is not even a member of the New Mexico Mining Association, has shown nothing but blatant disregard for Federal and State environmental laws. Over the last few years, New Mexicans have become justifiably alarmed about this degradation of the Jemez, resulting in my appointment of a citizens committee to develop a proposal to create a national recreation area [NRA]. Representatives from environmental organizations, timber companies, and concerned citizens held several meetings and worked diligently to produce a viable NRA proposal.

Since then, compelling testimony has been given at two congressional hearings and several town meetings in the Jemez area, and thousands of New Mexicans have called or written to express their support for an NRA in the Jemez. This legislation will provide protection for 57,000 acres of some of the most beautiful land in the country. The bill directs the Forest Service to develop a comprehensive management plan for the recreation area that addresses issues relating to native Americans, cultural resources, wildlife, recreation, mining, and visitors. It specifically withdraws the lands within the recreation area from new mining activity and prohibits the issuance of new mining patents, but protects the rights of those with existing mining operations. Mine operators will be required to reclaim the land as close as possible to its condition prior to mining.

Finally, I have worked hard to ensure that local landowners may continue with traditional uses of the land such as grazing, hunting, and timber harvesting. Because the Jemez Mountains are considered sacred by the Jemez Pueblo, specific language is included to protect their religious and cultural rights. Also, the bill will provide for much needed recreational and interpretive facilities, as well as a visitors center.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we look to the future and protect areas like the Jemez for our children and our children's children. This legislation will do just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 38, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 until tomorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

Votes will be taken in the following order: S. 328, and S. 326.

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

REHABILITATING HISTORIC STRUCTURES IN GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 328.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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. 328, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Beilenson	Bryant
Ackerman	Bentley	Bunning
Allard	Bereuter	Burton
Andrews (ME)	Berman	Buyer
Andrews (NJ)	Bevill	Callahan
Andrews (TX)	Bilbray	Calvert
Applegate	Bishop	Camp
Archer	Blackwell	Canady
Armey	Bliley	Cantwell
Bacchus (FL)	Blute	Cardin
Bachus (AL)	Boehlert	Carr
Baesler	Boehner	Castle
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Chapman
Baker (LA)	Bonior	Clayton
Ballenger	Borski	Clement
Barcia	Boucher	Clinger
Barlow	Brewster	Clyburn
Barrett (NE)	Brooks	Coble
Barrett (WI)	Browder	Coleman
Bartlett	Brown (CA)	Collins (GA)
Bateman	Brown (FL)	Collins (IL)
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Collins (MI)

Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
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
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Barton
Bilirakis
Byrne
Clay
Conyers
Emerson
Engel
Fields (TX)
Green
Henry
Houghton
Lantos
Moran
Quillen
Richardson
Sundquist
Torres
Unsoeld
Washington
Wilson
Wolf

□ 1427

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1430

GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 326.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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. 326, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 93, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—314

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh

Waters	Whitten	Wyden
Watt	Williams	Wynn
Waxman	Wise	Yates
Wheat	Woolsey	Young (AK)

NAYS—93

Archer	Hancock	Myers
Armey	Hastert	Nussle
Bachus (AL)	Herger	Orton
Baker (CA)	Hoekstra	Packard
Baker (LA)	Hunter	Penny
Ballenger	Hyde	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Inglis	Porter
Bartlett	Inhofe	Ramstad
Bentley	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Burton	Kasich	Royce
Coble	Kim	Santorum
Collins (GA)	King	Saxton
Cox	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Klug	Shays
Crapo	Knollenberg	Shuster
Cunningham	Kolbe	Slattery
DeLay	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Doolittle	Lambert	Solomon
Dornan	Lazio	Stearns
Dreier	Levy	Stenholm
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Everett	Lewis (FL)	Tanner
Ewing	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)
Fawell	Manzullo	Thomas (WY)
Fowler	McCandless	Vucanovich
Gekas	McCollum	Walker
Geren	Mica	Weldon
Goodling	Michel	Young (FL)
Goss	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Hall (TX)	Moorhead	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—24

Barton	Green	Richardson
Bilirakis	Henry	Smith (MI)
Byrne	Hoke	Sundquist
Canady	Houghton	Torres
Clay	Lantos	Unsoeld
Conyers	Moran	Washington
Engel	Owens	Wilson
Fields (TX)	Quillen	Wolf

□ 1438

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, PORTER, and ZIMMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes 137 and 138 on H.R. 328 and S. 326, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was attending a meeting with Secretary Henry Cisneros concerning housing and community development in the Houston area.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon during rollcall votes 137 and 138 because I was testifying at a hearing of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in Arlington, VA, concerning the proposed closing of Vint Hill Farms Station located in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia and the proposed realignment of the Naval Systems Commands from northern Virginia.

Had I been present on the House floor during those votes, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 137, in support of S. 328, concerning the Gateway National Recreation Area, and "yea" on rollcall 138, in support of S. 326, concerning the George Washington Birthplace National Monument.

□ 1440

NATIONAL ORGAN AND TISSUE DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to designate the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, I would just like to say that this piece of legislation is being sponsored by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], who unfortunately cannot be here right now. He is the chief sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] is the primary sponsor of this. He is also the chief sponsor of the House companion bill, House Resolution 94, to the Senate Joint Resolution No. 66.

He is very concerned about this issue, as we all are. I strongly support and urge all my colleagues to support the National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. BUTLER DERRICK.

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

I would like to take this opportunity to rise in support of this legislation that was introduced by our senior Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, some month or so ago.

He had no way of knowing, nor did anyone, but last week his 22-year-old daughter, who was to graduate from the University of South Carolina in May of this year and to enter the University of South Carolina Law School in September of this year, who was a bright, engaging young woman that I have known all of her life, was struck by an automobile in Columbia last week and died with injuries that she received and donated her organs so that others might live.

Our State has been in mourning for this fine young woman for the last number of days. I would like to suggest that the House pass this legislation in memory of a young woman that all of us would have been proud to call our daughter, Nancy Moore Thurmond.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAVENEL].

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to echo what my colleague from Edgefield County over in South Carolina had to say.

Senator THURMOND, in his long, long life, has certainly had his share of tragedy.

His first wife died of a brain tumor many years ago, when he was Governor. He did not marry again for a great many years, and then he married Miss South Carolina, Nancy Thurmond, who many of my colleagues know, and their first child was not born until the Senator was 68 years old, and that was Nancy Moore Thurmond.

A great many of my colleagues probably saw her at the Senator's birthday party, which was held a little less than a month ago. And of course, just recently, within the past week or so, she was walking across the street there in Columbia, SC, where she was a senior at the University of South Carolina, getting ready to run for Miss South Carolina, as her mother had formerly been. She was tragically struck down by an automobile and killed. She lay there in her hospital, I think on the moment of impact she had become brain dead. And her family, quite rightly, decided that her organs should be given so that others might live. And the life support systems were removed, and that occurred, and I just think this is just a very, very fitting tribute not only to that beautiful young lady, Nancy Moore Thurmond, but also to the Senator and his family.

I certainly would hope that the House would cast a unanimous vote for passage of this and in memory of Miss Thurmond.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today along with other Members of the South Carolina delegation a measure which would designate April 17–24, 1994, as Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week. As my colleagues may know, Nancy Moore Thurmond, daughter of Senator STROM THURMOND, died tragically in an automobile accident last week.

Although the time she spent with us was only 22 years, she made each of those years count. She contributed unselfishly to children's causes, and had already at such a young age established an exemplary record of public service and dedication.

According to her wishes, her organs were donated, and as an organ recipient myself, I know firsthand what a generous gift that is. Indeed, there are no words that are capable of conveying that gratitude.

I was proud to be a cosponsor of legislation introduced by my colleague ANDY JACOBS to

establish the National Organ and Tissue Donor Week and belief that it will increase public awareness for the importance of organ and tissue donations. Yesterday, I was honored to participate in ceremonies in my home State of South Carolina celebrating the establishment of this organ and tissue donor week. Every 20 minutes, a new patient is added to the national waiting list and designating the week of April 17–24, 1994 as the Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Week will give hope to the many who continue to wait.

When a tragedy such as this occurs, the first question that comes to mind is "why?" As a close friend of Senator THURMOND over the years, I watched his daughter Nancy grow up to become a kind, intelligent, and giving person. The only answer I can think of in response to "why?" is that Nancy was indeed so special that God wanted her close. Heaven has been enriched.

I know that my colleagues will join me in keeping the family of Senator STROM THURMOND and the many other families waiting for an organ and tissue donation in their thoughts and prayers.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, when I opened up the newspaper and saw the tragedy that had unfolded, the only thing that I could think of was not the headline of the moment but the absolutely beautiful young girl who had brought flowers over to the place that we rented in northern Virginia from her mother and father who lived next door.

I had never met Senator THURMOND at that time. I subsequently became acquainted with him as a neighbor.

When I looked down at the age of 22 and thought of my own sons, who were a little bit older, a little bit younger, all I could think of was the absolute tragedy, and all I could think of was that for years after, when people asked me who is the prettiest young girl I ever saw, I told them it was a 17-year-old little girl that was the daughter of a Senator and who, in a few years later, proved in many contests and on many different kinds of fields that that was the case.

□ 1450

The thing that struck me even more than her outward beauty was her friendliness, her demeanor, and the fact that she was such a warm and likeable person.

I will conclude by saying that this was a tragedy for a very beautiful young lady, beautiful in every sense in which that word can be used.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, and I do not know if this is in order or not, but I ask unanimous consent that the title of the joint resolution be changed to the Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week in honor of this lady who died in an untimely way, and who donated her organs to help other human beings. She is a perfect example of what we all ought to be as far as caring about our fellow man.

It is a very simple procedure, Mr. Speaker, for anybody to allow their organs to be donated to help other human beings in the event of their untimely death. They can do that simply, in most States, by putting a notation on the back of their driver's license, so if there is a terrible tragedy they can see from their driver's license immediately whether or not those organs are to be donated. It certainly would help other human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of this joint resolution be changed, in compliance with Senate Joint Resolution 80.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair advises the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that the gentleman's sentiments will appear in the RECORD, but the Chair is reluctant to entertain a request to change the title without concurrence of the manager and the sponsors of the bill.

However, again, the Chair again reiterates that the gentleman's sentiments, as have been duly expressed by other Members, will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolutions 66 designating the week beginning April 18, 1993, and the week beginning April 17, 1994, each as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that each person's goal should be to "make yourself necessary to someone". Across our Nation today, more than 30,000 people are waiting for an organ transplant. Their only hope, as they face each uncertain day, is that a fellow citizen has had the courage and faith to give them a second chance by having signed an organ donor card.

My family and I know from personal experience the hopes and fears of those thousands who wait. We also are fortunate to know the joy and deep gratitude of those have been organ recipients and now have a more certain future.

Senate Joint Resolution 66 will serve to remind all Americans that signing an organ donor card is a selfless act to "make yourself necessary to someone." I urge my colleagues to support and adopt this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 66

Whereas a new patient is added to the national patient waiting list for an organ transplant every 20 minutes;

Whereas thousands of lives are saved or significantly improved annually by organ and tissue transplantation; and

Whereas increasing the number of transplantable organs and tissues would save American taxpayers millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the weeks beginning April 18, 1993, and April 17, 1994, are each designated "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

INQUIRY REGARDING BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT ON SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the minority leader.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would say to the gentleman, the minority leader is not on the floor at the moment. I will be glad to try to, in his stead, answer any questions.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am curious, because as the Members know, before we left for the district work period it was my understanding that the leadership of the majority and the minority parties were to get together in order to bring some sort of structure, some sort of form to the special orders, 160 hours of which were paid for by the citizens last year at about $6,000 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would inquire from the minority, what is the status of those discussions?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer the gentleman's question. There was a task force

appointed by the minority leader on our side of the aisle. That task force, headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] of the Committee on Rules, will be meeting at 4 o'clock today to try to come up with a proposal. Excuse me, the Republican Research Committee of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has been working on that. We will have a proposal that we will be bringing before the body before too long.

They will be talking with the gentleman's leadership on his side of the aisle, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] and the majority floor leader, as well, so they have been working on this and there will be some hopeful resolution before too long.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman how does "before too long" translate in hours and days?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would inform the gentleman that we had a meeting today, the Republican Research Committee, and they talked about the proposal. It was presented to the body as a whole. It will go to our conference probably this week, and I feel confident that this will be discussed with both the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] very shortly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Director, Non-Legislative and Financial Services, of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, April 7, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LEONARD P. WISHART III,
Director.

THE HOLOCAUST MUSEUM, A HISTORICAL REMINDER

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read today that one in five Americans surveyed by the Roper organization thought it possible that the Holocaust never happened.

With the opening of the Holocaust Museum to the public next Monday, there could be no better time to remind everyone of the importance of remembering this horrible event in human history.

On April 15, 1945, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower visited every nook and cranny of the Nazi concentration camps in order, according to his own words, "to be in a position to give first-hand evidence of these things if ever, in the future, there develops a tendency to charge these allegations merely to propaganda."

Mr. Speaker, let's encourage these 20 percent of doubting Americans to visit the Holocaust Museum to see firsthand for themselves the horror of the Nazi past. Let them see the same things as General Eisenhower did nearly 50 years ago. As one famous historian has said, "Those who forget history are condemned to repeat it." Never again.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1993]

1 IN 5 POLLED VOICES DOUBT ON HOLOCAUST

NEW YORK, April 19.—A poll released today found that 22 percent of adults and 20 percent of high school students who were surveyed said they thought it was possible that the Holocaust, Nazi Germany's extermination of six million Jews, never happened.

In addition to the 22 percent of adult respondents to the survey by the Roper Organization who said it seemed possible that the Holocaust never happened, 12 percent more said they did not know if it was possible or impossible, according to the survey's sponsor, the American Jewish Committee.

The findings shocked Holocaust survivors, some of whom had devoted much of their lives to keeping alive the memory of the systematic extermination of Jews in World War II.

Roper interviewed 992 adults from Nov. 14 to Nov. 21 and 506 high school students from Oct. 19 to Oct. 30. All were asked, "Does it seem possible, or does it seem impossible to you, that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened?"

"WHAT HAVE WE DONE?"

Sixty-five percent of adults and 63 percent of high school students said it was impossible to believe that the Holocaust never happened. Twelve percent of the adults and 17 percent of the high school students said they did not know. The margin of sampling error was plus or minus four percentage points for the adult survey and plus or minus five percentage points for the survey of students.

"What have we done?" asked a stunned Elie Wiesel, the Nobel laureate who chronicled his experiences at the Auschwitz and Buchenwald concentration camps. "We have been working for years and years. I am shocked that 22 percent—oh, my God."

Benjamin Mead, president of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, called the findings alarming. "It was a Jewish tragedy," he said. "But the message is universal: It happened to Jews. It could happen to anyone."

David Singer, research director for the American Jewish Committee, said the study was "the first attempt ever to systematically get at what Americans know about the Holocaust."

The survey also found that 72 percent of adults and 64 percent of high school students said it was essential or very important for all Americans to know about and understand what was done to the Jews by the Nazis.

In addition, 63 percent of adult respondents and 54 percent of high school respondents rejected the idea that 50 years had erased the relevance of the Holocaust.

INSURANCE REDLINING

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness held a hearing to examine redlining practices of insurance companies. We heard very disturbing reports about a variety of practices insurance companies use to deny access to insurance to the residents of our urban areas.

There are those who deny redlining exists, who say it never happened. Or that it is purely an urban availability problem, not related to racial discrimination. The evidence shows otherwise.

Selwyn Whitehead of the Economic Empowerment Foundation testified at the subcommittee hearing about her experience in trying to get liability insurance for her telecommunications consulting firm in the late 1980's. When she identified her firm as a woman-owned firm, of color, in Oakland, she was turned away or quoted premiums for $8,000 to $10,000 per year. But when she called on behalf of her fictitious white male boss, a Mr. Selwyn Whitehead, the first quote was for $1,200.

And, in later February, there were news reports of a former sales manager for Allstate in California accusing Allstate of closing inner-city offices and ordering workers to lose files from minority insurance applicants.

The statistics speak for themselves. At the subcommittee hearing, Illinois Public Action revealed that there are 52 State Farm offices and 32 Allstate offices in a predominately white congressional district in Chicago. But in the Chicago portion of my district, there are only six State Farm offices and two Allstate offices outside the downtown area.

Illinois Public Action also revealed that in a primarily African-American neighborhood in Chicago, at 79th Street, there is a heavily trafficked Sears store. You can get your car fixed there, but you cannot buy Allstate insurance there, even though you can at many Sears stores.

And ACORN testified that in Chicago, only 51.1 percent of occupied, single family units in low-income neighborhoods, and only 57.6 percent in mi-

nority neighborhoods, were covered by any type of insurance, compared to 90 percent coverage in high income and 87.7 percent coverage in white areas.

We heard a somewhat different view from the American Insurance Association. I appreciated the association's willingness to testify and to engage in a dialog about this problem. Unfortunately, the insurance industry's general posture is to take issue with these studies and try to nitpick them to death. But it is hard to take issue with the basic conclusions. However, the industry criticism does point out one basic problem. There is a lack of good, solid, comprehensive data about insurance coverage in urban areas.

To remedy this, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1188, the Antiredlining in Insurance Disclosure Act. This act will require insurance companies to disclose information about their insurance practices and activities in urban areas, such as the breakdown of policies sold by census tract, itemized by demographic chacteristics. These disclosure requirements would apply to major lines of insurance, such as automobile, property, and small business commercial insurance. The legislation also requires reporting of agent location by census tract.

The information generated by this legislation would help determine the true nature and extent of redlining. The public disclosure of this information would also serve as a powerful disincentive against discriminatory behavior.

In addition, the legislation mandates disclosure to insurance applicants about reasons for rejection or nonrenewal and protects against the termination of agents as a result of their location or the location of their customers. The act would be administered by the Department of Commerce.

As a practical matter, access to property insurance is a prerequisite for access to mortgage loans and is often essential for access to small business loans. Without access to affordable insurance, small businesses in our urban areas cannot prosper nor generate badly needed jobs. Similarly, access to affordable automobile insurance is often essential for residents of the inner cities to keep and hold jobs.

Next week on Monday, April 26, our subcommittee will be conducting a field hearing in Chicago to examine how insurance practices are affecting the ability of low-income and minority residents to purchase homeowners and automobile insurance.

Redlining practices must stop. I am hopeful this legislation will be a first step in developing effective solutions to this problem.

□ 1500

MEDICAL DISCHARGE OF PETTY OFFICER FIRST CLASS NEGRETE

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, when is a hero not a hero—I'll tell you when—when he happens to be a Persian Gulf veteran by the name of Ruben Negrete. You see, Mr. Speaker, Petty Officer First Class Negrete has a disease which is consuming his life. Immediately after coming back to the United States from a 4-month stint in the Persian Gulf, Ruben Negrete's physical condition began to rapidly deteriorate to the point that he is now of no more use to the Navy; no more use to the institution he served with such loyalty and distinction; no more use to the country he was called to defend. Petty Officer Negrete, a man who invested 14 years of his life in the military service, a man who was building a promising career in the Navy, is being cut loose to fend for himself.

President Theodore Roosevelt once said, in his typically blunt fashion:

> A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud veteran of the Marine Corps and as a Member of Congress, it saddens me and angers me to say that Ruben Negrete, along with countless of other sick Persian Gulf veterans, is not being given a square deal by the Department of Defense.

From January 8 to April 24, 1991, Petty Officer Negrete was deployed to the Persian Gulf, assigned to Fleet Hospital Six as part of a construction battalion in Bahrain. During his normal course of duty in the Persian Gulf, Ruben Negrete was exposed on a daily basis to large quantities of oil smoke, generator exhaust fumes, microwave radiation, and all types of chemical agents.

While performing under strenuous environmental conditions, Ruben Negrete didn't think twice about the dangers posed by his exposure to chemical toxins—he simply and professionally carried out his assigned duties.

Prior to being deployed to the Persian Gulf, Ruben Negrete was a healthy young man. The Navy even gave Ruben a clean bill of health during a physical before he left for the gulf.

Since his return to the States, however, Ruben has been in and out of naval dispensaries and has been an inpatient at the San Diego Naval Hospital for the last year. Ruben has suffered from memory loss, chronic fatigue, hair loss, and severe arthritis. In fact, Ruben Negrete's ailments are so severe that he has great difficulty walking a street block and suffers constant muscle and joint pain throughout his body.

In the words of Ruben's mother, who has painfully watched the physical deterioration of her son, Ruben has become an immobile shadow of himself.

And how does the Navy treat this wounded warrior? It determines that he is unfit for duty and offers him a medical discharge with 10-percent disability. Upon appeal, the Navy raised Ruben's disability to 40 percent.

Forty-percent disability for a man who has tremendous difficulty performing and sustaining the most basic physical tasks; 40-percent disability for a man who honorably served his country in time of war; 40-percent disability for a man who is expected to support his wife and three children.

Mr. Speaker, how can the Navy realistically expect Ruben Negrete, who has been an inpatient for approximately 1 year and whose medical condition hasn't improved one scintilla, to find and maintain gainful employment upon discharge? How can the Navy expect Ruben Negrete to support and care for his family, when he is nothing more than the shell of his former self?

How can the Navy expect Ruben Negrete to set out on a new career path when he is physically incapacitated by chronic fatigue and pain?

In a 1962 commencement speech before West Point cadets, Douglas MacArthur said:

> The soldier, above all other people, prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war.

Mr. Speaker, Petty Officer Negrete prayed for peace on the eve of Operation Desert Storm.

However, when his marching orders were given, Ruben Negrete put his life in harms way in defense of America's national interests. Today, when the victory celebrations and welcoming home parades for our returning Persian Gulf heroes are nothing but a distant memory, families like the Negretes are reminded daily of the Persian Gulf war.

People like Ruben Negrete are the ones who must live day in and day out with the wounds and scars of the conflict in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, Petty Officer Negrete doesn't deserve to have his life brushed under the rug. He deserves, and has earned, a square deal from the Navy.

Ruben Negrete is a man who is physically incapacitated by his ailments and should be entitled to disability benefits that accurately reflect his critical condition. By offering Ruben Negrete 40-percent disability, the Navy is trying to get off cheap. The Navy, in my opinion, should live up to its obligation and acknowledge the fact that Ruben Negrete is clearly unable to work in any capacity.

I am asking the President, the Defense Secretary, and the Acting Secretary of the Navy to review Ruben's case in the farfetched hope that com-

mon sense and justice will finally prevail. The question that must be asked is how many other active duty personnel or Persian Gulf veterans suffer from similar ailments. These men and women are out there and the Defense Department needs to recognize that there is a medical problem related to service in the Persian Gulf war.

For nearly 20 years the U.S. Government shamefully ignored the agent orange claims of Vietnam veterans. In an age of the All-Volunteer Force, we cannot afford to treat our service men and women with such disrespect and disregard. Let us confront this problem head on and provide servicemen like Ruben Negrete with the benefits and care they so deserve.

BRANDON STUDENT WINS MISSISSIPPI VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest. This year, more than 147,000 students participated nationwide and competed for $87,500 in scholarship money.

Mississippi's winner this year was Brad Bowlin of Brandon. Brad is a senior at University Christian School and has an outstanding record of achievement and leadership throughout his years in high school. I want to share with my colleagues Brad's Voice of Democracy entry.

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Brad Bowlin)

What is my voice in America's future? In order to answer this, I must first ask the question, "Why do I have a voice in America's future?" I have a voice in America's future because of those voices in our past which spoke loud and strong enough to secure and maintain the freedoms I enjoy today.

What are these voices from the past? They are the voices of those pilgrims who perished for the cause of freedom that first dreadful winter at Plymouth.

They are the voices of those 56 courageous men who signed the Declaration of Independence and mutually pledged to each other, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Of those 56, many sealed that pledge with the loss of their homes, their families, and their very lives for the cause of freedom.

They are the voices of those statesmen such as Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Adams, Henry, and Lincoln who hammered out our laws on the anvil of wisdom, compassion, and human dignity. These were tough-minded, clear-thinking, sacrificial men who did more than talk about freedom. They did something about it.

They are the voices of those countless brave men and women whose bodies lie beneath white crosses—veterans who fought and even died that I might live to be free. The lives of these heroes bring to mind forgotten terms such as integrity, bravery, respect, faith, vigilance, honor, discipline, sacrifice, and godliness. To the many in our nation who have given their lives to further it, this freedom was dear—so dear they were willing to die for it.

I as a young citizen of the United States of America would not have a voice in America's future if there had not been those before me who counted the cost of freedom and willingly gave their lives to pay for it. It has been said that freedom is never free; it is always purchased at a great cost.

Because of these voices from the past, America is still the greatest nation in the world. Let negative voices argue about what's wrong with America, but our democratic system is still the envy of the world. Our shores are still the beacon of opportunity, shining to the rest of the globe. While other nations have built barbed-wire fences to keep people from getting out, America still greets a long line of people wanting to get in.

Yes, America is great, but will she remain so? The answer to this lies in my voice in America's future and in the voices of the countless other young men and women standing at the threshold of the 21st Century.

How will my voice in America's future be heard? I believe it will be heard through my vote, my valor, and my values.

First of all, my voice will be heard through my vote. In 1776 one vote gave America the English language instead of German. In 1876 one vote gave Rutherford B. Hayes the Presidency of the United States. In 1923 one vote gave Adolph Hitler leadership of the Nazi party. In 1941 one vote saved the Selective Service—just weeks before Pearl Harbor was attacked.

So what does all of this say? My vote could very well change the course of history.

Next, my voice will be heard through my valor. In the long history of this world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its darkest hour. I trust that I will not shrink from this responsibility and that I too will pay the price if another hour of danger threatens our democracy during my lifetime.

Finally, my voice will be heard through my values. Our real defense as a nation rests in the convictions, character, and commitment of each of us as citizens of this great land. In the words of General Douglas McArthur, it is my desire "to have a heart that is clean; a goal that is high; to learn to laugh yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future yet never neglect the past."

It is my hope that my voice will be a loud, strong, clear one for the cause of democracy in this, the most blessed nation on the face of the earth—the United States of America.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT

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, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, I rise to address the Freedom of Choice Act, a bill with a title that pays homage to the value of freedom—a value at the core of our beliefs as Americans. "Freedom of choice" are words that evoke the respect of all Americans.

Our country was founded on the principles of freedom—and countless Americans have made sacrifices, both small and great, to protect, defend, and enhance the freedom we enjoy as citizens of the United States.

Freedom is a political, legal, and moral concept. It is at the heart of our political tradition, our jurisprudence, and our collective morality.

But freedom is a concept which in our history as a Nation has never for long been divorced from the concept of responsibility.

□ 1510

Americans have always recognized that there can be no freedom without responsibility. Americans have always understood that our individual and collective choices have consequences. And that understanding is critical to the time-honored American concept of freedom.

Every attempt to undermine the value of personal responsibility and personal accountability will in turn fray and tear the fabric of freedom.

Despite its title, the Freedom of Choice Act would undermine the fabric of freedom by establishing an extremist policy of promoting abortion in America, a policy which is at odds with the views of most Americans.

I am aware that America is divided on the issue of abortion. Many Americans are committed to the pro-life position in opposition to abortion and support stronger laws to protect the lives of the unborn. Other Americans strongly identify with the pro-choice label and view that Government should not place undue restrictions on the ability of a woman to obtain an abortion.

Although the proponents of the Freedom of Choice Act put forward this legislation simply as a pro-choice bill, the truth is far different. The truth is: This bill is not a pro-choice bill, it is a pro-abortion bill, a bill that would invalidate all restrictions on abortion, including the reasonable, moderate restrictions that are supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans.

Consider what this bill would impose on Americans.

It would leave private religious and nonreligious hospitals open to legal action forcing them to provide abortions. Even institutions founded on principles totally at odds with abortion could be dragged into court on the pretext that their policies restrict the right of women to choose abortion.

It would very likely prevent State governments from implementing policies limiting the public funding of abortions. This is an offense not only to pro-life citizens, but also to other citizens who believe that Government funding of abortion simply goes too far.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would, in effect, prohibit any regulation of the practice of abortion, even to protect

the health of the pregnant women unless such regulation is accepted by groups representing abortion providers such as the National Abortion Federation and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

The bill would prohibit States from requiring that abortions be performed by licensed physicians. It would invalidate parental consent and parental notice statutes which have been adopted by various States and upheld by the courts, and it would, in fact, mandate parental circumvention by allowing a minor to obtain permission for an abortion from any other responsible adult including the abortionist.

The bill would prohibit enactment of meaningful informed-consent laws, laws which are designed to assure that pregnant women know the relevant facts and alternatives before submitting to an abortion.

The bill would prohibit the enactment of a reasonable waiting period prior to the performance of an abortion.

All of these features point out the radical nature of the so-called Freedom of Choice Act. The radical nature of the proposal is further highlighted by its prohibition of State restrictions on abortions after viability. The bill would grant the abortionist unfettered discretion to determine when an unborn child is viable, and it would invalidate the very State laws which establish an objective standard for determining the viability of an unborn fetus.

As a consequence, viable unborn children will be killed by abortionists operating under the protection of a Federal statute, if the Freedom of Choice Act is passed into law.

This is a result which the vast majority of Americans do not support, and it is a result which I submit this House should not support.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] for his research and his remarks.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently taken action to remove restrictions on Federal funding for abortion. He is now aiming his efforts at striking down the Hyde amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if the Hyde amendment is not upheld and abortions are performed with Federal money, there will be an uproar across this Nation by those who object to their tax dollars being used for what they believe is the taking of the lives of the unborn. They are tired of having the President lift the reasonable and commonsense restrictions mainstream America has supported since the time of Jimmy Carter when he had the foresight to sign them into law.

Mr. Speaker, if the President is looking for a way to ease tensions caused by the abortion controversy, lifting the Hyde amendment is the wrong move. There is overwhelming public support for restrictions of Federal funding on abortion.

A recent CBS News/New York Times poll found that 72 percent of the American people felt that the costs of an abortion should be paid directly by the woman who has the abortion. Only 23 percent felt otherwise. In spite of the overwhelming support for restrictions on Federal funding of abortions, the President who leads the majority party has chosen once again to side with a minority of the American people.

After taking immediate executive action to soften restrictions on Federal involvement in abortion, the administration now looks to strike down the Hyde amendment in order to provide abortion on demand. And we'll have to be on the look out when the President comes out with Mrs. Clinton's new health plan because there will certainly be new provisions for reproductive services there too. Indeed, Planned Parenthood in California is actually trying to build abortion clinics with Federal community development funds.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute [AGI], the research arm of Planned Parenthood, tentatively estimated that the Federal share of Medicaid-funded abortions would cost between $62.5 and $75 million in fiscal year 1994, funding about 312,000 abortions. Thus, the average Federal contribution would be $200 to $240 per abortion. AGI speculated that this may be a low estimate since it is based on the number of abortions paid for through Medicaid in fiscal year 1977, and the number of Medicaid-eligible individuals has increased.

Then the President advocates the Freedom of Choice Act, emphasizing his belief in a woman's right to choose. Of course, he does not say that this act virtually gives a woman the right to terminate her pregnancy at any time. Even worse, the president now advocates Federal funding of these abortions.

Perhaps this explains why so many people who voted for a woman's right to choose are feeling so alienated; they are finding out that what they really voted for was the Government's right to use their money to pay for the termination of a pregnancy at any point in the pregnancy and for any reason.

My question is: Does the President really think that by providing Federal funding for abortions, he'll be able to accomplish his so-called goal of decreasing the number of abortions in this country?

The nature of the controversy itself shows there are grave doubts within the heart of the American people. Even the President seems to have experienced a tugging on his conscience. He said "very few Americans believe that all abortions all the time are all right." He also made it a point in the campaign to mention that he was not advocating abortion on demand, and that he'd really like to see a decrease in the number of abortions performed in this country.

Congress would pay for hundreds of thousands of abortions each year. Prior to the fiscal year 1978, the Federal Medicaid Program paid for about 300,000 abortions each year. In fiscal year 1991, with only the life of the mother exception, only 89 abortions were paid for with Federal Medicaid funds.

Repeal of the Hyde amendment, rather than giving States flexibility, takes away from States the decision whether or not to pay for abortions. Unless HHS designates abortions optional procedures, or treats them differently from all other Medicaid services by paying for them entirely with Federal funds, rather than requiring a State match, States would be required to participate in providing abortions on demand, or lose Federal Medicaid reimbursement.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a gesture that will help decrease the devastation of abortion; it is not a gesture that will strengthen families. This is a gesture that coerces all citizens to help pay for abortions. We must recognize this and vote against the President's proposal.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], for his very insightful remarks.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, who is there who will speak for the children who cannot speak for themselves; who is there to demand that they be given rights? The children who are conceived come into being without any choices of their own: The choice to have sex is made by the father and the mother; the choice of whether to go to the inconvenience of birth control is made by the parents. Nowhere in here does the child participate in the process. However, whenever conception occurs, a being is created, not by the parents but by God, and as a consequence of these choices the child's rights should be protected.

The real difference between well-meaning people on either side of this issue comes down to when does life begin. If we all agreed that the child-like form in the mother's womb, the creation that has a head, hands, movements, and features, is in fact a child, then the controversy that grips this Nation would be but a whimper. I may be wrong, but that's my opinion.

The reason I say this is that we are a compassionate nation; we rush to the aid of the helpless whether it be the kids in the Waco compound, or the deer in the woods or the fish in the sea. Speaking of deer and fish, the thought

occurred to me that we sometimes use names for deer and fish in an effort to stop killing them. We say to the hunter, "Are you going to kill Bambi?" and to the restaurant owner, "Are you going to serve us Flipper?"

To illustrate this point, think what would happen if we gave names to all children who are to be aborted. The names that come to my mind are John, Laura, Ted, and Rachel. These happen to be the names of my children. Abortion could have have sent pain and writhing to their beings and taken their lives; if so, maybe their parents would have had more money and spare time to spend on themselves, but what would have been lost was the chance at life that they were created for. Not parents but children. What about it: Are they not entitled to live their own lives? To have the opportunity like we have to try and fail, try each day to improve on what God has given them, to serve our country, to make their choices of life of how they would help mankind, or just take care of themselves; to choose to be criminals and believe that the world owes them something or even, yes, to take their own lives? If we would give each fetus a name maybe we could see that they are valuable and their rights to make choices should be preserved.

In this time of a ravaging deficit, what are the costs involved in this attempt to force States to allow the funding of abortions or lose the Medicaid services? In 1977, when abortions were federally funded, there were 294,000 abortions inflicted at a cost of $86 million. What the costs would be now is anybody's guess, but someone should be counting. If someone responds and says that we will be saving money through free abortions, the response should be, "A nation doesn't solve the blight of poverty by killing off the poor." And please remember that this law is asking those of us who sincerely disagree to be accomplices to this wrong by using our tax money.

Before someone says that abortions should be treated like other medical services, the figures from the Planned Parenthood affiliate should be examined: 1 percent of abortions are the result of rape or incest; 7 percent to save the life of the mother. What these figures mean is that the rest of the 92 percent of the decisions are birth control decisions—this is wrong, period, but it is wrong for our Nation to fund these decisions, when the parents do not consult the Government before they decide that their drive for pleasure and their unwillingness to be inconvenienced are more important than the Nation's welfare. By doing this we are not only costing dollars that we do not have, but we are further encouraging our Nation to take what we want without having to pay for it.

I do not pretend to know everything about this issue; my opinions don't become more important because I have been elected to Congress, but I do know what I believe to be important: That our Nation can not survive as we want it to unless and until we can speak for the ones who cannot speak, until we can give everyone an equal chance to succeed and contribute. A house cannot be built starting at the top floors; we must build from the bottom. The bottom in this context is at the fetus stage. We were all fetuses and we were all given the right to live and pursue happiness by our parents and our Government.

I am not trying to convince anyone to change your minds; I do not intend to condemn anyone for the decisions that they make; I merely want to publicly state what is a strong, strong, strong conviction on my part, that someone needs to speak for the little children in wombs all across this Nation, the Johns, the Lauras, the Teds, and the Rachels. If we do not I believe sincerely that we will be doing wrong, and you can never do right by doing what is wrong.

□ 1520

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Arkansas, Mr. DICKEY, and his colleagues for those kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and congratulate him for arranging this special order. I particularly want to thank Mr. CANADY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. DICKEY for standing up and speaking in defense of the Hyde amendment.

You know, the United Negro College Fund has one of the best slogans I have ever heard, "A mind is a terrible thing to waste." Boy, is that true.

But if a mind is a terrible thing to waste, so is a whole person, so is a little baby, a defenseless, tiny member of the human family in his or her mother's womb.

You know, the Hyde amendment is an effort, a partial effort, to protect human life at its most defenseless, vulnerable stage. That in the womb of the pregnant woman is not a tumor; it is not a diseased appendix; it is not an abscessed tooth; it is a tiny, growing, burgeoning member of the human family.

Abortion kills that tiny member of the human family.

If we eliminate, as President Clinton has said he is going to do and as the so-called pro-choice people want to do—eliminate the Hyde amendment—then every American who pays taxes will become an accessory, an accessory to the extermination of an innocent human life. And that is terribly, terribly wrong.

So that I hope and pray that enough people will stand tall in defense of the defenseless, voiceless, unable-to-vote, unable-to-escape unborn in the mother's womb.

You know, a pregnant woman should be the natural protector of her child. When that pregnant woman, through whatever reason, becomes the adversary of that child and wants to exterminate that child, then the law should step in and say that the first duty of the law is to protect human life.

Our Founding Fathers in our Nation's birth certificate said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," meaning all members of the human family, "and are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights, among which are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

So, the first inalienable right, which is an endowment from the Creator, is the right to life.

And so we who defend the unborn are in the mainstream of American history; we are standing with our Founding Fathers and our Framers to defend the right to life as an endowment from the Creator.

That is why no Congress, no Supreme Court, no jury can divest an existing member of the human family of that right to life.

Oh, you have the power to kill it, to exterminate it—they talk about terminating a pregnancy; well, every pregnancy terminates at the end of 9 months. You want to exterminate a member of the human family because that tiny member is inconvenient, unwanted.

We, the living, can determine who shall live. What a tragic thing.

Well, I just salute my friends for standing on behalf of what is becoming an unpopular cause, the defense of the defenseless. But I say that you have never done a better day's work in your life; you have never taken a better stand than when you defend the tiny unborn.

"Whatsoever you do to the least of these, my brethren, you do unto me," was said by a very great man, I believe the Son of God. And I am not ashamed to say that.

We are supposed to be made in His image and likeness. And to throw a member of the human family away because they are inconvenient, unwanted, or rejected or handicapped is a tragedy of immense proportions. When you kill a baby in the womb, you kill that baby's progeny; you kill grandchildren, great-grandchildren, on through history, one of whom might solve the riddle of cancer, multiple sclerosis, God knows what marvelous things are possible no matter how handicapped a person is.

A handicapped person, if they can get through birth, we can give them a place to park, a special place to park, but they have got to make it through birth first.

So I salute the gentleman from Indiana and our colleagues. I just came over to thank them, to stand with them proudly in defense of the unborn. I thank my friend from Indiana, one of the really great Members of this body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I want to thank my friend from Illinois. I just want to say that there is nobody who speaks more eloquently or more from the heart than HENRY HYDE from Illinois, and I am proud to be a colleague of his.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 25, FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WATT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, I also would like to rise today to speak against the Freedom of Choice Act, or H.R. 25. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] for organizing this special order.

I have to just respond away from the prepared text of my script for a moment to talk about some of the comments that were made just previous to me.

In another life before coming to Congress, I was a news reporter. The amazing contradictions that I saw during my stint as a news reporter, as it comes to abortion and life, I hope will cause many of our colleagues on the other side of the issue to stop and think.

A little over a year ago we had a young child who was still in the womb and whose mother was in a hospital in the Pittsburgh area. It was determined that that child, while still in the womb, had some heart problems, yet birth was induced. The child was brought out of the womb and a heart transplant was undertaken to save the child's life. Yet there are many among us who would say that the great efforts made to save that child's life—by the way, the child ended up dying—the effort was for nought, there were many who instead of trying to save the child's life would have allowed that child to be aborted.

There is a distinguishable difference between those of us who stand for prolife and those who are in favor of choice, and that is that we believe this is a life. We believe that it has a right to live.

I sometimes feel like an outsider in my own party, Mr. Speaker, because my party is one that is supposed to stand up for those who cannot stand up and defend themselves; yet on this one issue we do not do that.

I have also been at the scene as a reporter an inordinate number of times when young women, even though they were allowed to get abortions, would be frightened after giving birth and would take the life of their own child. They did so in panic. They did so because they were scared.

I have a hard time envisioning the difference between killing a child right after birth and just before birth. I do not understand the difference. I think as a nation we have not answered that question.

The Freedom of Choice Act has led thousands of my constituents from southwestern Pennsylvania to write and to call my office and to voice their concerns about this bill. They are concerned with the eradication of Pennsylvania's abortion law. They are concerned with Federal funding for abortion, and they are concerned about children receiving abortions without their parents ever having known, and I share these concerns.

I do not think the Freedom of Choice Act is a good bill. It is designed to undermine laws that States like Pennsylvania have approved. If the Freedom of Choice Act were to pass, it would nullify Pennsylvania's restrictions regarding a 24-hour waiting period, parental consent, and the limitations on abortions in the 7th, 8th, and 9th month of pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other reasons that I oppose this, without getting into a long dialog. I will say this is an issue that I stand in very firm disagreement with many people on my side of the aisle. I look forward to having the kind of dialog that we can achieve something, and not the kind of dialog which can cause the divisiveness this has caused, not only in this Congress but our Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCHUGH) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, on April 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 30 minutes, on April 21.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KLINK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. CANADY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes, on April 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCHUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HENRY.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GILLMOR in two instances.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. RIDGE.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. KOLBE.
Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
Mr. FISH.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MANN.
Ms. NORTON.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. LIPINSKI in six instances.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. GLICKMAN.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. SARPALIUS.
Mr. FAZIO.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. STARK in five instances.
Mr. OLVER.
Mr. TRAFICANT in five instances.
Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. DEUTSCH.
Mr. STENHOLM.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. DURBIN.
Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
Mr. KOPETSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CANADY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLF.
Mr. MEEK in two instances.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. DARDEN.
Mr. MCKEON.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the

Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 17-24, 1994, as "Nancy Moore Thurmond National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1993, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1047. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Financial Management), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate for the quarter October 1 1992, through December 31, 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-165, section 9008 (103 Stat. 1130); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1048. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 103-66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Fiscal Year 1994 Base Structure Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 115; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1050. A letter from the Interim CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on the Affordable Housing Disposition Program, pursuant to Public Law 102-233, section 616 (105 Stat. 1787); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1051. A letter from the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities' 17th annual report on the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 959(c); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1052. A letter from the U.S. Court of Appeals, transmitting a recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., and Citizens for a Better Environment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 581 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1053. A letter from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting activities and expenditures of the Independent Television Service, pursuant to Public Law 100-626, section 8 (102 Stat. 3211); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1054. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's 77th annual report covering its accomplishments during the fiscal year ended September 30, 1991, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 46(f); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1055. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1056. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his actions in support of the United Nations efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina (H. Doc. No. 103-67); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1057. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of S. 284, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1058. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election 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; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1059. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1060. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 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.

1061. A letter from the President, National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for Fiscal Year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1062. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Security Council, 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.

1063. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1064. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the 1992 annual report of the activities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Rehabilitation Annual Report, fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1065. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his intent to designate Ecuador as a beneficiary of the trade-liberalizing measures provided for in the Andean Trade Preference Act, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3202 (H. Doc. No. 103-68); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1066. A letter from the Inspector General, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a copy of the Endowment's Internal Audit Report No. I-A-93-2; a report on the results of his review of its consulting services activities during fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations.

1067. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report the conduct of the National Security Education Program; jointly, to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Education and Labor.

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. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 38. A bill to establish the Jemez National Recreation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 63. A bill to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 328. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, NM (Rept. 103-60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. EMERSON):

H.R. 1722. A bill making appropriations to begin a phase-in toward full funding of the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children [WIC] and of Head Start Programs, and to expand the Job Corps Program for the year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 1723. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas:

H.R. 1724. A bill to modify the boundaries of Carlsbad Caverns National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BACHUS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. EWING, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BLUTE, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KING, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. BROWDER):

H.R. 1725. A bill to limit excessive compensation and bonuses paid by the Resolution Trust Corporation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BACHUS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. BEVILL):

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Internal Revenue Service to pay interest on late re-

funds of certain required payments made by entities electing not to have a required taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1727. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. COYNE:

H.R. 1728. A bill to revive the suspension of duty on 1,5-naphthalene diisocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FOWLER:

H.R. 1729. A bill to permit refund of customs duties on certain drawback entries upon presentation of certificates of delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow claims against the United States under that chapter for damages arising from certain negligent medical care provided members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Lanham Act to require certain disclosures relating to materially altered films; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States, under the program of aid to families with dependent children, to disregard from the income of certain stepparents an amount equal to the State's standard of need for the stepparent's new family; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 1733. A bill to amend title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to reserve amounts made available to participating jurisdictions under subtitle A of such title to provide smoke detectors and other fire safety devices in single room occupancy housing that qualifies as affordable rental housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1734. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of nonsporting handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional penalties for drive by shootings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTTO:

H.R. 1736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain deductions of members of the National Guard or reserve units of the Armed Forces will be allowable in computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 1737. A bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, delivery, or importation of school buses that do not have seat belts, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Ms. DANNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CANADY, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 1738. A bill to authorize the establishment of a fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens promotion and consumer information program for the benefit of the floricultural industry and others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 1739. A bill to provide for a feasibility study of including Revere Beach in the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY:

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to prohibit the use of solid waste as fuel for any incinerator being used for the destruction of polychlorinated biphenyls or other hazardous substances and to require the Environmental Protection Agency to review and research methods of disposal and storage of polychlorinated biphenyls; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1741. A bill to extend until January 1, 1998, the previously existing suspension of duty on crude feathers and down; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1742. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for advances to the unemployment trust fund for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend the Educational Organizational Act to establish an Office of Women's Equity and to amend part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to encourage gender equity throughout the education system in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 1744. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to make loans to assist units of local government acquire and maintain equipment for use in the enforcement of alcohol-related traffic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself and Mr. VOLKMER):

H.R. 1745. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1996, the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 1746. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2,3,6-Trimethylphenol [TMP]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for rollover of gain from sale of farm assets into an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1748. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain plastic flat goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LAROCCO, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1749. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to increase the ability of State and local governments to protect and enhance open spaces, enhance the capability of State and local governments to provide recreational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HEFLEY):

H.R. 1750. A bill to make permanent the formula for determining fees for the grazing of livestock on public rangelands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 1751. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the existing suspension of duty on graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution designating June 7, 1993, through June 14, 1993, as "National Flag Celebration Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

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

82. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to providing disaster relief to farmers for losses due to recent severe freezing weather in Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

83. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to the Naval Air Station Guam (Brewer Field); to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Mississippi, relative to Federal banking laws and regulations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

85. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to enacting District of Columbia tax policies unfavorable to the Commonwealth; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

86. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Vir-

ginia, relative to the extension of Amtrak rail services to Roanoke; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

87. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the drug RU 486; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

88. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the restoration of the exemption of local governments from demonstrating financial assurance regarding solid waste landfills; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

89. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to reviewing the current Medicaid income eligibility requirements to address the unique drug treatment needs of schizophrenics and other victims of mental illness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

90. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to providing the necessary funding for the implementation of a service which Congress mandates a State, county, municipality, or other political subdivision to provide and to relieve and exempt a State, county, municipality, or other political subdivision from all enforcement obligations or duties in such situations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

91. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to urging the Congress not imposing mandates upon the States and local units of government therein without providing full funding for such mandates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

92. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to ocean dumping; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

93. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the need for dredging anchorages in Hampton Roads; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

94. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the Haysi Dam in Dickenson County; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

95. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama, relative to higher energy taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HYDE introduced a bill (H.R. 1752) for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Earnest Sands (Ret.) and Roger Sands; 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: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 18: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KREIDLER, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 19: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 21: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 28: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 34: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 39: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BYRNE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. REED, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 88: Mr. COX.

H.R. 112: Mr. EVERETT and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 115: Mr. PARKER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 127: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 144: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 146: Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 163: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 171: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 212: Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 214: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. STUMP, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. COX, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 302: Mr. QUINN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 304: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 369: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 406: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 439: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 441: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 476: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 501: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GENE GREEN, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 502: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 513: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 518: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 544: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 549: Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 553: Mr. GALLEGLY and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 591: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 624: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MEEK, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 647: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 649: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 651: Mr. FROST, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 652: Mr. FROST, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 653: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 656: Mr. PORTER and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 667: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 703: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 726: Ms. MALONEY.

H.R. 746: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 749: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 767: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 772: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 773: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 784: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 790: Ms. FURSE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 795: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 799: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 833: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 857: Mr. COX.

H.R. 864: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 882: Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 894: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 896: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 903: Mr. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 911: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 922: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 924: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 929: Mr. PORTER, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 930: Mr. TUCKER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SABO, Mr. MINGE, Ms. MEEK, Mr. WYNN, Ms. THURMAN, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 934: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 977: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 978: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1004: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1006: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1008: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1036: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 1055: Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1080: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. FOWLER.

H.R. 1090: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1116: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1122: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1126: Mr. BUYER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1127: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1128: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1129: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. LINDER and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1131: Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 1141: Mr. PARKER and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1146: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1148: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PARKER, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1167: Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 1168: Mr. MCCANDLESS and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1171: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1188: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1209: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 1255: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1257: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1260: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1279: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MICA, Ms. MEEK, Mr. FROST, Mr. KYL, and Ms. LOWEY.

H.R. 1322: Mr. TANNER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. WISE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1324: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1330: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. HERGER, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1332: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1394: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1421: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1431: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KING, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 1438: Mr. FROST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KYL, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 1455: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1460: Mr. CRAPO and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 1517: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1552: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1563: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1565: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1573: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1583: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1598: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1600: Mr. FROST, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1670: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1712: Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. KING.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. REGULA.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. BORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MANN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. CARR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. COX.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. PARKER, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SWETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FISH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARR, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLEMAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DANNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCHALE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MANTON, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NATCHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. ROSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAW, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WATT, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WYNN.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. KOPETSKI, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 162: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FROST, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. COYNE.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. GRAMS, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WATT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BARLOW, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KLEIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. DREIER.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 35: Mr. DORNAN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 40: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Res. 53: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Res. 105: Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 135: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OXLEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

26. By the Speaker: Petition of the Prince George's County Government, Maryland, relative to the President's Economic Stimulus, Deficit Reduction, and Investment Plan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. Also, petition of city of Springfield, MI, relative to the possible closure of governmental facilities in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. Also, petition of the Department of Health and Human Resources, West Virginia, relative to the budget proposal that would reduce Federal reimbursement in the overall State Medicaid administrative costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

29. Also, petition of the American Bar Association, relative to support of H.R. 1328 and S. 564; to the Committee on House Administration.

30. Also, petition of the Lenoir County Board of Commissioners of Kinston, NC, relative to opposition of a cigarette tax increase; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—*Tuesday, April 20, 1993*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 19, 1993)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable PATTY MURRAY, a Senator from the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by guest chaplain the Reverend Dr. Charles G. Hankins from the United Methodist Church, Red Bank, NJ.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Charles G. Hankins, the United Methodist Church, Red Bank, NJ, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty God, grant that Your power, compassionate love and passion for justice for all of humanity pervades the hearts and minds of the men and women of the U.S. Senate. Guide them as they frame legislation that benefits the citizens of all the States represented in this body. Govern their thoughts as they guide our Nation in the area of foreign affairs to allow our leadership in the world to be an example for the new and growing nations.

We humbly ask You, O Lord, to give all of us the wisdom to make right decisions in crucial matters. Give all of the Senate the courage to carry out constitutional mandates. Give to all of this elected body the patience in times of frustration and confrontation over major issues of the day. May each Senator use his power correctly; may the respect they have for one another allow them to differ for the sake of the Nation. Help them understand the gratitude that is felt by this Nation for the work that is accomplished, and to sense Your hand at work in all their deliberations. Give all of this body the proper means and methods to serve those who are in need of help with joy and gladness.

Finally, O Lord, help us all, as citizen-servants, blend our desire to serve this great Nation with a sense of the destiny in which we are involved with You. Grant us Your grace, peace, and love of justice for all. We pray this prayer in Your holy name. 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, April 20, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PATTY MURRAY, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. MURRAY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

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 11:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, and Members of the Senate, pursuant to an order entered following the unanimous-consent request yesterday, the Senate will be in morning business until 11:30 this morning, at which time the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations jobs bill. There will be at that time an opportunity for Senators BYRD and HATFIELD to offer amendments on behalf of themselves and the respective leaders. It is not required that amendments be offered, but that opportunity will exist.

There will then be a period of debate from the time the amendment or amendments are offered until 5 p.m. today, at which time the Senate will vote first on or in relation to the Hatfield amendment, if offered, and then on or in relation to the Byrd amendment.

From 12:30 until 2:30 today, the Senate will stand in recess to accommodate the respective conference luncheons and the Holocaust memorial service, which will occur in the Capitol during that time.

Further under the order, a cloture vote on the bill, as amended, if it is amended, will occur tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., with the mandatory live quorum being waived.

So Senators should be aware that one and possibly two rollcall votes will occur commencing at 5 p.m. today and a rollcall vote will occur at 10 a.m. tomorrow, unless otherwise changed by order of the Senate.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

TRAGEDY FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, a great tragedy occurred yesterday afternoon. The Governor of my State, George Mickelson, died in a plane crash, along with everyone else in the plane. George Mickelson was a great Governor of our State. This morning our Lieutenant Governor, Walter Dale Miller, is being sworn in as Governor of South Dakota. I have sent him a message wishing him well and saying that he is my Governor and our Governor. I look forward to working with him.

The Governor and a group of our leading businessmen were flying home from Ohio where they had gone to fight to preserve jobs in South Dakota and in America. One of our large meatpacking plants in Sioux Falls, John Morrell & Co., was threatened with closure. The Governor flew to meet with the owners of the plant. When returning home, one of the plane's engines apparently failed, somewhere over Iowa, and, for some reason, perhaps a storm, it crashed, killing everybody aboard.

I would like to pay tribute, first of all, to the late Gov. George Mickelson. I knew him since our days together at the University of South Dakota. He led our State in economic development. Our State has had enormous economic growth under him. He was in his second term. He was 52 years of age. I send my sincere sympathy to his wife, Linda, and their family. Governor Mickelson's father had been Governor of our State and he represented the best in our State.

Also killed in the plane crash was a dear friend of mine, Angus Anson, 38 years of age, general manager of Northern States Power in South Dakota. I

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

have known him and his family since the late 1950's. They operated the food concession at the South Dakota State Fair, where I took my livestock as a 4-H youth. I have known him all my life. He was a great public servant.

Also killed was David Birkeland, president and chief executive officer of First Bank of South Dakota and North Dakota, a leading businessman in our State who was 54 years of age. He was my banker, an official in all of my campaigns, and a dear friend. I send my deepest sympathy.

Also killed was Ron Reed, director of the State office of energy policy and, formerly, the commissioner of economic development. In the last few years our State has had great economic development with the coming of Citibank and many other businesses. The selection of Sioux Falls as having the Nation's No. 1 business climate was in no small part due to Ron.

Roland Dolly, commissioner of the office of economic development, also was on the plane. I knew him when he worked in this Chamber for our former colleague, Senator Jim Abdnor. He returned to South Dakota to work on economic development.

There were others, Roger Hainje, director of the Sioux Falls Development Foundation. All of our congressional delegation worked closely with him on the Eros Data Center, the economic development of Sioux Falls, and other issues. The two pilots, Ron Becker and Dave Hansen, had been with the State for many years, and served as pilots for the previous Governor. They also held other positions in the State. I send my deepest sympathies to their families.

I do not know what more to say. You could not gather more talent in one airplane from our State. It is a great blow to our State. There is very little to say other than it is a great tragedy, an unexplained tragedy.

A wonderful editorial appeared in this morning's Sioux Falls Argus Leader written by Larry Fuller, which summarizes the careers of each of these men. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE MOURNS LOSS OF LEADERS

Today, South Dakotans are coming together, holding hands, sharing tears and trying to find some meaning behind the tragedy that has been unfolding since Monday evening.

We at the Argus Leader join in the sorrow of this incredible loss, remembering Gov. George Mickelson and the seven others who died in the airplane crash near Dubuque, Iowa.

We, like the rest of the state, still are shaken. The news planning meeting for today's edition began with a prayer. Many reporters in the news room produced this newspaper with reddened eyes.

With the immediacy of the loss still burdening our hearts, we'll save the formal tributes for later. We'd like to offer today a few informal remembrances for some important friends of our South Dakota family.

George Mickelson was an incredible personality, a man who at age 52 always seemed to have a reservoir of energy and compassion. He was the kind of governor who was in the middle of everything. He was not easily daunted—not by snowmobiles and fences in the middle of winter and not, at the end, by the possibility of the closing of the John Morrell & Co. meatpacking plant, the state's largest employer.

The governor was an imposing presence at 6 feet 4 inches and, in his words, "about an eighth of a ton." George loved politics and the political process. He was a genuine good guy who never held a grudge. In return, he also was a man who people said good things about even during the heat of political passion.

We fondly remember his commanding presence and leadership that emerged when he was speaker of the South Dakota House in the late '70s. Few political candidates ever worked harder at a campaign than did George during his first run for governor in 1986.

That exuberance, energy and commitment to serve and that unyielding love for South Dakota and for his family have been the hallmarks of Gov. George Speaker Mickelson.

David Birkeland, or "Birkie," will certainly go down as one of the few individuals who have done the most during the last century to make Sioux Falls a better place. He was the guy who got things done, whether in community volunteer leadership or in overseeing South Dakota and North Dakota operations for First Bank. Forward Sioux Falls, one of the nation's leading economic development initiatives, would never have happened without Birkeland.

Birkeland had a passion for action and wore his badge of urgency with pride. But he also had a quick sense of humor that paved the way to results. He was the volunteer and the business leader ready to call for the decision and willing to work as hard himself as he asked of others. He cared about people and especially his family. * * *

Roger Hainje was untiring in selling Sioux Falls. That was his job as president of Forward Sioux Falls and the Sioux Falls Development Foundation. He was always sincere about it, whether appearing on national television after we won the "most livable city" honors last summer or in convincing an industrial prospect to locate here.

Using the qualities of sincerity and honesty, he helped Sioux Falls become one of the fastest growing communities in the Midwest. He, too, had a quick sense of humor and a refreshing perspective on life.

Angus Anson brought a human touch to his job heading local operations at Northern States Power Co. We were impressed by his commitment to customers and by his expanding volunteer leadership roles in Sioux Falls and in the state.

Anson was excited about everything we saw him encounter, and we don't recall ever seeing him without a smile.

Rolly Dolly brought to his job as head of the Governor's Office of Economic Development a focus and a strategy to help bring more employers to the state. He spent a lot of time in governmental offices in Washington, but he was never happier than when back home working for the state. We admired his eagerness in making plans for bringing Canadian business to the state.

Ron Reed served the state well in two jobs in Pierre, but we remember him best for his work in putting Brookings on the economic development map during his time with the chamber and economic development organizations there. Communities like Brookings don't become viable by accident. There's usually someone behind it all, like Reed.

Pilots Ron Becker and Dave Hansen of Pierre, didn't share the high profile. Today we join with the rest of the state in extending our sympathies to their families.

Life will go on, but those in South Dakota will not forget the eight men who died in the crash Monday. We will miss them all, and we will be grateful for their having made a real difference in our lives.—LARRY FULLER.

Mr. PRESSLER. In conclusion, Madam President, I wish well the State's 29th Governor, Walter Dale Miller, who has served as Lieutenant Governor. He is an outstanding individual. I spoke to him on the phone this morning.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader containing a summary of our new Governor's biographical background.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLER BECOMES STATE'S 29TH GOVERNOR

(By David Kranz)

PIERRE—Lt. Gov. Walter Dale Miller will be sworn in as South Dakota's 29th governor today.

Robert Miller, chief justice of the state Supreme Court, said there was no urgency to swear the lieutenant governor in Monday, in the aftermath of the death of Gov. George Mickelson.

"There are automatic powers for the lieutenant governor to act in the absence of the governor. There are just too many things going on today," Justice Miller said.

The constitution allows Miller to serve the remaining 20 months of Mickelson's term, said Dr. John Hendrickson, retired professor of political science at South Dakota State University in Brookings.

Hendrickson said Miller can nominate a person for lieutenant governor, but appointment must be approved by a majority of the South Dakota House of Representatives and Senate.

Until that time, Steve Cutler, the Republican speaker of the House from Claremont, is next in succession after Miller.

Hendrickson said Mickelson was the first of the state's 28 governors to die in office. Gov. Richard Kneip left office to become ambassador to Singapore in 1978. Lt. Gov. Harvey Wollman succeeded him.

Those who knew Mickelson said it is difficult to consider the future while the hurt of the governor's loss is so fresh in their memory.

But they acknowledge that Mickelson left a legacy that provides a foundation of strength for the people of the state.

Lionel Bordeaux, president of Sinte Gleske University in Mission, called Mickelson "a very strong and powerful governor."

He knew Mickelson as a governor who made a commitment to heal wounds between races.

"I know his desire to improve race relations. If there is something we can remember him by, it is a monument to his existence to continue those efforts. It is very tragic. The state will be a long time picking itself up, but the people are strong here. South Dakota has some strong cultures, Indian and non-In-

dian. They will pull together and continue to do what he wanted to achieve, and his memory will propel us to achieve those things."

Dr. William Farber, retired professor of political science at the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, said the issues Mickelson worked for will become a basis for future growth.

"He was such an active governor. When there was a problem like this, he personally would do something about it," Farber said. "You have to commend a man who would take the time, no matter what, to do the investigating and help in any way he could."

Bob Burns, professor of political science at SDSU, said that even those who differed with Mickelson saw him as bringing a tremendous amount of energy and dedication to South Dakotans.

"I don't look for a lot of change, but I hope that Governor Miller could work to continue Mickelson's efforts in health care. I think that was his biggest disappointment, and I would hope Governor Miller could help propel that," Burns said.

Dona Brown of Huron, a long-time educator, called Mickelson courageous and dedicated.

"We find the deaths of our leaders an overwhelming loss. It will take time to get over the shock but when we do, our entire population will work together with our political leadership to assist Walter Dale Miller."

Two former governors found the loss difficult to accept.

"That is a horrible loss to the state, to the families, to the leadership and direction in this state," said former Gov. Frank Farrar, a Republican from Britton. "It will not be easy to recover from".

"I just hope we can do something for these families. We have to look at their needs now."

Wollman said the state needs to stand still for a moment.

"I think first we should just take some time and be patient. It is a very painful thing to lose people like that. You just take time to hurt and mourn. We can't do things in a hurry. There will be time to look ahead."

Wollman said that despite party differences, he and Mickelson had a good relationship.

"I remember at the governor's hunt, he told people from many states, 'I have the best job in the world and I get paid for it. I love to sell South Dakota.' There was a wonderful spirit about him. He was a great spokesman, and I think we can build on that."

To Wollman, the loss was personal.

"When I heard about it, I had thought for awhile and then I cried."

WALTER DALE MILLER

Birth date: Oct. 5, 1925.

Hometown: New Underwood.

Education: New Underwood High School; attended South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City.

Family: Three daughters: Nancy Burma, Karey Albers and Renee Johansen; one son, Walter R. Miller. His wife, Mary, preceded him in death.

Career: Lieutenant governor of South Dakota since 1986; rancher near New Underwood; businessman; member of House of Representatives, 1966–1970, 1972–1980, 1982–1984.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader containing a summary of the outstanding career of the late Gov. George Mickelson of our State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE T. MICKELSON

(By Kevin Woster)

From the beginning, it seemed almost preordained that George Speaker Mickelson would be governor.

Born into a family that thrived on politics and cherished public service, he came first to the South Dakota Capitol in 1947. He was the only son of the new Republican Gov. George T. Mickelson, 5 years old and already growing into the towering man he would become.

There was never any doubt that this boy would be a leader, his mother, Madge Mickelson, would say in a 1986 interview, just days after her son achieved his political destiny by winning the governor's race.

She believed that politics would neither turn his head nor change his innate commitment to the people of his state.

"I don't think you could spoil Speaker," she said. "He's always thinking of the other fellow."

George Mickelson was thinking of others when he died. He was on his way back, with members of his staff and Sioux Falls economic development leaders, from meetings in Ohio intended to help the troubled John Morrell & Co. plant.

Mickelson worked at the plant as a young man and knew how important it was to the state's largest city.

The man who lost to Mickelson in 1986 and saw his dream of following his own father into the governor's chair fade into election night defeat, wasn't surprised that Mickelson was working on economic development during his last hours on earth.

"I'm not surprised. That's what I'd expect him to be doing," said Democratic state Sen. Lars Herseth, a farmer, rancher and businessman from Houghton. "I think the main thing that got him where he was was economic development."

Herseth, whose father, Ralph, was governor from 1959 to 1963, and Mickelson both came to the South Dakota House in 1974. While Mickelson rose to positions of power, including his namesake role as speaker, Herseth became leader of the Democrats.

The 1986 election was a culmination of political and philosophical battles that were always pointed, but never nasty.

"He was a good adversary. I think it seemed inevitable at times that our lives would be intertwined—both of us with fathers who were governors, both of us spending time in Pierre," Herseth said. "We were adversaries, but I think we were friends. We had respect for each other. And agree with him or not, you couldn't question his motives. He always had the best interests of this state at heart."

Mickelson carried his father's deep commitment to South Dakota and its people into a difficult job. But there were clear differences in style.

Like his dad, remembered by many as a hard-nosed politician who shrugged off criticism and sometimes overpowered political opponents, George S. Mickelson also could lean on those who opposed him.

And at a shade over 6-foot-4 and 250 pounds, this governor cast a big shadow. When asked his weight, he preferred "about an eighth of a ton" to actual numbers.

But he didn't like power politics, preferring whenever possible to build consensus, to end each conflict in a handshake. More than any governor, perhaps, in recent times, he looked for answers and solutions not just from his staff and political allies, but also from the people of the state.

Mickelson took Cabinet members and other government leaders on regular journeys across the state in a get-to-know-government event called capital for a day. He held town meetings and used those responses to help shape legislation on prominent issues such as water development and taxes.

One of his best known accomplishments also was one of his most controversial. After campaigning against new taxes in 1986, Mickelson's first major initiative in 1987 was a temporary penny increase in the state sales tax to create a low-interest loan fund to spur industrial development.

Some Democratic legislators still question the way the loans are handled, but Republicans consider it one of their governor's daring and productive ventures.

"That was a brave move, a severe move, maybe, but a brave move," said Mitchell businessman George Shanard, former Republican leader in the South Dakota Senate. "I think that symbolized his total insistence that South Dakota address economic development. I admire anyone who has guts. And he had guts."

Economic development brought Mickelson into a seemingly strange partnership with Sen. Tom Daschle, D–S.D. Daschle won his Senate seat the year Mickelson beat Herseth. And despite their political differences, Daschle said he and Mickelson had a close relationship during their first few years in office.

Although the relationship soured during Mickelson's 1990 race against Democratic challenger Bob Samuelson of Faith, Daschle remembers the cooperative times with the Republican governor as "an example of the way government should be."

"We decided to put politics aside and worked very closely during that period," Daschle said. "We talked to each other at home at night and had dinner together from time to time. This is a tremendous loss. I'm stunned."

When asked about his accomplishments, Mickelson pointed to economic development, record increases in state school aid and an economy that held steady and even improved during the national recession.

He was disappointed that teachers' pay still ranked at the bottom nationally and was criticized for a series of tax study commissions that did little to improve South Dakota's tax structure.

Improving race relations was another Mickelson goal, and one that began with his father, who expressed frustration to his son that he couldn't help bring Indians and non-Indians closer together.

In typically bold style, Mickelson accepted a challenge by American Indian publisher Tim Giago and declared a Year of Reconciliation between Indians and non-Indians in 1990. He followed by extending the reconciliation into the next century, and made an emotional stop at Wounded Knee for the 100th anniversary of the massacre of Indian men, women and children by military troops.

Although it sometimes appeared that reconciliation meant more conflict than cooperation, Mickelson said that was to be expected, because emotional and divisive issues were being addressed. And at his passing, he was praised even by tribal leaders who had battled him over issues like jurisdiction and gambling.

"I was tremendously supportive of the governor's Year of Reconciliation," said Gregg

Bourland, chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. "This is extremely tragic. I was very encouraged over the last few months with negotiations with the state. I think this comes as a blow to us."

That blow will be felt through the entire state, Shanard said, as the grief and loss extends into all the towns and rural townships where Mickelson traveled to talk, and most importantly, to listen.

"I feel greatest sympathy for his family, of course, this is such a terrible loss," he said. "But the governor had 700,000 family members, really, everyone in this state. They'll all be grieving today."

Mr. PRESSLER. I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam 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.

THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I rise to share a communication with my colleagues concerning the issue before this body, the stimulus package as proposed by our President which would add some $16 billion to the national debt.

I think there is a general understanding prevailing among the public on the issue of additional spending and whether this body has given appropriate attention to reducing spending. Clearly, in the mind of the Senator from Alaska, the emphasis has not been adequate in addressing spending cuts. The fact remains that this measure would add $16 billion in emergency supplemental spending for the purpose of creating jobs. But when one takes the time to look closely at the proposal, one quickly comes to the conclusion that many of these jobs are summer jobs, that many of these jobs have a very short duration and really are not the type of full-time jobs we are looking for that would stimulate the economy.

The specific matter that I think should be addressed here is the manner in which the administration has encouraged the members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors to voice their support for this measure, and how one mayor responded to that encouragement.

I refer to a letter from the mayor of one of Alaska's larger cities, Madam President.

I will briefly refer to the letter addressed to myself, the senior Senator from Alaska, and Alaska's Representative in the other body. It reads as follows:

As a member of the United States Conference of Mayors, I have been under constant pressure to bombard you people in favor of the Clinton economic stimulus program. I have responded to the administration that I had no intention of putting pressure on the three Members of the Alaska congressional delegation to support his program.

The note that I received yesterday was to put pressure individually upon the senior Senator and myself to see that there is not a filibuster in the Senate.

The next paragraph reads:

If some kind of stimulus program is passed, I certainly intend to seek our share. However, as you can probably guess, if a stimulus program is going to cost more in taxes, then I am opposed to a stimulus program. Needless to say, I very much am opposed to a proposal that would add to the national debt.

The point is an obvious one, Madam President; the prevailing attitude is that this is a spending program that will either increase taxes or add to the debt, but if it is passed everybody wants into it. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has taken it on as a major issue to encourage lobbying of members who might support it because many mayors just want the money. But the fact is that this proposal adds to the debt and will not create real jobs. We need to cut this proposal back and we need to pay for it without raising taxes.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Alaska withhold that request.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GRAMM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas to speak under the previous order up until the time of 11:30.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, we have talked for a long time about this so-called stimulus package. I would like this morning to go back and outline how we came to be here, and I would like to begin in 1990 because I think often the Congress has a very short memory about commitments it makes to the American people. In 1990, the Congress of the United States adopted a budget package that raised taxes on the American people by some $160 billion, and in turn promised the American people that we would limit the growth of Federal spending for 5 years. That spending limit became the law of the land.

There is a spending cap for this year that is currently law. The only way we can consider, without violating that law, this spending bill is to designate it as an emergency because with that designation, it does not count as spending and it does not count as deficit. The so-called stimulus package before us violates a solemn commitment that we wrote into the law of the land in 1990 when Congress took $160 billion from the American public in new taxes and promised in return to control spending. This bill violates the commitment we made.

Second, for 3 months, the President has said over and over and over again: Raise taxes on income, raise taxes on small business, raise taxes on family farms, because that is what the marginal tax rate increase does, raise taxes on Social Security, impose an energy tax on every family in America, raise taxes to lower the deficit to help the economy. That has been the rallying cry for 3 months.

Madam President, there has been a big gulf between that rallying cry and the budget because, as we all know, if you look at the President's budget, it raises taxes by $3.23 for every $1 of spending cuts, when the President had initially promised $3 in spending cuts for every $1 of taxes. Seventy-five percent of his budget is taxes and the deficit 5 years from now is still over $200 billion, and 10 years from now it is over $400 billion. So over a decade, under the President's plan with all the taxes, deficits go up and not down.

But the rhetoric has always been raise taxes to lower the deficit to help the economy.

When we adopted the President's budget at about 11 o'clock in the morning, by 2 that afternoon the rhetoric had completely changed. The rhetoric by afternoon when we took up this so-called stimulus package was raise the deficit to raise spending to help the economy. And the American people started to figure out what the end game was. The end game was to raise taxes to raise spending so Government could get bigger so that Government could spend more of the money earned by the hard-working men and women of America. That is what this debate is about.

What is the issue here?

The President tells us that, if we would just raise the deficit by another $16 billion and let him spend this money, everything would be great, we would create all these jobs. Just by raising deficits we could create jobs. That is the argument of this bill. Spend this money; and create jobs.

Madam President, when we have a $300 billion deficit this year, why have we not already created all these jobs? If deficit spending creates jobs, why with $300 billion worth of deficit spending have we not reached economic heaven? We have not reached economic heaven because we have to borrow that money, and the money we borrow is being taken away from people who would have invested it to build new homes, new farms, and new factories to

generate new economic growth in America. If deficit spending really worked, we would already have prosperity.

What is the issue? The issue is the deficit and the issue is new spending. The position of the Republican Party or the Republican Members of the Senate on this issue is very clear. We have already decided on extending unemployment benefits. That is not at issue here. Our position is this: No net new spending, period. No net new spending. If we want to reorder priorities, if we want to take money away from low-priority programs—and we certainly have a lot of them we are funding in the Federal Government—to fund the higher priority programs, pay for it by cutting another program.

We have said to the President repeatedly—as he has used children trying to find Easter eggs as a backdrop to criticize Republican Members of the Senate—that we are willing to look at programs he is willing to pay for by cutting programs that are of a lower priority. But on that issue there will be no compromise: No net new spending, no new deficits. If the President wants to pay for these programs by cutting lower priority programs, we have the basis of working out an agreement and ending this debate. But if the whole debate here is about new spending and new deficits, that is not going to happen, and that is what the whole issue is about.

So I hope that we can reach a conclusion that the American people do not want to raise the deficit. And the American people must be amazed that we cannot seem to understand that. What part of "no" on deficit spending do we not understand? The American people do not want net new Government spending. But they are on the way to getting a lot of it and they are realizing it, and they are realizing that there has been a gulf between the rhetoric and the reality in this whole debate on the budget and on the stimulus package, and when they finally look at the fine print, when they finally find out what the budget contains, $3.23 in taxes for every $1 of spending cuts—new taxes not on rich people, but on small businesses, family farms, medium-income families, and people on Social Security earning $25,000 a year—the American people are going to be outraged when they find out that we taxed everybody saying we were lowering the deficit and we were not, and now we say let us raise the deficit to spend money to help the economy.

I think the President has shifted direction a little bit too rapidly for the American people. I am hopeful that we will reject this stimulus package and that we will stimulate the economy the old fashioned way, by dealing with the deficit, by freeing capital for private use, by promoting free enterprise, by trying to generate permanent, productive, taxpaying jobs in the private sector of the economy. That is what this debate is all about.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I would like, if I might, to make a few comments on the bill in response to the comments made by my friend and distinguished colleague from Texas.

First, the American people should know that the President's budget provides for net reductions in expenditures of more than $200 billion in four major areas: Less defense spending, less spending in mandatory programs, less spending in discretionary programs, and as a result of the reduction in the deficit, less spending on debt service.

He does provide for some additional investments in areas that are important, but the net effect of the President's budget is a reduction in spending over 5 years of more than $200 billion. Every single Republican Senator voted against the President's deficit reduction package. They would not vote for the spending cuts that President Clinton proposed. Now having voted against the spending cuts in the President's budget, as contained in the resolution that the Senate approved 2 weeks ago, they now oppose this jobs bill on the grounds that it does not reduce the deficit.

I repeat: The President's budget calls for reductions in spending, some increases in spending including this jobs bill, the net of which is more than a $200 billion reduction. That is the first point.

The second point: 10 years ago last month, when Ronald Reagan was President, this Senate voted on a economic stimulus bill which is strikingly similar to the bill now pending. And most of the Republican Senators now complaining about President Clinton's bill voted for that bill when Ronald Reagan was President. If it is such a bad idea now that Bill Clinton is President, why did they all vote for it when Ronald Reagan was President? The answer is obvious. It is sure politics, an effort to embarrass the President, an effort to defeat the President's program. What is at risk is not the politics of the Presidency but the American economy. That is what is at risk here.

The question before us is: Are we going to improve a bill that will encourage the creation of jobs that will deal with the problems in the American cities in this potentially explosive summer, with millions and millions of unemployed youth facing the prospect of not having summer employment, to score political points for our colleagues? The very people who give the most speeches about the deficit here are the people who will not vote to cut spending, particularly spending that affects their States.

We have huge spending programs here that our colleagues consistently vote for, even as they make the speeches about the budget deficit—huge spending programs, tens of billions of dollars. We ought to ask ourselves what is at stake here. Is it worth scoring a few political points to risk the American economy? Is it worth scoring a few political points to risk the danger of an eruption in an American city this summer? I think not, and I hope my colleagues will join in supporting this bill, an important part of the President's program.

He has been President for less than 3 months. They do not want to give him a chance. That is what this is all about. This is an effort to embarrass President Clinton, to make him look bad in his first couple of months in office. I think we ought to rise above that, just as Democrats did, many of whom voted for President Reagan's economic stimulus program 10 years ago today. It was fine for Republican Senators then when there was a Republican President. Now the same Senators are against it when a Democratic President proposes it. I think that exposes the political nature of what is going on here.

I yield the floor.

TENNESSEE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WEEK

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, it gives me great pleasure at this time to request the unanimous consent of my colleagues to the insertion in the RECORD of a proclamation by the Governor of my State of Tennessee.

On March 12 of this year, my good friend, the Honorable Gov. Ned McWherter, signed the proclamation that the week of April 12–16, 1993 shall be known in Tennessee as "National Association of Retired Federal Employees Week." Our State's chapter of this national organization is very spirited and active, and does an excellent job of keeping me aware of matters of concern to its members. My own father was a Federal worker with the Soil Conservation Service in Tennessee, and I am keenly aware of the dedication to duty displayed by those Federal employees who are enjoying their retirement.

I am happy to note that on Friday, March 26, the Senate passed Joint Resolution 11, of which I was a proud cosponsor, designating May 3–9, 1993, as "Public Service Recognition Week." It is in that same spirit that I endorse Governor McWherter's comments in support of a similar tribute to our State's Federal employees, and ask that they be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF TENNESSEE—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the United States Civil Service Act of 1883 was signed into law by then President Chester A. Arthur, thereby creating the United States Civil Service System; and

Whereas, the United States Civil Service Retirement System was created in 1920 and signed into law by then President Woodrow Wilson; and

Whereas, virtually all state, county, and municipal civil service systems have developed from the United States Civil Service Act; and

Whereas, untold thousands of United States Civil Service employees have worked diligently, patriotically, silently and with little notice to uphold the highest traditions and ideas of our country; and

Whereas, thousands of federal employees are retired in Tennessee and continue to devote inestimable time and effort toward the betterment of our communities and state;

Now, therefore, I, Ned McWherter, as Governor of the state of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim the week of April 12-16, 1993, as "National Association of Retired Federal Employees Week" in Tennessee, and do urge all our citizens to join in this worthy observance.

IN RECOGNITION OF SISTER LUCILLE McKILLOP, PRESIDENT OF SALVE REGINA UNIVERSITY

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in recognizing Sister Lucille McKillop, a member of the Religious Sisters of Mercy who has served as president of Salve Regina University in Newport, RI, since 1973.

Sister Lucille came to Salve Regina at a troubled time in the university's 47-year history. Salve Regina faced extreme financial difficulties and dwindling enrollment. But Sister Lucille did not let these obstacles daunt her.

Under Sister Lucille's leadership, Salve Regina has undergone a remarkable transformation. The University's curriculum has expanded to include 6 undergraduate degrees in over 20 concentrations. Graduate programs were established, with advanced degrees offered in nine fields, including business, financial management, health services administration, and the administration of justice. Study abroad programs were created, allowing students to study in Europe and in Africa. Student enrollment has more than doubled, and the school has been recognized as one of the top 10 small comprehensive universities in the East.

But Sister Lucille's contributions, and those of Salve Regina students, go far beyond the university's gates. Sister Lucille serves on numerous boards including the board of directors of the Newport Music Festival and the advisory board of Dorcas Place, an adult literacy center in Providence. The University and its students have strong commitments to the city of Newport and its surrounding communities and have made a tremendous difference in the lives of the less fortunate by organizing food, clothing, and medical drives, and mentorship programs for local youth.

Sister Lucille is rather humble about her many accomplishments. She once said, "I have really not done all of these things. I am like a conductor. I am taking the bows, but the school is the orchestra. We are all making this music together." And what wonderful music it is for the Salve Regina faculty and students, the city of Newport and surrounding communities, and for our State of Rhode Island.

I wish Sister Lucille continued success in her presidency.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, as anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows, no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been approved here in Congress.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that Congress could and should have controlled Federal spending.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at $4,251,467,295,773.57 as of the close of business on Friday, April 16. Averaged out, this means that every man, woman, and child's share of this debt comes to $16,551.76 per person.

TRIBUTE TO AN INSPIRED AND INSPIRING WOMAN

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I rise today in honor of a brilliant leader and educator, Sister Lucille McKillop, who is celebrating her 20th anniversary as president of Salve Regina University, a beautiful Catholic institution resting on the shores of Newport, RI.

When Sister Lucille assumed the presidency in 1973, the campus of Salve Regina was suffering under severe financial difficulties and low morale. Under Sister Lucille's visionary leadership, the school shed its massive budget deficit, doubled the student population, increased faculty salaries, and expanded academic programs. The composition of the campus became coeducational, and the vision of the campus became global.

More important than her administrative abilities, Sister Lucille brought to Salve Regina the ability to inspire students to be their best, to strive beyond academic achievement, and to visualize a mission beyond the confines of the classroom. While motivating students to excel in every endeavor, she also instills in them a sense of compassion and human service. The students of Salve Regina gain many opportunities to serve at home in local social work agencies or abroad in Europe or Africa.

A sincerely humble leader, Sister Lucille attributes the success of the past 20 years to the students and faculty of Salve Regina. While I know she feels uncomfortable as the subject of acclamation, this tribute is well deserved and cannot fully describe the wealth of her accomplishments. I ask that my distinguished colleagues join me in saluting this remarkable woman who brings joy to the many lives she touches.

UNITED STATES SHOULD REASSERT CONSTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP ON LAW OF THE SEA

Mr. PELL. Madam President, during the 1970's the United States played a leading role in the international effort to establish a rule of law for the world's oceans and seabeds. Known as the law of the sea negotiations, these discussions involved more than 150 countries and were a truly remarkable effort to reconcile the interests and concerns of industrialized countries, private corporations, and the many less developed countries that have important ocean coastlines and adjacent seabeds.

I have long been an enthusiastic supporter of this effort. I believe the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea agreed to in 1982 was a remarkable document and a testimonial to the negotiating skill of the person who headed the U.S. team, former Ambassador and Cabinet member Elliot L. Richardson.

Mr. Richardson in association with Margaret Tomlinson, who with him chairs the Council on Ocean Law, published an article in the Boston Globe April 7 calling on the Clinton administration to pick up the ball that was dropped by the Reagan administration in the 1980's.

The situation is as follows: Fifty-five countries have ratified the convention, and 5 more ratifications will bring it into force. When that happens it will be more difficult to make changes in the text that would improve the document from the U.S. point of view.

U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali has scheduled talks in late April that provide a fresh opportunity for a new administration to reassert U.S. leadership on this important subject. The United States thus far has played only a limited role in U.N. talks, but even that participation has generated significant support for proposals that would help preserve U.S. interests.

I hope the Clinton administration will see the wisdom of a full and vigorous U.S. participation in the law of the sea talks when they resume at the end of this month.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the April 7 Boston Globe entitled "Remember the Law of the Sea? It's Time To Sign It" by Elliot Richardson and Margaret Tomlinson be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 7, 1993]

REMEMBER THE LAW OF THE SEA? IT'S TIME TO SIGN IT

(By Elliot L. Richardson and Margaret L. Tomlinson)

WASHINGTON.—The Clinton administration can still assert US leadership in establishing a constitution for almost three-quarters of the earth's surface—the world's oceans. But it must act quickly. In the 1970s the United States took a leading role in this unprecedented international effort. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea that emerged in 1982 satisfied our most essential negotiating objectives. The Reagan administration refused to sign it, objecting to its deep-seabed mining provisions.

Now, 11 years later, 55 of the 156 signatories have ratified the convention. Only five more ratifications will bring it into force, and that will greatly add to the difficulty of making changes in the text. With this in mind, former UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar three years ago began a series of informal talks aimed at modifying the seabed mining provisions so the agreement could become universal law. His successor, Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, has continued these talks; the next is scheduled for later April. The participants hope that the new administration will play a constructive role.

President Clinton has shown clear awareness of the relationship between the need to reduce Cold War strategic forces and the need to create mobile units capable of meeting new threats to peace. This significantly augments the importance of securing universal acceptance of principles guaranteeing unimpeded mobility for air and naval forces over, on and under the oceans.

Increasing pressures on oceanic resources are adding to the potential for conflict. The UN conference that produced the Law of the Sea Convention was an exercise in preemptive lawmaking—an effort to codify existing rules and create incentives for the observance of new ones, and so prevent the oceans from turning into a battleground. The United States succeeded in getting into the convention language safeguarding freedom of navigation and overflight, even though few other countries share our interest in maintaining this freedom. To the contrary, many give priority to territorial aspirations conflicting with it.

Although the United States could, of course, depend on military power to assure mobility, the countries most likely to challenge us are countries whose friendship we value. Our interests will be much better served, therefore, if, as a party to the convention, we can point to its universal applicability and, when necessary, invoke its dispute-settlement provisions.

A universally accepted regime of ocean law would contribute to other important US objectives as well. For example, it would protect the marine environment far more comprehensively than any other present or prospective international agreement, covering not only vessel-source pollution but pollution carried from land to the sea by rivers and air currents. In fact, the convention was the basis for the ocean-related proposals adopted at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro last June. The United States also needs the convention to underpin the management and conservation of fishery stocks inside our 200-mile zone and to establish the right of our scientific research vessels to operate in remote coastal waters.

Despite these gains for US interests, the convention's ideological opponents persuaded President Reagan not to sign it. Objecting as a matter of course to any supranational regulation even if ocean areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, the critics concentrated on the regulatory mechanisms that might someday interfere with the freedom of private enterprise to mine the ocean floor. Fifteen years ago, visions of endless wealth from seabed minerals danced in the heads of the developing countries. Since then the probability that metal prices will continue to be low for many years has indefinitely postponed the economic viability of seabed mining.

These were the developments that led Perez de Cuellar to propose reexamination of the seabed-mining issue. Although the United States has thus far played only a limited part in the UN talks, they have generated significant support for an approach that would preserve the equitable principles framing the seabed-mining regime while deferring its operational details.

As Adm. William L. Schachte, speaking for the Department of Defense, recently pointed out, the convention "could play a significant role in achieving US national security objectives and economic growth in the hears ahead."

"The US," he continued, "is uniquely positioned to assume a more visible leadership role in the ongoing UN effort to achieve a widely accepted international order to regulate and safeguard the many diverse activities and interests of nations regarding the world's oceans."

All countries would benefit from such in international order, especially our own. The Clinton administration can make it happen.

WASHINGTON POST'S DON OBERDORFER, DEAN OF DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENTS, TO RETIRE

Mr. PELL. Madam President, for 35 years, Don Oberdorfer has covered politics and foreign policy for the Washington Post.

Don Oberdorfer announced his retirement this week as diplomatic correspondent, a title he has held for 17 years. During that period, and through his entire career as a reporter, he has earned the highest reputation for accuracy, reliability, and thoroughness.

He has covered my work with the Foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate during my entire Washington career. I came to the Senate just a few years after Don Oberdorfer started with the Post. I consider him a friend, and more important, I recognized how that friendship never stood in the way of his objectivity. I have seen time and again how hard he has worked to get a story, and to get it right.

Although there has been no formal selection process as far as I know, Don Oberdorfer is widely acknowledged as the dean of diplomatic correspondents in Washington. His retirement will leave quite a gap, and I am glad to note that he will stay in this city as distinguished journalist in residence at the Johns Hopkins University Paul Nitze School of Advanced International Studies. I hope he will continue to write the kind of analytic articles we have come to expect from him and to produce other books in the distinguished pattern of "The Turn," his definitive study of the end of the cold war.

Don Oberdorfer wrote a typically thoughtful article as his valedictory in the Washington Post April 18, entitled "Lies and Videotape: Watching Journalism Change in an Age of Suspicion." It is a useful and cautionary account of the many ways the truth has been distorted in foreign policy over the years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Don Oberdorfer in the April 18 Washington Post "Outlook" section, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIES AND VIDEOTAPE: WATCHING JOURNALISM CHANGE IN AN AGE OF SUSPICION

(By Don Oberdorfer)

It seems surprising from today's perspective, but many of the leading lights of Washington journalism, veterans who had been through wars, political campaigns and much else in their careers, were indignant and almost incredulous that a spokesman of their own government would deliberately lie to them in an official report.

That was 1960, and when I look back on my time as a Washington reporter, I see that as the first big blow to the relationship between the government and the press. The news today would be greeted with a shrug; 33 years ago, there was shock when we learned that State Department spokesman Lincoln White had disseminated a "cover story" that was, in fact, a bald-faced lie. What White had been instructed by his bosses to describe as a "weather research plane" that unaccountably had drifted off course was, actually, Gary Powers's U-2 spy plane, shot down on a pre-planned mission over the Soviet Union.

Since then, we members of the Washington press corps have been lied to by people far more adept than the hapless and despairing Linc White. Under Presidents Johnson and Nixon in the late 1960's, there were bitter disputes over truth and falsehood in the Vietnam War. The Nixon White House lied repeatedly in its attempt to cover up the bungled Watergate break-in.

In the summer of 1986, when I was looking into rumors of undercover U.S. arms dealings with Iran, a National Security Council official told me flatly—I had my notebook out and tape recorder rolling—that no such thing was going on. Later I learned that, months before, he had been along on the secret U.S. mission to Tehran carrying a cake in the shape of a key and promises of U.S. weapons in return for the release of American hostages in Lebanon.

Today the attitude of the press corps is starkly different from what I found when I arrived in Washington as a young reporter in 1958. Then the vast majority of journalists covering national affairs in the capital were trusting and uncritical of the ways of government. There was a certain coziness, a degree of intimacy and civility, between most of the press corps and the people they covered.

Thirty-five years later, many reporters have gone to the other extreme, assuming that nearly every official statement is a lie or half-truth until proven otherwise. There is a pervasive sense of being manipulated by official spokesmen, a sense that is intensi-

fied by the widened physical distance between reporters and officials.

No doubt, greater skepticism was sorely needed in the earlier era, when reporters tended to be unquestioning consumers and purveyors of official information. But today's climate is also unhealthy. Without at least a modicum of trust on both sides, it is difficult to see how reporters and officials can relate effectively.

Moreover, the corrosive climate has given rise to a widespread belief in conspiracy or malfeasance even in the absence of credible evidence, as in the case of the alleged "October Surprise" plot to keep U.S. hostages in Iran until Ronald Reagan could win the 1980 election. There is a tendency as well to view governmental mistakes or policy differences, such as the Bush administration's failure to wake up to Saddam Hussein's aggressiveness before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, as conspiratorial or criminal behavior.

The sea change in relations between government and press would be of importance mostly to journalism professors and retired reporters except for a central fact: This country has increasingly become "a media democracy," in the words of an extensive 1986 Harvard University study of the impact of the press on federal policymaking. To a large degree, as the Harvard study suggests, the news media have taken over the role of political parties and other established institutions as a source of information and influence.

Since the late 1950's, when decisions were made by a relative handful of officials and blessed by a small number of senior members of Congress, the policymaking process has been opened to many more actors in the executive branch, Congress and outside interest groups. The decline of consensus has brought a willingness, often an eagerness, by various participants to do battle in the press using leaks of inside information or rumors of newsworthy confrontations. The press is a main communications link among these groups as well as an arena for combat, and in the television age it has become a powerful force in shaping public opinion.

If members of the press are now insiders in terms of their importance to government, they are in some ways also more remote from the day-to-day processes.

In the late 1950s, when a reporter entered the main entrance to the West Wing of the White House, the press room was just off the main lobby where visitors to the president came and went. Reporters often sat around the lobby waiting for news from those emerging from presidential meetings. When President Eisenhower's press secretary, Jim Hagerty, had something to say, he summoned reporters to his office, where we all stood around his desk.

A decade later, at the start of the Nixon administration, the press corps was moved away from its tiny space near the lobby to the grander but more remote quarters where it remains today, in a press room built over the former White House swimming pool. Briefings became more sterile and formal, often staged for television cameras. Reporters were increasingly cut off from the comings and goings of presidents and their visitors, as well as the White House staff. Recently the Clinton administration barred reporters from the last of the West Wing offices routinely available to them—that of the press secretary.

Over at the State Department, there are also major changes. In the late 1950s, daily press briefings were held at noon around a long table seating less than 20 reporters, with the spokesman at its head. It was a clubby atmosphere dominated by reporters of the wire services, a few major U.S. newspapers and prestigious overseas outlets such as the Times of London and Le Monde.

Even this was a major dilution of intimacy from the World War II days of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who usually met the press at his own desk at noon. Those conversations were mostly off-the-record (not for publication), but were often highly informative.

Today State Department press briefings are held in a theater-like room lit for the television cameras. The spokesperson's words are broadcast throughout the government on an internal information system and transcripts are quickly available to most reporters in their office or home computers.

Nowadays the telephone, which has always been a key instrument of Washington reporting, has become even more important, joined by fax machines and computerized transcription services. Many news events are covered live by CNN or C-SPAN. A journalist can cover many of the official events in Washington without leaving the office. The routine work of new gathering has become more remote and impersonal and less interesting.

At the same time, competition for information going beyond the official effusions of spokesmen has increased tremendously. To a greater degree than in the past, the imparting of information and explanations beyond the government line has become a private transaction between reporters and sources, rather than an official transaction of public business. Thus access to policy makers has become essential to coverage of the White House or agencies of the executive branch.

One of the most crucial decisions facing a reporter for a major news organization in Washington is how much distance to maintain from the principals. Some journalists have considered themselves friends and even unofficial advisers to presidents and other high officials; others stay strictly aloof. A few years ago Time magazine placed a series of advertisements in national media boasting of a Time correspondent's credo: "Get as close as possible, as often as possible."

In my 17 years of covering U.S. diplomacy, I tried to be close enough to be reasonably assured of personal access in an emergency but distant enough so that neither the secretary of state, his aides or the public would mistakenly believe I was a mouthpiece for his views. In this, the eight secretaries I covered posed different problems of access and intimacy.

Henry Kissinger, whom I knew well from his days as White House national security adviser, preferred close rapport with key members of the State Department press corps. But after I wrote a front page-story sharply questioning his handling of his personal papers, being too close was no longer a problem. Alexander Haig, with his barracks-room manner, was the most prone to call up unsolicited and complain, but he never considered me in his personal orbit.

Cyrus Vance I respected for many things, including his refusal to lie under any circumstances. He agreed to see me alone at a crucial moment when, it turned out, he was preparing his resignation on policy grounds on the eve of the failed 1980 Tehran hostage raid. Inside his office I discovered that he was furious at me and had been brooding for weeks over what he considered a personal slight to him that appeared in one of my stories.

George Shultz insisted with rare exceptions on staying "on the record" in his contacts with reporters, and many of us called him "the Sphinx" because of our inability to discern what he was thinking beyond established policy lines. After Shultz left office, he spent a great deal of time in interviews with me for my book on the U.S.-Soviet negotiations that ended the Cold War. We eventually became friends in a way that would not have been possible while he was in Reagan Cabinet.

James Baker posed a special problem for me, largely because he and I were classmates at Princeton, a fact known to many State Department correspondents and a number of diplomats, some of whom made the automatic assumption that this meant I would be a Baker insider. I had to tell Baker in our first State Department encounter that I would cover him just as I would any other public official, which doubtless did not surprise him. But because of the assumptions about our relationship, which had been cordial but certainly not close in college and thereafter, I kept my distance from Baker while he was in office to a greater extent than I otherwise would have.

Looking back at the newspapers of my early days in Washington, I have no doubt that the press today does a much better job of gathering, analyzing and disseminating information. Even some of the stories written by that era's media stars, with their easy acceptance of official viewpoints, are embarrassing to read.

In major papers, coverage has expanded. The Washington Post today contains more than twice as many column inches of news as it did in 1958, and its staff is much larger. The Post had one foreign correspondent covering the world in 1958; it has 25 today. Its national, financial, sports and metropolitan news departments are much bigger and better. In the late 1950s, the popular Style section was still called "For and About Women."

In some respects the biggest change in Washington journalism has been brought about by satellites, passing unseen in Earth's orbit. For the first time, news and pictures can be transmitted and received instantaneously nearly anywhere in the world. When dramatic events impend or occur, officialdom as well as journalists now watch in real time on satellite-connected media. This is a glorious technological triumph, but problems abound.

What you see may not mean what you think it does; even events that appear to be unfolding before your eyes depend heavily on context for their meaning and interpretation. And the very instantaneousness of transmission puts terrible pressure on government officials as well as journalists. There is demand for instant interpretation, which is often faulty interpretation, and for instant reaction, which may be panicky or misguided. During the Gulf War, too many newspaper editors hung on every picture and word of CNN rather than relying on their own reporters.

For all the changes and problems, American journalism remains a magnet for talented people. Where else can you have a front seat on great events and be paid to learn more about them and inform others? I had the chance to see first-hand and cover the civil rights revolution in the United States, the rise and fall of the U.S. military effort in Vietnam, the growth of Japan to an international powerhouse, 10 Washington-Moscow summits and other negotiations that held in check and finally ended the Cold War, travels by the secretary of state to more than 50 countries, and the diplomatic

activities of five presidents, eight secretaries of state and nine White House national security advisers.

Among my most enduring images of coverage of international affairs was one of the first: that of Iowa corn farmer Roswell Garst throwing handfuls of stinking fodder at reporters crowding too close around Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev during his 1959 tour of the United States. Garst was furious that the journalists were getting in the way of the epochal first visit by a Soviet leader to this country. Khrushchev was amused and more tolerant. He knew, as the farmer did not, that journalists' words and pictures were powerful tools of diplomacy. As in the case of Roswell Garst, many others have learned that venting ire against the press will not make it go away. For better or worse, we are part of history, and the events that make it.

TRIBUTE TO PETE DEGRAVELLES, JR.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, earlier this year my good friend and a friend of many throughout the sugarcane belt, P.J. "Pete" deGravelles, Jr., retired as vice president and general manager of the American Sugar Cane League. I rise today to pay tribute to this distinguished Louisianian who many of my colleagues here in the Senate also know from his years of work in behalf of sugar farmers as chairman of the league's national legislative committee and later as president and then general manager of the league.

Those who know Pete have deep respect for his thorough knowledge of the intricacies of sugar production and processing. That he is an expert on the complexities of sugar is no surprise considering that he was born into one of Louisiana's distinguished sugar families. Pete's father, the late P.J. deGravelles, served as county agricultural agent in St. Mary Parish for 30 years and was a recognized leader in the Louisiana sugar industry in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's. Pete joined his father in a partnership farming 120 acres of land in 1950. Under Pete's stewardship, this business expanded and was eventually incorporated as the Teche Planting Co. until 1980, when it was sold to a consortium of employees. For many years during this time, Pete was active in the St. Mary Parish Farm Bureau, serving as president, and was an officer and member of the board of directors of the St. Mary sugar co-op. He won awards too numerous to list individually, but two examples of the esteem in which he is held are his selection as the "Man of the Year in Service to Louisiana Agriculture" by Progressive Farmer magazine in 1978 and his selection as King Sucrose XXXV of the Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival.

But Pete took on more than the full-time stewardship of his own farm. Early on, he became active in the American Sugar Cane League serving as chairman of the employee relations committee and as spokesman for Louisiana's sugar industry on matters pertaining to labor and legislation. He served as chairman of the contact committee which coordinates research activities on sugar and in 1976 was president of the Louisiana division of the American Society of Sugar Technologists. Pete's leadership ability was also recognized early on and he was soon selected to be chairman of the league's national legislative committee. In 1977 he was elected 29th president of the American Sugar Cane League and since 1988 he has served as general manager of the league.

Pete's hand has been at the helm during some of the most difficult debates on our national sweetener policies, but his leadership and foresight have helped us develop the strong program we now have. This program has been critical to the 18 parishes in Louisiana where cane is the mainstay of the local economy as it has been for generations. Pete understands this well. A lifetime resident of Franklin, LA, Pete served as director of the First Commercial Bank of Franklin, on the advisory council to the Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta and for 2 years as a member of the Business Advisory Council to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Through these roles he saw first hand the critical role of sugar in our State's economy and the direct and indirect impact of sugar throughout related businesses in the area.

Pete has also been very active in strengthening support for Louisiana State University, organizing and serving as the first president of the LSU Parents Club. More recently, he organized and served as chairman of the task force that created the LSU Agricultural Leadership Program, an initiative designed to develop a broad network of informed agricultural leaders throughout the State.

With this background, it should come as no surprise that Pete is an expert on all aspects of sugar and agricultural production in Louisiana's sugar triangle. We will all miss his day-to-day guidance on a variety of complicated issues: agricultural credit, trade, disaster assistance, tax, and a host of other issues. Even though he is stepping down in an official capacity, however, knowing how involved Pete has been in sugar all his life, I am sure we can count on him to continue to give us good counsel from time to time as we tackle difficult issues in the future. I wish Pete, his lovely wife Jane, and his five daughters all the best in the years ahead, but I want them to know that I for one intend to keep his address and telephone number handy.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1335, which the clerk will report.

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.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I have listened with great interest to the statement by my friend, Mr. GRAMM of Texas. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He is well aware of the requests that come to that committee from members of the committee for spending items in their States, and he is well aware of the pressures on the committee. I would like to respond to his remarks this morning.

He talks about the bill violating commitments made in 1990. This bill does not violate any commitments made in 1990. The 1990 budget enforcement agreement very wisely contemplated, as the Senator well knows, that emergencies might arise, unforeseeable in 1990—hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes and so on—and that they would necessitate a response by the Federal Government, as the Federal Government does always respond, and as it should respond to emergencies. As a result, emergency provisions were included in the 1990 agreement.

I am just going to read the first paragraph:

If for fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995 appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as emergency requirements, and that the Congress so designates in statute, the adjustments shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements and the outlays flowing on all years from such appropriations.

So those emergency provisions, Madam President, are as much a part of the law as are the discretionary spending caps. We are not violating any law here. We are merely invoking a provision that was set forth in the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act that would deal with then unforeseen emergencies.

So we have invoked those emergency provisions before. When President Bush asked Congress to declare an emergency to send nearly $1 billion in aid to Israel and Turkey, we complied by a vote of 92 to 8, and 30 of the Republicans in the Senate today voted for that overseas "emergency."

Likewise, we have declared emergencies to respond to natural disasters

here at home. I believe these emergencies were justified, just as I believe that we are right to declare an emergency now.

If a family is about to lose its home or a father his job, it really does not matter to that family whether it is due to a natural disaster or to a disaster resulting from the economic policies of this country; it is still an emergency to that family.

The Senator talks about hardworking people. The hardworking people of America are not working. That is what we are talking about. The hardworking people to which the distinguished Senator from Texas has alluded are not working. That is the problem. If they were working, we would not have to extend unemployment benefits again.

The distinguished Senator is willing to spend money to keep people on public assistance, and that is what this might be called. He is willing to keep people on the unemployment benefit rolls. That is a type of public assistance. But he is not willing, and others of his colleagues are not willing, to spend money to put people who are on those rolls back to work.

Oh, yes, they have all on that side of the aisle very readily agreed that: We will support the $4 billion in unemployment benefits, no question about that; we will be glad. We will not raise any question about that. We will not filibuster on that.

What Senators on the other side of the aisle do not want to do is put those people on the unemployment benefit rolls back to work. So Republican Senators are filibustering a bill here that is calculated to put those people back to work. The American people want jobs, not a pink slip, not just an unemployment check. Working Americans mean that there is money going into the communities and into the county and State and Federal treasuries. Nonworking Americans mean that the deficit widens because we are spending money on food stamps, on Medicaid, on Aid to Families With Dependent Children, and on unemployment benefits.

When the working people of this country are not working, less money flows into the Treasury. More people require public assistance. So the course that Senators on that side advocate—including my friend from Texas who serves on the Appropriations Committee with me—means that very likely the deficit will widen because of the inaction of this Senate, because of its inability to remove the obstruction—the roadblock, a simple letter to the Republican leader saying, "We will not move, we will not vote for cloture." That is a filibuster by letter.

Ten percent of our Nation is on food stamps; 26 million of our people are on food stamps. That is a disgrace, simply a disgrace. The greatest Republic in the world, the oldest Republic in the world, a nation that has helped in the past to rid Europe of a madman, to raise the battered and defeated nations of Europe after World War II to their feet; a nation that provided for those countries the Marshall Plan; a nation that has provided food for the hungry peoples of all continents; yet, a nation with 1 out of 10 of its people on food stamps. Think of it!

The minority does not want to take action that will bring people off those food stamp programs. They would rather continue to pay for more and more food stamps and increase the deficit; pay unemployment benefits, keep the people on the unemployment benefit rolls, increase the deficit. They will pay them unemployment benefits. Let them stay there. That is what we are hearing.

The unemployment rate is stuck at 7 percent, yet the distinguished Senator who has just spoken and other Senators on that side say—not all of them; there are some Senators on that side, I think, who want to pursue a moderate course—but here we hear it said: "The line is drawn. There will be no compromise unless we deal with the deficit in the old-fashioned way." The old-fashioned way, they say.

Let me show Senators the old-fashioned way. Let me show the Senate and the viewers the old-fashioned way of dealing with the deficit.

This chart represents the growth in the Federal deficit over fiscal years 1976 through 1993. Up until the first fiscal year in which the Reagan administration was responsible, there had never been a triple-digit billion-dollar deficit. In all the 39 previous administrations, in all the previous 192 years of the Republic, there had never been a triple-digit billion-dollar deficit.

But in that first fiscal year for which Mr. Reagan was responsible, what happened? We had a triple-digit billion-dollar deficit, $120 billion. The next year $208 billion, the next year $186 billion, $212 billion, $238 billion, $169 billion, $194 billion, $205 billion, $278 billion, $322 billion, $340 billion, and then the estimate for 1993, $352 billion; massive, unheard-of previously, deficits.

How did we deal with them? That was the old-fashioned way. What happened as a result of those deficits?

Look at the national debt, which was $932 billion when Mr. Reagan was sworn into office on January 20, 1981. He appeared on our television sets and said, "If those dollars were $1,000 bills and stacked on top of one another, they would reach 63 miles into the stratosphere."

Well, by March 1, 1993, we had the debt that had quadrupled to the tune of $4.114 trillion, and if those $1,000 bills were stacked one on top of another, they would reach 278 miles into the stratosphere. That is what happened to the deficits and that is what happened to the debt under the Reagan and Bush administrations.

The Senator talks about taxes. Well, let us see what is the result of those deficits and that debt. In fiscal year 1981, we paid $69 billion net interest on the U.S. debt. In fiscal year 1993, $198 billion. That is the result of these accumulated debts and the quadrupled debt from the Reagan and Bush administrations, an increase in the interest on the national debt.

We hear the cry about raising taxes. The net interest on the U.S. debt is a hidden, a hidden tax on every American, man, woman, boy, and girl in this country. Not only today's Americans, but the unborn of tomorrow will pay that tax, that hidden tax, which is the result of the deficits having accumulated to build such a mammoth debt, and we have to borrow to pay the interest.

We hear the charge repeatedly from the minority side, tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend. What did they do when they were in control of the White House? Borrow and spend, borrow and spend, borrow and spend. And these are the results, the bars on the charts, the hidden taxes, the deficits, the debt. Borrow and spend—that was the Republican policy.

We shifted the debts to our children. And to those who cry today no more taxes, no tax and spend, do not spend for investments in this country's physical and human infrastructure, investments that will enable the country to have a sound economic base and put people to work, they are saying, let us go back to the old fashioned way of borrowing and spending; just let our children pay the debts.

Madam President, President Clinton does not want to go back to that old fashioned way of borrowing and spending and shifting the debt to our children. He is proposing a program here which will cut the deficit over a 5-year period; which will provide investment in this country's infrastructure, so neglected during these past dozen years; and which will provide jobs now.

As the majority leader just stated, and as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] has stated repeatedly, the cost of this bill was included in the overall concurrent budget resolution, which passed the Senate before the Easter recess.

Admittedly, no Member on the other side voted for that. No Member on the other side of the aisle voted for that package which was devised to provide long-term investment in infrastructure, short-term investment in jobs, and a reduction of the deficit. It has already been paid for, and not a single Republican Senator voted for it; not one. But every Republican Senator put his or her signature on that letter to the Republican leader, saying, "We will not be moved. We will not vote for cloture."

Madam President, this is gridlock, gridlock in the old-fashioned—not real-

ly in the old-fashioned way. This is a new type of gridlock. In my 34 years in the Senate I have never seen this kind—this kind of tactic: A letter saying, "We will not be moved."

The opportunities have been here to offer amendments. The Republicans, indeed, have offered 9 or 10 amendments on this bill from the very beginning. But they have stopped offering amendments. They simply said we will not budge. We will not allow a vote, a final vote on this bill, until it can be shaped to suit us. It has to be done our way; not the old-fashioned way, our way. So that is what the Senate is up against.

I do not want to take further time except to say, again, that I realize there are Senators on the other side of the aisle who are not accustomed to doing the business of the Senate in that kind of fashion. They are accustomed to offering amendments, having them voted up or down, having cloture votes, vote up or down, and if cloture is invoked, then proceed with the bill until a final vote occurs. The situation on that side is difficult for some Senators, I know. They feel compelled to, reluctantly, not resist.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Madam President, that portion of section 251 of the Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, which provided the debt forgiveness for Egypt and Poland; also that portion of the Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, which provided for IMF funding to be exempted from the caps. Hear me, I say, exempted from the caps.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 251. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS. * * *

Section 251(b)(2)(B) and section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(B) DEBT FORGIVENESS.—If, in calendar year 1990 or 1991, an appropriation is enacted that forgives the Arab Republic of Egypt's foreign military sales indebtedness to the United States and any part of the Government of Poland's indebtedness to the United States, the adjustment shall be the estimated costs (in new budget authority and outlays, in all years) of that forgiveness.

(C) IMF FUNDING.—If, in fiscal year 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 an appropriation is enacted to provide to the International Monetary Fund the dollar equivalent, in terms of Special Drawing Rights, of the increase in the United States quota as part of the International Monetary Fund Ninth General Review of Quotas, the adjustment shall be the amount provided by that appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. Let me read this:

Debt forgiveness: If in calendar year 1990 or 1991 an appropriation is enacted that forgives the Arab Republic of Egypt foreign military sales indebtedness to the United States, and any part of the Government of Poland's indebtedness to the United States, the adjustments shall be the estimated costs in new budget authority and outlays in all years that have forgiveness.

So we forgave the debts. That was in the Budget Control Act of 1985.

IMF funding: If in fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, an appropriation is enacted to provide in the International Monetary Fund the dollar equivalent in terms of special drawing rights of the increase in the U.S. quota as part of the International Monetary Fund ninth general review of quotas, the adjustments shall be the amount provided by that appropriation.

So, these were outside the caps provided for in the Budget Deficit Control Act of 1985. I also ask unanimous consent that the paragraph on emergency appropriations be likewise included.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(D) EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS.—(i) If, for fiscal year 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as emergency requirements and that the Congress so designates in statute, the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements and the outlays flowing in all years from such appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I have 7 minutes. And the other side has?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. They have 29 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. They have 29 minutes. I thank the Chair and I apologize to my colleague on the other side if I have kept him waiting too long.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Senator that the unanimous-consent agreement included submitting the amendments that were talked about yesterday.

Mr. BYRD. By?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By both sides, by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BYRD. By 12:30?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Within the time constraints that have been defined, 6 minutes and 42 seconds; the Senator from Oregon, 29 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may I inquire of my friend on the other side of the aisle, Mr. HATFIELD, as to whether or not there is an intention to offer the amendment. Mr. DOLE had indicated for days before the break that he anticipated he probably would, or might introduce an amendment.

My question now is for the purpose of determining whether or not that amendment, if it is offered, would be a substitute or a perfecting amendment?

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I would respond to the question by saying, yes, there will be an amendment offered by the Republican side of the aisle on behalf of Senator DOLE and myself. No. 2, it will be offered in the form of a substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator for responding thusly. Our problem is, now, I had intended to offer a perfecting amendment, not a substitute. If I offer a perfecting amendment and the other side offers a substitute amendment, except for the verbiage of the time agreement, in the ordinary run of things, the substitute would wipe out my perfecting amendment if the substitute were agreed to. It is to be voted on first, under the agreement.

So, if the substitute were to be agreed to and my perfecting amendment were to be agreed to, in the normal course of things my perfecting amendment would be wiped out and the substitute amendment, if agreed to, would carry the day. I had hoped that the other side would offer a perfecting amendment so that both amendments would be equal in their status in that regard.

I can offer a substitute as well. I would rather not.

Mr. HATFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, let me make very, very clear, there is no parliamentary strategy to our amendment. We have just an expectation that we can offer this amendment and there is part of a unanimous-consent agreement that it will be the first amendment to be voted on at 5 o'clock, I believe, to be followed by an amendment, if it fails, offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

If it is easier from a parliamentary procedure, we will be happy to change ours to a substitute—to a perfecting amendment. Whatever format is going to expedite the matter.

I want to assure the Senator again, the parliamentary part of this procedure has no part in our strategy.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I accept that explanation and I have no doubt whatsoever that that is the case.

I am glad the distinguished Senator has indicated his willingness to offer the amendment as a perfecting amendment because even though, by the terms of the agreement, I think that the adoption of the Republican substitute amendment, which would come before the vote on the Byrd-Mitchell perfecting amendment—even though that amendment, if it were adopted, it would not have the effect, as would be the case in the normal course, of wiping out the perfecting amendment, I do not like such procedure. That is a part of the unanimous-consent agreement that escaped my attention. I do not like that.

But if the Senator will offer his as a perfecting amendment, then there is no problem. Therefore, I am ready to offer, on behalf of Mr. MITCHELL and myself and other Senators—Senators BINGAMAN, BRADLEY, BUMPERS, CAMPBELL, DASCHLE, DORGAN, FORD, HARKIN, INOUYE, LEAHY, LEVIN, MIKULSKI, MURRAY, REID, ROCKEFELLER, SARBANES, SASSER, and WELLSTONE—this amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator will yield for just one question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I will yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, if we shift the parliamentary format here from a substitute to a perfecting amendment we are going to have to redraft our proposal and I am not certain that we can do it by 12:30. So I ask the Senator if by changing this—we do not want to be frozen out——

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. HATFIELD. Under the current unanimous-consent agreement.

We are willing to restructure our amendment to satisfy the request of the Senator from West Virginia, but we would like to have it clearly understood that if we need additional time beyond the 12:30 hour in order to complete the restructuring, we have it.

AMENDMENT NO. 300 (TO AMENDMENT NO. 283) OF A PERFECTING NATURE

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I think that is only fair.

I have no objection and, as I understand it, the majority leader has no objection. So I would suggest that we offer our amendments now. If the Senator has to restructure his amendment because of this previous drafting, it will be understood that he will have that right to do so.

I offer the perfecting amendment, and I send it to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REID, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 300.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon is recognized. I advise the Senator he has 26 minutes and 42 seconds remaining.

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I think I will either reserve or yield some additional time to the Senator from West Virginia, if he needs it at this point, because we are in the process of restructuring our amendment. I will be very happy to outline the basic content of our amendment at this time, and then I will reserve the remaining part of our time.

I yield myself what time is sufficient to cover my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREAUX). The Senator is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday I outlined the evolving package as an alternative option that the Republicans were working on, and we held our caucus this morning. We have modified some of the points I made yesterday and the consensus now that represents the Republican alternative is the following: We will provide for the $4 billion of the unemployment compensation extension, which was already agreed to in March by this body and was included in President Clinton's package that was calculated to be about $19 billion.

We at this time would offer in addition to that, based upon the following criteria: No. 1, will these expenditures create immediate jobs; will they create immediate jobs? No. 2, what is in the pipeline as far as unobligated funds are concerned? If there is money in the pipeline unobligated in these accounts representing these programs, we felt very strongly they should not be further adding to our deficit.

I cited yesterday the example of the CDBG Program—the Community Development Block Grant Program—in which there is today, of unexpended and unobligated in the pipeline, $8.8 billion. We do not feel it is necessary to add further money to that program. It has a 4-year general spendout schedule anyway, and we have appropriated in the current fiscal year $4 billion, the highest in history for that account. At this point, 6 months into the fiscal year of 1993, 26 percent of that has been obligated. So we felt that it was not necessary to include that in our package, and that would be an example of another criteria: Money in the pipeline.

A third criteria that we put together on this was, what will contribute to the deficit? We say cut spending, yes; but we also say, do not add to the deficit. So the additional programs will be offset under administrative costs in our appropriations or in our budget program.

We have added $1 billion to the highway program. Our information is that the highway departments across the country have indicated that the spendout is really going to be very difficult to accelerate beyond that level. The President's package is $2.9 billion. So we are saying that the $1 billion is a more reasonable figure relating to the spendout capability.

Summer jobs: We have seen again that the summer job program, as offered by the President, for a 2-year package—and, by the way, ours is a 1-year package, a 1-year package. We do not believe that emergencies can be predicted over a 2-year period and, therefore, we are considering the emergency character. Even though we do not declare this an emergency because we want to pay for it and offset it, we found it to be in two programs: One, the summer jobs account, which the President had asked for a billion dollars for 2 years. We are suggesting $450 million for 1 year. In addition to that, we are suggesting $150 million for natural resource protection because that includes a lot of summer jobs potential. That is our suggestion for the first year, for the 1-year program, relating to summer jobs and natural resources that also contain a potential for a number of summer jobs: The BLM, the Forest Service, whatever.

The President has asked for $300 million for immunization. We are suggesting $300 million for immunization. Again, a factor emerges here, and that is, in the current immunization program, even though the job impact is going to be less, the fact is that their obligations are running out in this current fiscal year, and we believe that $300 million there is desperately needed for our commitments, our common commitments to the program of protecting our children.

Mr. President, we have also recognized that—and we have spoken on the floor many times about jobs—jobs in industry are really more potentially productive in small business, in small enterprises. There is where the future of a goodly percentage, if not a vast majority, of our new jobs will be created. And so we have a part of our package which would say $100 million for the Small Business Administration.

That comes to a total of $2 billion offset, paid by absorbing it within the agency administrative costs.

Mr. President, that is a basic outline of what we will incorporate in our perfecting amendment that we had proposed as we first structured it as a substitute amendment.

I do not want to spend a great deal of time rehashing history, but I think the President, Mr. Clinton, was very eloquent in his State of the Union Message when he spoke about this common concern that is expressed and felt on both sides of the aisle about our deficit. And he said in that State of the Union Message that there is enough blame to go around.

I could recite recent political history, and I would start with the Vietnam war: Borrow and spend and fight a war.

Borrow and spend and fight a war on Vietnam. We did not pay for that war as we went along. This is part of the accumulated sins of the forefathers that we are dealing with today. And they did not all have a Republican title

to their position of responsibility. Some had Democratic titles. But as the President said, there is enough blame to go around.

I could go back to when the Republicans controlled the Senate of the United States, by a margin of 53 to 47, in 1986 and the resolution that came out of a Republican-controlled committee proposed to freeze all the entitlements for 1 year in order to get a grasp on the deficit problem. We had 53 Republicans. We twisted arms and cajoled and browbeat 50 to vote for it and we got 1 Democrat—1, Mr. President, 1 Democrat—to vote for that budget resolution.

So when it is said today that all the Republicans voted against the budget resolution, well, that is a precedent of what happened in 1986, probably some time even before during the time we have had the Budget Act.

But, nevertheless, the point is whether it is the Republican side or the Democratic side that has put its troops into harness and was able to express its opposition or its difference of opinion by a vote of that kind, I do not consider it undermining the cause of good government or whatever else we want to apply to that precedent.

Now, Mr. President, let me say one other thing. The Senator from West Virginia and I have stood shoulder to shoulder on the line-item veto. We opposed it, and I continue to oppose it. I oppose it under a Republican President. I oppose it under a Democratic President. The chairman of the committee opposes it under Republican Presidents and opposes it under Democratic Presidents, so we do not have a difference on that point. But we, in that debate, have heard it argued from the White House the President does not spend a single dollar that is not appropriated by the Congress. And that is true.

Now, when we talk about administrations and deficits that have happened under the administrations, whether Democrat or Republican, or whether they borrowed to fight a war or borrowed to build up military might, a military machine, we in the Congress appropriated every one of those dollars on those charts.

In 1981, when the Republicans controlled this Senate and Mr. Reagan said we are going to go on a big buildup of the military, MX, SDI, nerve gas, all the other ones, there was what was known as the Gang of Six on our side, and that Gang of Six said to our Democratic friends across the aisle, we can deny our party the majority status in the Senate on war-peace issues and on those matters relating to weapons buildup and weapons programs. We can deny the Republican Party, our Republican President, that majority status.

But what happened? Seventeen to twenty-one Members on the Democratic side swung over and supported Mr. Reagan on SDI, MX, nerve gas, and every one of his requested dollars for building up the military. And, remember, the House of Representatives was overwhelmingly controlled by the Democrats—only to illustrate that there is enough blame to go around for this horrible deficit we face today.

I do not want gridlock, but at the same time I think there are certain principles and perhaps certain distinctions that exist between our parties. When I taught political science, I used to say I wish there were more distinctions as to separating what the Democrat Party believes and fights for and what the Republican Party believes and fights for so that the average person out here in the public can see a choice, see a distinction.

That does not mean I want extremes of the left and right, all the liberals on one side or all the conservatives on the other side, but distinctions. And I suppose if you want today to look for that distinction at this moment in time, you could say that 43 Republicans have a great range of viewpoint on social and political issues but fundamentally and basically we are all fiscal conservatives. That is a label. It means something to one person. It may be different to another person. But that is the unifying purpose at this point. It is not to embarrass the President. It is because we have reached a day of reckoning which we as a party participated in bringing this day to pass and the Democrats have as well participated in bringing this day to pass, but this is the day of accountability.

I agree with the chairman when he says we want to not do the old-fashioned ways; we want to do the new ways of some kind. But what is more old-fashioned over the last 50 years of our Federal programs under Democrat and Republican Presidents alike is to tax and spend and to borrow and spend. That is the old-fashioned way.

We are saying in our package today let us meet these needs of immunization of our children and trying to stimulate jobs and providing summer jobs for our youth to get them off the streets, to help our natural resource protection and to help small business, but let us pay for it now by putting such a high priority on it we subtract from some of the other commitments we have in the fiscal year 1993 fiscal year. That is what we are saying.

I am not suffering under any illusion that we have the votes to pass this. But up until this point our position has been in opposition to the pending package before the Senate. We have come to that point in time in this debate, which has not gone on excessively long—I can remember many issues that have taken up the time of the Senate for more hours than this one has—but we have come to a point where we say in effect we have expressed our opposition, we think there is a better way, and this is it.

Now, I know there will be those who will say, well, after all that huffing and puffing, this is all that has been produced; it is not very much to show for the effort, or other such criticisms. But I think, again, it depends on the perspective of where you are coming from, and I respect the diversity of our thinking. Walter Lippmann had it on key when he said whenever everyone is thinking alike, no one is thinking very much.

I feel there is strength in diversity, not conformity. So this is a diversity at this time in our history between 43 Members of the Senate, and I cannot speak for all of the Members on the other side because I have not attended the caucuses, but I am sure there is a variation, as there is on our side, of degrees and extent and measurements of various kinds. Some would say no package is sufficient because there is no basic emergency. Some would say, well, a small package, or a bigger package. But this is the consensus, and this is a proposal that is offered in good faith by our leader, Senator DOLE, and by myself representing the 43 Republicans on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, I now have my proposal ready. If it is permissible at this time with the Chair and with my colleague, I will send to the desk what is a perfecting amendment that incorporates the program as I have outlined.

AMENDMENT NO 301 (TO AMENDMENT NO. 283) OF A PERFECTING NATURE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] for himself and Mr. DOLE, proposes an amendment numbered 301.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. 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:

In amendment 283, strike all after the word "That" and insert: the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Business loans program account" for the cost of guaranteed loans authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, $100,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to $2,000,000 of this amount may be made available for administrative expenses of the guaranteed loans program and may be transferred to and merged with, appropriations made available under Public Law 102-395 for "Salaries and expenses", Small Business Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", $75,000,000.

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "National forest system", to be used for maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation, and natural resource conservation activities, $75,000,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services", $450,000,000, to carry out activities under part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act: *Provided*, That of the funds provided herein, 30 percent shall be for academic enrichment, as defined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That funds used for academic enrichment shall not be used to supplant other Federal funds for existing academic services or activities, and services shall be maintained at least at the level of funding used for these purposes during the summer of 1992: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, except for the 30 percent expressly used for academic enrichment activities, service delivery areas may transfer up to 10 percent to the program under part C of title II of the Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That up to 3 percent of each State's allotment used for academic enrichment, at the State's discretion, may be reserved for State administration, oversight, and support of a State practitioner's network.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health" for carrying out childhood immunization activities under title III and subtitle 1 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, $300,000,000, of which $282,800,000 shall be transferred to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, of which $4,200,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and of which $7,000,000 shall be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$15,326,750,000" and inserting "$16,326,750,000": *Provided*, That section 310(c) of said Act is amended by renumbering existing subsection (2) as subsection (2)(B) and by adding a new subsection (2)(A) as follows:

"(2)(A) ninety days after distribution of any increase in the fiscal 1993 obligation limitation, as enacted October 6, 1992, revise the distribution of such increased funds under subsection (a) if a State has not obligated and received bids on projects for the increased amount distributed, and redistribute amounts to all States able to obligate amounts on projects for which bids can be received no later than August 1, 1993: *Provided further*, That the additional authority provided under this heading shall be for maintenance activities only".

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. (a) Of the amounts provided in previous fiscal year 1993 appropriations acts and available budget authority under previous appropriations acts, such amounts of budgetary resources are rescinded so as to equal $295,000,000 in outlays as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall made uniform percentage reductions in budget authority in Federal agency administrative expenses, except that no reduction shall be made in current rates of pay under current law.

(c) For the purposes of this section, Federal agency administrative expenses are defined as object classes 10 (excluding object classes 12.1, 12.2, and 13.0), 20 (excluding object class 23.1), and 30.

(d) To the extent budgetary resources are not provided in appropriations acts, the Director shall make the same uniform percentage reduction as required in subsection (b) in Federal administrative expenses as determined in section 256(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993".

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield any time to Senator BYRD that he may wish to use.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia controls 3 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his usual, characteristic generosity in offering to yield time. I do not want to take the Senator's time. I thank him.

Mr. President, just a couple of things: one, I compliment the Senator from Oregon on leadership that he has provided in offering the amendment that he has offered.

That moderating influence that I have seen at work so many times in the Appropriations Committee when he was chairman, and subsequently when he was ranking member, I am sure has had some impact on the Republican caucus. So I thank heaven that we have some people on both sides who try to be moderate and reasoned. The Senator from Oregon is certainly one who has always, to my knowledge, chosen to use that course.

One other thing that he has said about the chart, as I recall, the distinguished Senator from Oregon said that every penny on those charts, on those deficits, were in bills that Congress passed; that the President does not sign any bills that Congress does not pass. Therefore, all those deficits Congress passed and appropriated for. Those may not be the exact words, but in essence I believe that is about what the Senator said.

Let me make this point. It is an important point. Not every dollar on those deficit charts was passed by the Congress. Let us say in addition thereto, not every dollar that is on those deficits was passed by Congress in appropriations bills. No. The appropriations bills over the years 1945 through last year will show total accumulation of all of the amounts, that the appropriation bills came in under the totality of Presidential requests that were made during those years; the totality of the Presidential budget requests. Congress appropriated less money in all those years than the Presidents requested. That holds true for the Reagan and Bush years.

Second, much of those deficits were caused by tax expenditures, not appropriations bills, big tax cuts, the wiping out of tax loopholes and the creation of additional tax loopholes.

I do not say this with any disrespect toward the tax-writing committees, because some of the major portions of those deficits—some of it at least—were brought about by tax expenditures that the appropriations committees had absolutely nothing to do with. I cite one glaring example of such. That was the 1985 tax bill which Mr. Reagan insisted that we pass making cuts in 3 years, 5, 10, and 10 percent respectively in those 3 years. Tax cuts. I voted for them. So I plead guilty.

But, the cry came out of the countryside, give the new President a chance. So I heard that cry that came out of the hills of West Virginia, and I voted to give that President a chance.

I wish we would do that now, and give this President a chance.

Mr. President, I am sure that the distinguished Senator has something that he wishes to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from President Clinton addressed to me—and I believe he wrote also a letter to Senator MITCHELL—which outlines the reductions that President Clinton has recommended and which are included in the amendment which I have introduced on behalf of myself, Senator MITCHELL, and other Senators.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 16, 1993.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Senate prepares to return Monday to consideration of the pending appropriations bill to create jobs, to boost the economy, and to meet

pressing human needs, it is important that we renew our commitment to breaking gridlock and to making government work.

To help accomplish those goals, I recommend you consider changes in the pending legislation to reduce its scope, while leaving unaffected certain key programs in the bill. I understand the procedural situation permits you and Senator Mitchell to offer a substitute amendment when the Senate reconvenes. Unfortunately, the rules of the Senate have enabled a minority to block the will of the majority. That makes it necessary for us to step forward and modify the bill in order to meet our objectives. Therefore, I recommend you consider offering a substitute that includes these components:

Leave in place the proposed funding levels for these essential programs to create jobs and to meet human needs; highway construction, summer jobs for young people, childhood immunization, the Ryan White program for AIDS victims, construction of wastewater treatment facilities, hiring meat inspectors, and assistance to small business. Of course, the $4 billion for extended unemployment compensation benefits would be left in place.

Reduce proportionately the other programs in the bill to bring budget authority down from $16.2 billion to $12 billion. This will require an across-the-board cut in other programs of about 44 percent.

Target $200 million for grants to local government to hire police as a means of helping to fight crime and to offset layoffs resulting from the fiscal constraints on local government.

This approach would reduce the budget authority in this bill by approximately 25 percent, but it would create only 18 percent fewer jobs in this fiscal year.

I make this recommendation reluctantly, and regret the unwillingness of the minority to let the Senate act on the original legislation. But our mandate is to achieve change, to move the country forward, and to end business as usual in Washington. By taking the initiative in the face of an unrelenting filibuster I believe we can respond to that mandate and achieve a significant portion of our original goals.

Your advice and counsel, and persistent hard work for the working people of this country are greatly appreciated. You have my respect and the thanks of the millions of Americans in the cities, towns and rural communities across the nation who you are trying to help.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 4 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I merely want to thank the Senator from West Virginia. I thought I said that none of the dollars expended or created on those charts were there without an act of Congress. I make the distinction obviously between that money which is appropriated by Congress and the appropriations process, those entitlements which are established by an act of Congress, all going back to the Constitution that says all moneys expended must be for the Treasury, must be through an act of Congress which includes, of course, appropriations and other implementing legislation.

I appreciate the opportunity to clarify that point.

I still say that this is the basic relationship, of course, between the Constitution provision that puts the power of the purse strings in the Congress and the people's bodies, as against the President of the United States based upon history of the power of the kings and the autocrats who not only can tax and spend, but they do not have to ask anybody for it.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has no more remaining time.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague.

I used a minute of his time in thanking him for his continuing support against the line-item veto, and expedited rescissions and enhanced rescissions and all such.

The Constitution did give the power of the purse to this body and the other body, but it also gave a veto to the President of the United States, not a line-item, but a veto.

I do not recall Mr. Reagan or Mr. Bush having vetoed any appropriations bills. Perhaps I have forgotten. That is my recollection. But certainly not for the reasons of the dollars. We may have gotten a veto of the appropriations bills in the District of Columbia, and he may indeed have done it, but for the reason of its pertaining I believe to funding of abortions and not because of the amounts remaining overall in the bill.

So I thank my friend. We are going to continue to stand together, and we are.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:29 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. CONRAD].

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATFIELD. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator to amend his request, if he would, that the time be charged equally against the situation of the controlled time at the moment.

Mr. SPECTER. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, I am here to speak on the bill. I will not object if I may have a unanimous-consent agreement that I be recognized immediately at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to that request.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I had understood that we were going to be allowed just a couple of minutes to offer a resolution in recognition of the fact that we lost the Governor of South Dakota yesterday. We had hoped we could pass that resolution and, in just a very short period of time, make a couple of comments with reference to that resolution.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be set aside at the moment for morning business, equally charged, and that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] be recognized thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished ranking member again what his request is.

Mr. HATFIELD. I requested that we take 10 minutes for morning business, equally divided between the two sides, and let the Senators speak as they will within that 10 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. And at the conclusion of that, Mr. President, I will be recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, the Senator from Montana wanted 7 minutes, which would exceed by 2 minutes the time allowed for this side.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if I might——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Reserving the right to object, I ask if I might be included for up to 3 minutes in morning business, as well.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am trying to accommodate my colleagues. We are under controlled time now. We do have a Senator on the floor ready to talk on the matter that is pending. If we get into longer than 10 minutes, I am afraid we are going to cut ourselves short in the debate on the pending issue.

To try to accommodate, I will increase that to 12 minutes, 6 minutes on a side, equally charged; but I am afraid that is about the limit.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, I can cut my time down to about 3 minutes to accommodate other Senators.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I so modify my request, with the Senator from Pennsylvania being recognized thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the results of President Clinton's summit meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa.

It is about time that an American President honestly and forthrightly—at the very first meeting—tells Japan that we will no longer tolerate lopsided trade imbalances. This strong message is certain to let the Japanese know that, while we value our ties with them, we want fairness and balance.

Our trade deficit with Japan, at $49 billion in 1992 and rising, deserves immediate attention. This is over half our $84 billion trade deficit with the entire world. Something is clearly wrong.

I am pleased at the way the administration spoke this strong message with one voice. Over the past week, even Secretaries Christopher and Bentsen documented the need for increased computer sales to Japan. As the Japanese said very aptly later, our "honne," or underlying intent, matched our "tatemae" or public rhetoric.

This is something we have not seen in the past. It means not only that we are speaking with one voice, but that trade has achieved the importance it deserves. I am encouraged to know that our Chief Trade Negotiator, Mickey Kantor, need not go to the White House hat in hand for trade issues to receive top priority. Unfortunately, this is what his predecessors often had to do.

This proves the Clinton administration's commitment to treating economic issues as national security concerns. This is just what President Clinton told us he would do, on the campaign trail and during his watershed speech at American University 1 month ago. How refreshing it is to see that commitment in action.

MORE THAN JUST TALK

But let me get to the heart of the matter—results. The Clinton administration's strong signals, unified front, and new resolve on economic issues were not just hot air. At the end of the day, President Clinton and Prime Minister Miyazawa had agreed to create a framework for results-oriented negotiations within the next 3 months—just in time for the Group of Seven meeting in Tokyo.

I look forward to working with the Clinton administration over the next few months as it fleshes out the details of this framework. In particular, I think my proposal for a United States-Japan framework for expanding trade and investment [FETI] would achieve their goals very well.

My FETI proposal would enable the administration to target specific sectors of the Japanese market—supercomputers, electronics, aviation, agriculture, and autos—that have eluded United States exporters. The key is to target sectors that have larger structural barriers looming behind them, and thus killing two birds with one stone.

For example, Japan's exclusive distribution system is part of the reason for poor United States auto sales in Japan. If we can secure an agreement in this sector, we can get at the larger distribution problem as well.

By targeting real-life instances where structural barriers exist, we can make more progress than the United States-Japan structural impediments initiative [SII] talks ever did. I am pleased that the Clinton administration has no intention of extending SII past its June expiration. The SII was a cultural exchange program, not a bona fide trade negotiation.

SII showed us, once again, that trade talks with Japan must have teeth if they are going to get results. That is why FETI would feed into Super 301 after 1 year if the sector-specific negotiations failed.

I think FETI is a formula for success. I am hopeful the President will use it as a model for these historic negotiations.

Mr. President, I think last week's talks between President Clinton and Prime Minister Miyazawa rounded a corner in United States-Japan relations.

Finally, we are treating Japan like a grown man, not a little brother. Perhaps it took a President born in the post-cold-war era to make this transition. I am sure that our relationship with Japan will be the better for it.

Indeed, this is a new era in United States-Japan relations, an era that demands a fresh approach to economic and security issues. Both the United States and Japan must be prepared to shoulder the challenges of their maturing relationship together. After all, the United States-Japan relationship is the most important one we have.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MICKELSON AND OTHER LEADERS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness that I come to the floor today. Yesterday South Dakota's Governor and my friend, George Mickleson, and seven other South Dakotans were killed in a plane crash.

George Mickelson was working for us when he died. They all were really.

He did not have to be in that plane trying to save a couple of thousand jobs for South Dakotans.

There was not any press. There was nothing in it for him. It was just his job. He was serving his State, and he died doing it.

The last time I spoke with George Mickelson was on a weekend. He was working. He called to express his concern that we might lose the very facility he was traveling to Cincinnati Monday to try to save.

It was typical George Mickelson. Giving up a weekend. Not worrying about what political party anyone was in. Just looking for ways to solve problems and make things come out right.

How much every one of us who knew him wishes now that everything had come out right for him.

And how much our State has lost because it did not.

George Mickelson's death surely defines the word "tragedy."

The tragedy is deepest and most horrifying for a wife and children whose compassion and caring for one another have shown all of us in South Dakota what family truly ought to mean.

All who do jobs like George's, all of us here, know the pain of hours torn from our families. Those are hours intended to be repaid. Sadly, for George that can never be.

For those hours every person in my State is in the debt of Linda Mickelson and her family. They lost those hours for us.

Words are inadequate to express our grief at this moment. We offer our prayers and sympathy. We send our heartfelt thanks and gratitude for what Linda and her family have given, but we know they are not enough.

The tragedy of George's loss is deepest by far for them, but it is deep indeed for all of South Dakota. In George Mickelson we have lost a man who truly believed in service—a man willing to give whatever it took, to risk everything in the service of others.

He did it first in Vietnam. Then as a young prosecutor. He served us in our legislature, as our speaker, and, finally, as the Governor of our State.

Sometimes we fought, he and I. But it did not matter. Because with George Mickelson you knew the fights were about how to serve best. Sometimes you disagreed for the moment, but always you respected the man, because you knew he sought to do what he felt was right.

Nothing was more important to Governor Mickelson than jobs for South Dakota. Economic development was his passion. The team he assembled to pursue this passion was first rate.

That our loss should extend beyond our Governor, that it includes seven others, people who were the heart of his economic development team, only compounds the tragedy. Like the Governor, each one of those men stepped into that plane to serve our State.

Roger Hainje, whose effortless brilliance helped make his city number one.

Roland Dolly, who led our State's development team.

Ron Reed, our energy commissioner.

Dave Birkeland and Angus Anson of First Bank and Northern States Power, men who volunteered their special abilities to the effort the Governor was making.

Ron Becker and David Hanson, two professional pilots who did their best in a tragic and unavoidable situation.

All of them were working for us. Each of their families has our most profound sympathy and thanks.

Too often we take men like these, and like George Speaker Mickelson, for granted. What they do for us. Who they are. We just assume it will go on forever.

We often do not realize how fortunate we are to have people like them—people like Gov. George Mickelson.

Then we lose them, and we know.

Mr. President, for myself, my family, and my State, I join Senator PRESSLER in this expression of sorrow at the death of Gov. George Mickelson. It is so little, but it is all we can do.

EXPRESSING SORROW FOR THE DEATH OF GOV. GEORGE MICKELSON AND OTHER LEADERS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE, and ask for its immediate consideration.

This is a resolution saluting the eight careers that ended yesterday, of those who served our State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 99) to express the sorrow of the Senate upon the death of George Speaker Mickelson, Governor of the State of South Dakota, and other South Dakota leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I join in my colleague's remarks. I spoke this morning at length on my friendship with the Governor and with many of the people on the plane. They were serving our State on a flight to save jobs for South Dakota. I have known some of the people on the plane for 35 years from 4-H activities at the State fair. It was a great personal blow and a great blow to our State.

There is very little more that can be said, except that these men are an example to us all, and I think that the editorial in today's Sioux Falls paper summed it up best.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE TRAGEDY IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in extending our sympathies to our distinguished colleagues from South Dakota and the families of those in their State who perished yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 99) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 99

Whereas, Governor Mickelson had a long and distinguished career, having been born in Mobridge, South Dakota in 1941, earning a law degree from the University of South Dakota in 1965 and serving a tour of duty with the United States Army in Vietnam;

Whereas, he was first elected to the South Dakota State House of Representatives in 1974, where he served six years and served as House Speaker in 1979-80;

Whereas, he was elected Governor of South Dakota in 1986 and was reelected in 1990, during which time he was dedicated to numerous initiatives, including economic development, education and health care, and served as cochairman of a National Governors' Association task force on health care and as chairman of the Western Governors' Association; and

Whereas, Governor Mickelson and South Dakota State business leaders Roland Dolly, Ron Reed, Angus Anson, Dave Birkeland, Roger Hainje and pilots Ron Becker and David Hansen were killed in a plane crash while returning to South Dakota from a meeting to help advance economic development in the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow and profound regret of the death of Governor Mickelson and expresses its sympathy to his wife, Linda, his daughter, Amy, and his sons, Mark and David.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow and profound regret of the deaths of Roland Dolly, Ron Reed, Angus Anson, Dave Birkeland, Roger Hainje, Ron Becker and David Hansen and expresses its sympathy to the families of these leading South Dakotans.

THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN WACO, TX

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, Americans have been transfixed by the tragic events in Waco, TX, and there has been much discussion already about what happened yesterday.

I rise today not to engage in what might be called Tuesday morning quarterbacking, but to say that I think there has been too much of that already.

It is too early and wrong to be pointing fingers of blame at anyone other than David Koresh. It is he who is responsible for the terrible events that occurred yesterday. And it was he who was responsible for the terrible event that took place 52 days ago, when four Federal agents were murdered and more than a dozen were injured, at his command. Today we mourn for the children who died yesterday, innocent victims of Koresh's madness. But let us not forget to mourn for the children and families of the law enforcement agents who were killed at the outset of this crisis. They, too, are victims of Koresh.

It is certainly appropriate for a review of this case to take place. We can learn from this tragedy, as we always learn from tragedy. All the answers are not in. But from all we know right now, I believe it is clear that Attorney General Reno and the FBI deserve our support for the extremely difficult decision they made, under fire. They were involved and on the scene in a way that their critics were not. As they have said, they acted in a measured way, only after a thorough and careful review of all the facts available. The FBI did not storm the compound, guns blazing, yesterday. The only guns that were blazing belonged to David Koresh and his followers and they were being fired at the FBI. Every opportunity was given for those inside to come out. Koresh and his followers had every opportunity to give up, peacefully, for 51 days. They had the opportunity to give up, peacefully, yesterday. So let us not, in a frenzy of finger pointing, forget who started this crisis and who ended it in a conflagration yesterday—it was David Koresh.

Mr. President, let us not forget the respect we owe to the law enforcement people throughout this country—Federal, State, and local—who put their lives on the line every day to protect the rest of us from criminals and madmen.

The buck may stop with Attorney General Reno and the FBI, but the blame should go directly to David Koresh, who bears the fullest responsibility for all that has occurred in Texas.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has expired.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, in the amount of some $6 billion, covering $4 billion to extend unemployment compensation, an additional $1 billion for highways, an additional $450 million for summer jobs, $300 million for the immunization program, $150 million for natural resources, and $100 million for the Small Business Administration.

It is my hope, Mr. President, with this amendment being offered by Senator HATFIELD, that we will move toward an accommodation of compromise to end the gridlock which has paralyzed the Nation. I believe, Mr. President, that the problems of America need to be solved and Americans are

not concerned whether they are solved by Democrats or Republicans.

I have said in the past, off the floor and on the floor, that I am prepared to help President Clinton, but I am not prepared to give him a blank check.

In opposing his so-called stimulus package, I have done so because I do not believe that, aside from unemployment compensation extensions, there is an emergency which ought to be addressed by an appropriations bill.

I make that statement because, in each of the categories where the President has sought additional funds, there are, at the present time, unexpended funds which could be spent at the discretion of the President.

But I am supporting Senator HATFIELD's amendment in the spirit of accommodation and in the spirit of compromise to see if this effort, in the sum of $6 billion, may provide a working point to bring the parties together and to end the gridlock.

We have at the present time, Mr. President, in community development block grants, unexpended and unobligated funds, the sum of $8.8 billion; $3 billion of those moneys are appropriated for the current year, fiscal year 1993, and $5.8 billion are available from prior years. That is the reason the distinguished Senator from Oregon did not include any funds in this Hatfield amendment for community development block grants.

When we take up the issue of transportation on the most recent available figures as of December 31—and this Senator has sought more updated figures—out of $39,954,000,000, only 18 percent were obligated as of that date. But it is possible to have additional expenditures and to spend more money on highways, and that is why the Hatfield amendment has added $1 billion which can be spent and which can provide new jobs. When the appropriations bill was considered last year, this Senator supported a greater appropriation than that which was made. The amendment by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is consistent with that approach in putting up an additional $1 billion.

On the very important subject of summer jobs, there has been appropriated for fiscal year 1993 the sum of $883 million. Again, Mr. President, as of December 31, only 5 percent of those funds have been obligated or expended. But there is the argument and there is the consideration that if additional funds were available, there could be more young people hired for summer jobs. I think it is prudent, as Senator HATFIELD has offered in this amendment, to increase this sum by some $450 million, which will provide considerable additional employment opportunities.

When you talk about summer jobs, the reality happens to be that any amount of money that you add could be expended. But this will be added to the sum of $833 million already appropriated and should provide very substantial additional employment.

Last year, in the wake of the problems in Los Angeles, there was an emergency appropriation for some $500 million to provide additional jobs, so that the suggested addition of $450 million is very much in line with what was done last year.

Similarly, on the item of immunization, an additional $300 million has been added by the amendment from Senator HATFIELD, although it should be noted that there is available as of April 4, a very substantial portion of the $341 million appropriated for fiscal year 1993, with some 59 percent having been obligated, leaving a total of $137 million which would be supplemented by the $300 million in the Hatfield proposal.

To natural resources are added $150 million; the Small Business Administration $100 million; all of this in an effort to move ahead to try to resolve the gridlock, to provide a basis for accommodation and to provide a basis for working out some agreement with the bills which are pending.

Mr. President, as it is well known, President Clinton traveled to Pittsburgh, PA, on Saturday to stimulate support for his package and, beyond any question, to put some additional pressure or some pressure or something on this Senator.

I was invited to join him on Air Force One. I received the invitation when I was in the Central African Republic on a trip for the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on the issue of foreign aid, since the United States has more than $1 billion at issue in Africa.

I would have loved to have gone.

Last Wednesday, from the Central African Republic, I talked by telephone extensively with Vice President ALBERT GORE, and it was just impossible for me to be in Pittsburgh, much as I would have liked to have been there. I think it was interesting, Mr. President, although not dispositive—nothing in our work is dispositive—to note what has happened on the telephone calls to my offices in Pennsylvania since the President's trip to Pittsburgh.

Yesterday, on April 19, on the full day through 5 p.m., the total calls in favor of the President's position totaled 372. The total calls in opposition to the President, or in favor of the position which I have taken, totaled 1,234. And in the city of Pittsburgh, the office there received 118 calls in favor of the President's proposal and 566 calls in favor of this Senator's position.

Today, up until 12 noon, the tally of calls from my offices in the State of Pennsylvania and Washington, DC—the offices being Allentown, Scranton, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia—were 134 for the President's position and 326 in favor of the position taken by this Senator.

I think it is entirely possible that we could move through the balance of this bill without having any portion of the bill adopted. The Republicans have stood firm in opposing final passage because there are many amendments which we have sought to offer. And this Senator has sought to offer an amendment on health care, which is a comprehensive bill to provide health coverage for all Americans, which follows legislation which this Senator has introduced going back to 1984, and a comprehensive legislative package on health care introduced in the 102d Congress, a portion of which was brought up in July; a bill, Senate bill 18, which this Senator introduced on July 21, the first legislative day; and a more expansive bill introduced on March 2, Senate bill 618. It was my bill which was on deck, ready for offering, when the majority leader sought to change the procedure and permit only debate on the bill.

This is not a filibuster against the bill. A number of other Senators had announced amendments which they sought to offer, which were relevant to the bill and within the rights of those Senators to offer. We have not come to the point where we are debating simply for the sake of debating, where you would ordinarily say that there is a filibuster, or talking, but have sought to offer these amendments. I think that if there had been simply an attitude of negativism, simply to oppose President Clinton's economic package, the likelihood is strong that the President's package would have been defeated in its entirety and that 43 Republicans would continue to insist on the right to offer these amendments as a preliminary to consideration of the bill in its entirety.

But we have met in a caucus. We have come to a position, and it is not a uniform position. There were some who would have liked to have seen more money and some who would like to have seen less money. But the $6 billion is a good-faith offer for the $4 billion in unemployment compensation benefits. It is simply intolerable not to move ahead and extend those benefits. This Senator was one of a handful of Republicans who voted for this measure many weeks ago, and I said at the time, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, that it would be my preference to pay for it but I was prepared to extend unemployment compensation benefits even if they were not paid for.

The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, does pay for the $6 billion by offsets against administrative costs. So we are standing firm with the position that the expenditures ought not to be made without offsets and offsets have been made.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I will.

Mr. FORD. The Senator said that—I do not believe the total $6 billion is offset. The $4 billion unemployment extension is under the emergency and that is not paid for. The administrative charge is for the balance. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SPECTER. Well, my response is, to the best of my knowledge, all $6 billion are recovered with the reductions in agency administrative costs. My colleague—if I may?

Mr. FORD. My colleague, that is a huge amount.

Mr. SPECTER. If I may finish?

Mr. FORD. Excuse me. I apologize.

Mr. SPECTER. My colleague from Oregon just signaled me that the administrative costs cover $2 billion.

Mr. FORD. I wanted to be sure, the $4 billion for extended unemployment is under the emergency and is not paid for. But then the $2 billion is paid for by deducting administrative costs somewhere in Government. Is that correct?

Mr. SPECTER. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his inquiry. We have put this package together since the conference this morning at 10 o'clock—which I had to leave early to go to an appropriations hearing on the Department of Defense. We have conferred over the lunch hour. I am appreciative for Senator HATFIELD's signal—from the bench, here—to make sure as to precisely what is involved.

Senator FORD is correct. The $2 billion is offset and $4 billion is not.

Mr. President, that is the essence of what I have to say.

I, in conclusion, ask unanimous consent that the calls received by my office on April 19 up until 5 p.m., calls received by my office in Washington and across the State up to 12 noon today be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Caldwell and Doug Loon.
From: Jill Schugardt
Date: April 19, 1993, 5:00 pm.
Subject: Constituent totals in response to the President's stimulus package.

	For the Republican position	Against Republican position
Monday calls:		
Washington	369	122
Philadelphia	90	61
Pittsburgh	566	118
Harrisburg	85	28
Scranton/Wilkes-Barre	79	34
Allentown	45	9
Total	1,234	372

The general consensus is for Senator Specter to hold firm and not be swayed by the President.

MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Caldwell and Doug Loon.
From: Jill Schugardt
Date: April 20, 1993, 12:00 noon.
Subject: Constituent tallies.

THE PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

	For the filibuster	Against the filibuster
Washington	121	40
Philadelphia	26	27
Pittsburgh	146	50
Harrisburg	15	7
Scranton/Wilkes-Barre	3	1
Allentown	15	9
Total	326	134

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would like to just take a moment to express my appreciation for the very lucid and eloquent statement summarizing the Republican package here today by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER]. I hear Mr. SPECTER on frequent occasions take a very complex issue and make it very clear. He has done so again, especially to underscore the point we come here today with this package as an action of good faith to present an option, an alternative to the President's package, recognizing those key elements still have to be expended in a reasonable and an efficient manner, and those accounts that have—as distinguished from those accounts that have pipeline money, great sums of pipeline money unexpended, unobligated. We have made that kind of a separation. Also, with the strong impact upon jobs immediately, jobs now, as against those that would have jobs in the future or those in the President's package that have zero job impact; zero.

So we have tried to make that clear in our package as well. I just wanted to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let us look at the amendment that has been offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Whereas the Clinton proposal would provide $2.9 billion for Federal aid to highways, the Republican proposal would provide only $1 billion.

What we are talking about here is reinvesting in our country. For a dozen years during the Reagan and Bush administrations we disinvested in this country. We penalized domestic discretionary spending, highways and bridges and mass transit and so on. Now, President Clinton is attempting to play a little bit of catch-up ball here and rebuild the infrastructure of this country so that our people can compete, so that our businesses can compete in the world markets. Because we will—by having more public investment—we will encourage private investment and we will also encourage and enhance productivity.

Here is where we have been falling short for so many years. This is the message I carried to the 1990 budget summit.

I have never ceased to harp on it. We disinvested in our own Nation, disinvested in our own people, and here we see today, in the Republican amendment that has been offered, a failure again to grasp the significance of the need to invest in our highways. The money is there. The money has been paid into the highway trust fund by the users, and they expect it to be used.

Then, on the Summer Youth Employment Program, the Clinton proposal is that we add $1 billion. The Republican proposal is that we add only $450 million. What is the purpose of this? The title of the program provides the answer: Summer jobs; summer jobs, mostly for young people throughout this country; in the 100 largest cities in the country and in the rural areas, summer jobs.

We need to put people to work. That is what this bill is all about. It is a jobs bill. What are we going to do with those young people who will be out of school but with no work? The additional $1 billion will provide additional jobs for our young people throughout the country. They will use that money. It will be spent in the communities. It will be spent in the various businesses of the communities, and the ripple effect will produce additional jobs.

EPA wastewater treatment: $845 million in the Clinton proposal, as contained in the amendment offered by us Democrats; zero in the amendment offered by the Republicans. Again, we are talking about infrastructure. We are talking about improving community life, enhancing the opportunities of large as well as small communities to attract businesses. We are also talking about lifting the health level of those communities.

I suppose not many of my friends on the Republican side grew up in the kind of environment in which I grew. We lived back in the "sticks" when I was a boy. We had no electric lights, no running water in the house. We got our drinking water from an old spring house. My mom washed on an old washboard with water heated on a stove that burned wood. No running water in the house, no sanitary facilities. None. And there are people in this country today who live under such conditions. That is what this is all about: Investing in the American people by providing wastewater treatment facilities.

Now we are soon going to be asked to vote for more aid to Russia. How many on that side of the aisle today who are complaining about helping the American people to find jobs will vote for that Russian aid readily and without any questions asked?

Let us also do a little something for our own people. EPA wastewater treatment funds. They will put men and women to work and will help us to catch up from having been behind now

for so long in providing this kind of infrastructure.

Childhood immunization remains the same under both amendments. Ryan White AIDS Program: The Democratic amendment provides $200 million; the Republican amendment zero. This is for people, people again. Who is to deny that this money is needed?

SBA 7(a) loans, $141 million in the Democratic proposal; $100 million in the Republican proposal. This money generates bank loans to the tune of $2.575 billion in bank loans for small businesses, as provided under the Clinton program.

Here, again, the attempt by the minority is to slice away and cut away the program that is devised to help small businesses to put people to work and to stimulate the economy of this country so that people can pay taxes, so that they can get off the welfare roll, they can get off the food stamp roll, they can get off the unemployment benefit roll.

Food safety and inspection service: $4 million in the President's program; zero in the Republican program. As an old meatcutter, I can tell you that the inspectors need to be out there looking at those carcasses of mutton, lamb, veal, beef, pork. That is money well spent. It may not put throngs of Americans to work, but it will put some people to work. It will also enhance the health standards of this country and improve the living standards of the country.

As to the other programs concerning which the President has recommended that we reduce by 42.9 percent in our amendment on this side, our friends on the other side of the aisle, again zero; wipe them all out. Let us not have any of them.

Hiring local law enforcement personnel: President Clinton, through this amendment which we are offering on this side of the aisle, would add $200 million for hiring local law enforcement officers; the Republican side says nyet, nyet, no, zero. Who is there to deny that this country needs more policemen out from behind the desks, out on the streets?

I would say that the Republican amendment does do this: To a certain degree, it does admit that at least some of the programs in the President's package do create jobs because in connection with summer youth employment, SBA loans, and Federal aid to highways, it goes along, tremulously, saying me, too, but not much.

Well, why minimize the jobs created by reducing the program? This amendment that we have offered on this side of the aisle invests in the people of America and in its infrastructure.

The Republican amendment cuts the President's programs in many instances—in most instances, as a matter of fact, eliminates it in its entirety and produces fewer jobs. And then the Republican amendment proposes to pay for $2 billion of the total $6 billion. The $4 billion in unemployment compensation was declared an emergency some time ago when the Congress passed the authorizing legislation. At that point Congress declared that as an emergency, so we do not have to do that in this bill. Everyone has agreed that that is an emergency.

But of the remaining $2 billion which the Republicans have included in their amendment, $1 billion of that is Federal aid highway moneys, moneys paid into the highway trust fund by the users, and the other billion has actually been distributed among 3 or 4 or half a dozen programs. The $2 billion they would say is paid for, they would pay for it out of administrative expenses.

Now, when we cut administrative expenses, we cut people out of jobs, so we will be reducing personnel, on the one hand, by taking it out of the agencies' administrative expenses. On the other hand, we will be increasing the number of jobs through the stimulus program. So it is a wash. We take from jobs on the one hand, add to jobs on the other.

Mr. President, it is not a jobs program when we add jobs with one hand and take away jobs with the other.

This amendment ought to be rejected. It is too little, and it negates part of the good that it would do by reducing jobs in the various agencies that administer programs, thus cutting down on the efficiency of the programs themselves.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). The Senator from West Virginia reserves his time. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time necessary to make a few remarks.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in carrying the responsibility of the President's package, has emphasized constantly, and again in analyzing the Republican amendment, that the President's package is a jobs package, and that we need the money now for these other programs because you would have to assume, if we need this kind of money now, then we are running out of money for those programs that are already in place for the 1993 appropriations bill.

Let us take Ryan White. Let me cite, Mr. President, as far as the jobs impact is concerned, a document prepared by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, March 9, 1993, signed by Leon Panetta, the President's Budget Director. Let us take Ryan White. This program I cosponsored and I have supported from the very beginning and continue to support this program. What is the jobs impact according to the administration's own chief fiscal officer? Zero. Zero. No jobs by this additional money made available, which will add to the deficit.

I might say, going through this whole chart, account by account, again Mr. Panetta's office will list here the jobs impact, accounts affected by the stimulus proposal. You will find zero job impact: worker profited, zero impact; enhanced school operations, zero impact; supportive housing, zero impact, in terms of the immediate job-creating power of this additional money.

So it is not true that in all of these parts of the President's package they have "an immediate jobs impact."

Now, the second point made is that we need this additional money. This is a supplemental appropriations bill to the 1993 appropriations. Rural Development Administration—rural development, certainly a high priority not only on the chairman's part but on my part as well and others on both sides of the aisle—rural water and waste loans and grants, Mr. Panetta's statistics on the first quarter spending, of that amount that was appropriated under the 1993 appropriations bill, 23 percent was expended. If you double that figure, because we are coming to the end of the second quarter now this month, which means in effect we will have reached 50 percent or halfway of the fiscal year, you double that and we still have expended or obligated 46 percent. I do not see any crying need for money now when we still have unexpended, unobligated 54 percent of the 1993 appropriation ready and available.

Mr. President, let me also add there is another supplemental that is being created now coming down the track, another supplemental that we will have to address in the next probably 2 to 3 months. This is not the last train out of Shanghai as far as the availability of funds for programs of importance, whether in this package or other packages.

Mr. President, let me give another illustration. One of the big parts of the President's package was CDBG. I repeated this and I want to repeat it again. That is one of the biggest parts of the President's package, $2.4 or $2.6 billion. And yet at this point in time when we appropriated $4 billion for the current fiscal year for that program, and the unexpended part, unobligated part of that Community Development Block Grant Program with the pipeline of previous year carryovers and you have $8.8 billion.

I do not see any emergency. I do not see any great cause to rush in and add more dollars to a program that has not expended almost twice as much of the current level of appropriations.

Mr. President, it begins to appear to me we see a social problem and we are going to throw money at it and that solves the problem. That has been the character of this Government for far

too long. I want to fund those programs that can wisely expend the taxpayers' money, and create jobs. I am one of those on our side of the aisle that believes that there is a legitimate call for some kind of a program, but it has to follow a criteria. The criteria is simply that there is an emergency, they run out of funds or they are going to run out of funds very shortly, and second, that we pay for it because of the priority we place on it in the current fiscal year.

Is that too much to ask? Is that too much to ask, that we wisely expend the taxpayers' money, putting the money where it is needed, and needed now, rather than putting money where there is an $8.8 billion pipeline unexpended, unobligated in part, and the fact that we have appropriated the highest figure in the history of the Community Development Block Grant Program of $4 billion in 1993?

No, there is a difference between these packages. It is not in the scope of the dollars only but it is in the criteria we have used to suggest an appropriation of those dollars.

Let us take the so-called scaled down President's package of 15.2, I believe is the figure, for 2 years. Compare that to our program of 1 year. I must tell you I do not have a crystal ball. I do not have gifts of prophecy. I have no way to say there is going to be an emergency the second year out of a 2-year program even if I agreed there is such an emergency today. I think there is concern for today. Whether I would declare it an emergency to get around the budget responsibilities of paying for it as you go is another story. But that is a technicality.

But let us say it is a full-blown emergency today. How can we go ahead and make commitments today of expenditures adding to the national deficit that will create the cost for interest rates to go up in terms of paying for that additional money, and say it is going to happen down the road the next year? I do not have that kind of foretelling.

But let me take that comparison. Let us take the President's scaled down package of $15.2 billion. Break that down to 7.6 per year. It will not all divide out equally 50–50. But let us take it for the sake of illustration. Our package is $6 billion for a single year. The difference between 6 and 7.2 is not a great gap of difference of money but it is not a me-tooism. It is far from a me-tooism. There is a very clear distinction. That is the President's package and the Democrat's proposal is to put it on the cuff, increase the deficit, add to that deficit now.

As to our package, we agree. There is high priority on this. We are willing to make subtractions and adjustments within the current fiscal year caps and pay for it, pay for it now. That is the distinction.

I think we are down to a point, as I say, where the difference in dollars, if you want to break the President's 2-year package down to 2-year increments and our package as a 1-year package, that gap is not that great. The basic fundamental distinction in principle is this: Do we have less compassion on this side because we have less money we are proposing and suggesting we pay for it as we go? No. Let me say that this idea somehow that there is compassion on one side of the aisle, no compassion on the other side of the aisle, by implication is just not a fact.

I think we have to understand that we do have a concern for summer jobs. We have a very great concern for summer jobs. The President asked for $1 billion for 2 years. We are saying $450 million for 1 year. But do not forget we also included for natural resource protection $150 million, which has tremendous summer job potential for those young people on the streets.

So if you want to break this down as a comparison between the 2-year program and a 1-year program, I think we have an equal amount of compassion represented in our funding proposal level.

Immunization: Of course we are not immunizing, even today with the current budget, enough of our children. There are those children that are going without. But let me also say, Mr. President, doctors have said we cannot drag those children in from their parents to get immunization. Dollars alone are not going to solve this problem. We have to develop some kind of an educational outreach and a broadcast outreach to have those parents know that there is this free immunization available to bring their children into the centers to receive the immunization.

In other words, dollars are a means to an end, not an end in and of themselves. We have to address the total problem in that case. Is there any less compassion on this side for immunization of children? Of course not. We have the same level of funding. Frankly, I would like to see that funding increase, and I would like to see a part of that increase be given over to the kind of advertising and broadcast and educational outreach to get those children into those centers that are not there now even though there is available now immunization protection.

I want to say, Mr. President, that again we are basing our proposal on a very clear criteria, immediate job impact, looking at the pipeline money and the availability and the percentage of that pipeline money that has not been expended or obligated, and to pay it and to pay for it as we go.

Is that a new philosophy? Well, it certainly has not been perhaps as well exercised over the years, but there have been those in this body on both sides of the aisle who have been concerned about the mounting deficit. I have engaged in debates on this floor over the years that I have been in the Senate and oftentimes it is against the imagery and sort of the symbolism that, for instance, increasing military spending does not add to the deficit; that increasing immunization, or women and infant children care, or housing, or some of these social programs are what is causing the deficit. So these debates have been going on about both sides of the aisle wanting to hold down spending.

I do not know about your caucus, Mr. President. But I am sure that it is like our caucus to some degree; that is, each individual Member has perhaps a different set of priorities. Some Member wants to include this, or include that, and another Member says, no, I do not think that is necessary, I want to include this, and I want to include that. And we build a consensus out of those kinds of far-ranging viewpoints of priorities of a normal average group of 43 Americans.

I suppose that one would say that is maybe a weakness. I consider it a strength in spite of the tedious nature of trying to build consensus. I like diversity. And I think it is healthy.

But let us not consider that somehow, because there are two different options here, that one option represents more concern and compassion for those in need, for those out of work, for those who are going hungry as against, say, another group of people. I do not want to ascribe that to any Member of this body, 100 Members. I see it as a different perspective of priorities. And I am happy that everybody does not agree with me.

By the same token, I do not want others demanding that I have to conform to their view. But I think here you have a very solid consensus of 43 Members of this body, good faith, offering what we think is a better proposal, filled with the compassion necessary to meet the needs of individuals, and at the same time being concerned about the growing deficit and the increased spending that this represents.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield 10 minutes?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, beginning on the floor of this body some 4 weeks ago at the onset of this debate, a small crack or fissure developed along that center aisle between the parties.

During the course of the first 2 weeks of debate on this bill, and increasingly and dramatically in the 2 weeks of recess since, that crack or fissure has grown to a gulf, perhaps to a chasm

separating and distinguishing the views of all of the Members on this side from the great bulk of the Members on the other side.

That difference, that chasm, it seems to this Senator, is made up of two elements. The first element, if I can characterize it appropriately, is that Members on that side of the aisle feel that expenditures on the part of the Federal Government on the order of $1.5 trillion during the course of the present fiscal year are insufficient.

That $1.5 trillion in Federal spending is not sufficient to create a healthy economy which, evidently, according to their views, can only be created by the spending of the Federal Government. And they, therefore, propose to add some $15 billion to that spending—1 percent, if it were all to be spent in the course of this year. Of course, it is not.

Members on this side of the aisle believe that to a very significant degree, it is that spending itself which has caused a major portion of the difficulties under which this Nation operates. Members on this side believe that we should cut spending first, before we discuss and pass the huge increase in taxes which is explicit in the budget resolution passed here about a month ago.

A second and closely related difference between the two is that, evidently, Democrats believe that a $290 billion deficit is too small a deficit, that it is important—nay, vital, if we listen to their arguments—in order to get our economy moving again that that deficit be increased. They believe that the debt of several trillion dollars is too small and that there should be additions to it. Republicans believe that both are too large, and that our primary goal should be directed at their reduction.

There are grace notes in connection with each of these proposals. One fact that few of my constituents, and perhaps even their Senators, failed to realize at the beginning of this debate is that this first $19 billion, now $15 billion, does not include any new programs; it simply represents a broad increase in existing programs, already funded generously for 1993, some at least funded at the highest level in their entire history. But suddenly now, we need more money for each one of them; that if 100 percent is insufficient to stimulate the economy, perhaps 101 percent, another 1-percent increase, will do.

At the same time, in addition to the programs which have been lovingly described, each one of which has merit—lovingly described by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee—in addition to that—I was going to say the clearer "implication," but it is not an implication; it is a precise element of the proposal that these programs must not be paid for now. They must go on the cuff. In order to have any effect, they must be added to the debt of the United States. And no significant portion of the wherewithal to pay for them should come from the present Government or from the present economy.

In other words, we want these programs, but we want our grandchildren to pay for them. In fact, we can multiply and say our great, great grandchildren, because who in this body seriously believes that in his or her lifetime this debt will be paid off? This current $15 billion will be in addition to the debt of the United States for what, three decades, a century? Our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, and their children will literally be paying for it forever, the interest on the debt, created to stimulate 3- or 4-month jobs to build particular public works. They are unwilling to pay for this proposal. This is the chasm between the two sides.

It would seem to this Senator fairly obvious that if $290 billion in deficit—that is to say, a Federal Government which spends $290 billion more than it takes in—if that is an insufficient stimulus to the economy, how in the world is adding $7 billion or $10 billion or $15 billion to that deficit going to stimulate the economy? If $1.5 trillion is not enough to spend, how will $15 billion more suddenly revitalize the economy of the United States?

Mr. President, to summarize, it seems to me that most of our articulate citizens are wiser than we are. They see any uncompensated spending bill as increasing the pressure to increase taxes even more. They see the defeat of a spending bill to lower the pressure on increasing a tax burden, which they already regard as too onerous.

Mr. President, it seems to me clear that they are right. Their message is: Cut spending first. And that, of course, is what the amendment proposed by the distinguished Republican leader and the senior Senator from Oregon proposes to do; to spend a modest portion of what is asked on those items which will clearly create jobs, at least in the short-term, but to pay for them in some other Federal program.

Can it seriously be argued that while this $15 billion is absolutely essential to our economy, there is not 1 percent of the rest of the Federal budget which cannot be canceled in order to pay for it? Does that not cry louder than any speech on the floor of this Senate to the true importance of this spending, that its proponents cannot find 1 percent of the rest of the budget to cancel in order to pay for it and to keep that bill from going to our grandchildren?

Mr. President, to this Senator at least, the answer seems self-evident. To this Senator, the jobs vote is a vote for the Dole-Hatfield proposal, or for no bill at all; that to add to our debt, to add to the pressure on our private economy, will almost certainly destroy two jobs in the private sector for every job that this direct Federal spending will add.

The jobs vote on this proposal is yes on this amendment, and if it fails, no on the entire bill. That is the argument we make. That is what the people wish: Cut spending first. We cannot stimulate an economy with an extra $10 to $15 billion in deficit when we have not sufficiently stimulated it with a $290 billion deficit.

First, it is dubious, questionable, almost certainly counterproductive from a jobs point of view to spend this money and effectively to take it from the private sector.

Second, if we are determined to do so, we should at least do it in a way which does not add to our bill for debt service literally forever, and have the courage to find a way to pay for it, or withdraw a set of ideas which will benefit a handful of good grant writers in various Government agencies, but hurt the economy of the country as a whole.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington a question.

How do the Republicans pay for their amendment?

Mr. GORTON. During the current fiscal year, as I understand the explanation from the Senator from Oregon, it is taken out of the administration, out of various agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator say that again, please?

Mr. GORTON. As I understand the explanation of the Senator from Oregon—who would perhaps be a better subject for the question of the Senator from West Virginia—it is taken out of administrative costs of the Federal Government in its various agencies.

Mr. BYRD. Does that not cost jobs? Does that not cut jobs?

Mr. GORTON. Well, if it sends some people whose jobs are unnecessary in the public sector into the private sector, my guess is it will create two jobs in that private sector for every job it will cost in the public sector. That, I say to the Senator from West Virginia, is precisely the argument.

But to spend $15 billion to do that, we do not have to add the pressure on the budget deficit to borrow that. To drive up interest rates is going to hurt the private sector on an order of two jobs for every one that it can conceivably create.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator is proposing to cut jobs across the board—across the board. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I believe he is on my Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior. Does he have any ideas as to what impact that

would have on the Interior Department? We have been operating on budgets that are cut to the bone, as far as our Interior Subcommittee is concerned, Mr. President. We have been operating under very tightly constricted allocations.

The Senator is on my subcommittee. He knows the importance of that subcommittee to himself, to his State, to Western States. I have often said it is a Western State subcommittee. He surely knows the impact that this amendment that is offered by the Republicans would have on that Department, the Interior Department, and the various agencies that are included.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. No, not at this point.

So we have a proposal for our new President that attempts to pump funds and to identify backlogs and known resource restoration requirements, and the Members on the other side of the aisle do not want to let those projects go forward.

Mr. President, the American people have seen a minority of Senators use the rules of the Senate, appropriately as far as the rules are concerned—they can be used by Senators—but inappropriately in an effort to avoid a vote on the President's package.

They have offered amendments. They have had those amendments rejected. Yet, they then say, "Well, we cannot amend the bill, but you cannot pass it either. We will not let you vote on it unless you redo it to our satisfaction."

The American people have seen a minority keep a vital piece of the President's economic plan from being implemented in a timely manner, and they have seen that minority perpetuate the gridlock the people themselves told us last November that they were tired of watching.

President Clinton was elected to provide the leadership this country so badly needs. He was elected by the people to change the failed economic policies of past administrations—past administrations—the failed economic policies that put us where we are today.

Oh, the born-again, pay-as-you-go crowd, we hear talking; born-again Senators who are against deficit spending. Their administrations were in the White House for 12 years when we saw the national debt quadrupled, the budget deficits become triple-digit billion-dollar deficits for the first time in the history of this country, and the interest on the national debt rise from $69 billion in 1981 to $200 billion. That is a hidden tax. The minority cries out about taxes. What about the tax—the hidden tax that everybody pays on that national debt which ballooned during their administrations—and the economic policies, failed economic policies of past administrations? What we see going on here in this body is minority Members saying they do not care what the American people want.

Now, I do not believe all the Members on that side say that, but the collective action—collective action, which is to do nothing if you will not rewrite the bill to suit us—the collective action sends that message. It does not make any difference whom the people elected last November, the minority has chosen to use the filibuster—and that is just what it is, despite what they would like people to think—to keep this bill from being voted on in this body.

Why are they doing this? What reasons could they have for telling the American people that they are willing to kill an important part of the President's economic plan? What will they say to the thousands of Americans who would otherwise be put to work as a consequence of this bill, if it is not passed?

For the past 11 days, what we have been hearing from our Republican friends is a virtual avalanche of rhetoric about deficit spending. Can you believe it? We are drowning in a sea of oratory from those on the other side of the aisle that the President's plan to put America back to work will add to the deficit. Suddenly they have become concerned about the deficit. Where was that concern in 1981 when we passed the Reagan tax bill which added to the deficit and which added to the debt, probably to the tune of nearly $3 trillion by now?

Some argue they did not like this piece of the bill or that piece of the bill. But when Senator HATFIELD and I put forth amendments that spoke to those objections, they fell back to their antideficit argument.

Now, besides being wrong, just plain wrong, those arguments are bewildering, in view of the past actions of those who are now decrying the deficits.

Well, I, for one, am amazed, to put it somewhat mildly, to witness this new Republican spirit here in the Senate. I am amazed that many of our colleagues who are clamoring the loudest about deficits are the very same Senators who came to the floor time after time after time and voted for deficit spending when it was proposed by their Presidents. They were our Presidents, too, but the titular heads of their party.

Where were the voices that now decry the morality of Federal spending when the deficit literally exploded during the 1980's? Where were these Senators when President Reagan's budget sent the deficit from $74 billion in fiscal year 1981 to $120 billion in fiscal year 1982? I do not remember anyone from that side coming to the floor and trying to filibuster President Reagan's budget until he sent up a plan that was fully paid for.

Back then, our colleagues did not seem to mind the fact that the President's economic plans called for massive amounts of deficit spending. Back then, our Republican friends did not seem to mind the policy of strapping our children with unprecedented amounts of debt.

There have been some very salty tears shed today and over the past few days concerning the burden that we are going to add to our children's heavy loads by passing this bill—which, it has been explained time and time again, is paid for in the overall comprehensive package for which almost all the Democrats voted a few days ago. Republican Senators talk about strapping our children with unprecedented amounts of debt. The reason we are in the trouble we are in today right in this country is because of the policies, the economic policies, in the main, that were proposed and promoted and pushed through the Congress by Republican Presidents in the last 12 years.

Any major cuts in defense spending during those years would not have gone anywhere. Any any attempt to raise revenues during those years in order to keep from passing the burden on to our children and grandchildren would have been vetoed. Congress could not have overridden the President's veto. So the dilemma we are in right today can be traced back to those days when we had the borrow-and-spend crowd in the White House.

Back then, our Republican colleagues did not seem to mind the fact that the President's economic plans called for massive amounts of deficit spending. Back then, they did not seem to mind a policy of strapping our children and our grandchildren with unprecedented amounts of debt. They passed on the huge tax cuts to the wealthy in this country, making our children pay for the tax expenditures in their time.

Good morning in America. Have a free lunch. Enjoy today at the expense of tomorrow. Those were the Reagan years.

Back then, they did not seem to mind policies that added to the deficits. Back then, with a Republican President, it was OK. Where were those voices of fiscal salvation? Where were those born-again Republicans when President Reagan took the debt on a soaring flight into the stratosphere and virtually tripled it during his administration?

I can tell you, Mr. President, they were not here on the floor attempting to filibuster their own President's economic plan. They did not come here and insist that every dollar of spending proposed by the administration be paid for up front. And they do not argue with that when they come before the Appropriations Committee either, I can guarantee you that. Oh, the appeals, the requests I get from my friends just on my subcommittee. "Do not worry about paying for it up front."

They did not think it was so terrible to use deficit spending to fund the star wars program back then when the Re-

publicans held the White House. I voted for it. People said give him a chance, give the President a chance.

There is no sense in trying to fool the American people. We all know what the difference is between those years and now. It was OK to have deficits back then. Nobody paid any attention to the deficits back then. It was: Borrow and spend. Pass the debts on to our children. Everybody is happy. People only want to hear goods news. So they heard good news every morning from the White House. And now the chickens are coming home to roost.

It was OK to have deficits back then because they were being used to finance the military buildup that the Republican Presidents so desperately wanted. It was OK to push their borrow-and-spend policies back then because the dollars were being spent on new weapons to fight the cold war and being spent on tax expenditures to benefit the rich in this country. That kind of spending was considered politically correct.

I say to my colleagues, the cold war is over, it is finished. It is now time to look to the needs of our own people, to help alleviate their suffering and to put them back to work.

So why have our Republican friends suddenly had a change of heart? Why do they insist on crippling this President, this new President? He has only been in office 90 days today; 90 days. Why did they not use the same tactics they are using now against their own President? Those are the questions that should be asked, and many of those who do ask the questions are the unemployed, or the underemployed, that would be helped by President Clinton's plan. They want to know why this minority of Republican Senators have chosen this time when the people are most in need to use this filibuster, their filibuster, a Republican filibuster.

The American people want to know why the Republicans have chosen this time, when our economy is in such a fragile state, to have suddenly found religion. Religion: Pay for it, pay-as-you-go, do not add to the deficits, do not add to the debt, do not add to the burden of our children and our grandchildren. The minority has now got religion. Suddenly found. Born again.

Well, what are the Republicans going to say to the American people when they are asked why it was OK to spend billions of dollars bailing out the savings and loans that were mismanaged under those Republican administrations? That all added to the deficit. But now it is not OK to spend a modest amount to bail out the unemployed in America.

Why was it OK to put those funds off budget for the savings and loan bailout so it did not have to be paid for in the years they were provided? Those funds were put off budget. They were not paid for. But they added to the deficit. I think the people would be right to ask why our Republican friends did not filibuster and demand that those funds not be appropriated until they were fully paid for. I say, let our friends on the other side of the aisle come forward and explain why they have now suddenly found religion.

Now that we have a new President, let them tell the public why, if their maneuvering has nothing to do with embarrassing our new President, they have suddenly had a change of heart and are now demanding what they have never demanded before—what they have never demanded before. Let them tell the American people why they are perpetuating the gridlock that has for too long gripped this body. Let them tell the American people why, even after the President has offered a compromise to move the process along, they still dig in their heels based on an ideology that they have not practiced in the past.

Fortunately, the American people are not as naive as some of our friends may think. People are quite capable of seeing through the smokescreen the minority has thrown up as an excuse of continuing the politics of the past. The people know that this newfound Republican zealotry does not square with their past actions. People sent us a message last November that they do not want gridlock to continue. And it is time, I think, for the people to hear, for our friends in this body to hear the people.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). The Senator from West Virginia has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, let me talk just a little bit about the Committee on Appropriations which I chair. The original economic stimulus proposal submitted by President Clinton and pending before the Senate at this moment includes a total of $748 million for agencies under the jurisdiction of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee, which I chair.

These funds are proposed for critical backlogs of identified facility maintenance and repair projects throughout our public lands infrastructure and in our Indian schools. Some of these funds are proposed for restoration of the natural and cultural resources for which the Federal Government has responsibility. Other funding is proposed for road maintenance and repair backlogs. Some of these funds are proposed for energy efficiency and conservation measures.

Madam President, I call these initiatives to the attention of my colleagues, and especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because these are many of the same types of projects that, year after year after year, Members of the Senate write to me about and request funding increases over budgeted amounts.

I have stood on this floor as manager of the Interior appropriations bill for days on end, as Members debate one issue after another affecting the public lands of our country, an issue that is most important to western Senators in particular. Many of these lands are in the West, and the programs and the agencies in the Interior bill are of vital importance to those States.

We hear the repeated cry of the impact of the public lands on the economy of the West. Well, as I said a moment ago, here we have a proposal from our new President that attempts to pump funds into identified backlogs and known resource restoration requirements, and the Members on the other side of the aisle simply do not get it; they do not want to let those projects go forward.

These are not make work projects or new initiatives. They come from identified backlogs and priorities, backlogs that have accumulated over the years: Maintenance and repair, and so on. And the need to do this work will not disappear if these funds are not provided. I hope our friends will keep that in mind.

Let us talk for a minute about the economic impact. Many of these public lands are located in remote rural areas of the country. Funding provided for maintenance and resource restoration will be available for hiring of additional personnel to plant the trees, grade the roads, repair the roofs, operate the campgrounds, restore the watersheds, clear the trails, improve the electrical wiring, fix the sewage systems, stabilize the shore lines, and so forth and so on.

All of these relate to protection of the resource and the provision of services. Try to tell the communities that border on our national parks and refuges and forests and depend on the tourism dollar that these investments are not needed. You tell those people in the Western States that those investments are not needed, and in the Eastern States as well.

Who gets hired to do the work? It is not men and women from West Virginia who go to the State of Washington or to the other States on the far west coast, the State of Oregon, to help with reforestation. It will be displaced timber workers from Forks and Packwood and Roseburg and Grants Pass.

Let me mention briefly the backlogs that exist for the Interior bill agencies. In total, the identified backlogs contain an estimated $6 billion in project work that would be necessary to bring projects up to standard. The biggest single piece of this exists in the National Park Service.

We have all read about the problem of loving our parks to death. The Department of the Interior supports

about 450 million annual visits to its resources. The Forest Service supports an additional 500 million visits annually. Those visitor loads affect not just the physical infrastructure but the natural infrastructure as well. The physical plan of the Park Service includes 15,000 buildings, 8,000 miles of roads, 1,400 bridges, 5,000 housing units, and approximately 1,500 water and sewer systems. Of the 359 units in the park system, 203 are predominantly cultural sites. Hence, they might not have a huge land base but extraordinary measures are necessary to protect the resource, whether it be Independence Hall in Philadelphia or the Hamilton Grange in New York or Petroglyphs in New Mexico.

The BIA is responsible for 182 bureau-funded schools and 22,000 miles of reservation roads. Unemployment on Indian reservations averaged 50 percent last year, with some areas experiencing unemployment as high as 90 percent. I hardly call that pork-barrel spending.

Madam President, if this type of infrastructure is not maintained, the cost to protect these resources will just increase in the future. These resources may deteriorate beyond repair. Now we have the opportunity to do something about them, to catch up on the backlog, put people to work repairing the facilities. If we invest the funding now, we can protect and restore many of the problems which so many of my colleagues have been diligent about bringing to my attention each year in the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. They have been very diligent about bringing to my attention each year those needs. But today they say, "Oh, no, forget the needs, forget the maintenance and repair, forget the backlogs, got to pay for it."

For those who would suggest we should revoke funds already appropriated for this fiscal year to offset the cost—that is what they say—of the stimulus package, I dare suggest that they would be quick to cry out if the funds were taken from some of the very programs that they sought increased funding for during consideration of the Interior bill only last summer—last summer. There would be considerable mirth and the ripples thereof would go across this Chamber out through the galleries and right through that camera up there if one could but see the number of requests that I receive from my dear friends on the minority side who want more money, more money, more money in the Interior appropriations.

It is a great subcommittee. As I say, it is really a Western subcommittee. It helps out all over the country, but the West in particular, and how eager they are, how eager those Senators are to share the allocations. And I do not blame them. They are diligent in pressing for the needs of their people in their States.

I do not quarrel with them for that. But here today it is a different note that is sounded on the bugle. O, we have got to pay for it. We cannot add to the deficit. These maintenance and repairs backlogs, just forget it.

We faced a situation in the Interior Subcommittee over the past several years where the allocations to the subcommittee have been at or below the CBO baseline. Now, you might say, "Well, Senator Byrd, if anyone could fix that situation, you could." And I would respond that I have attempted to set an example of fiscal responsibility with my own subcommittee. I have maintained that it would be unfair for me to expect the other subcommittees to restrain spending if I were not willing to try to do so with my own subcommittee.

And yet, for all the preaching about deficits and the need to reduce spending, the oratory sure seems to be forgotten, forgotten when it comes time to develop the amendment request letters that I receive.

Alexander, in the first years of his reign, when capital causes were brought before him, he used to stop one of his ears with his hand, while the plaintiff was opening the indictment, that he might reserve it perfectly unprejudiced for hearing the defendant.

Well, I have tried to keep both ears open. I have heard those who come before my subcommittee with their pleas. They write letters to me, which I appreciate, and they come to me on the floor, sit down beside me and tell me about their letters and how important all this is to their States. And they are doing their work. That is the work they are supposed to do for their States. I do that for my State.

But we are hearing a different cry today. My eardrums are resounding with the drumbeat, not so muffled a drumbeat: "Let's pay for it. Don't add to the deficit."

Since I took over as chairman of the Appropriations Committee in 1989, the amendment requests to the subcommittee have grown considerably. For fiscal year 1990 there were about 2,000 requests for amendments to the Interior bill. Last year, fiscal year 1993, there were a little over 3,200 requests. This is an increase of nearly 60 percent.

Granted, some of those requests were for programs of national interest. Most, however, were State-specific in nature. And when a request comes in at the door of the Interior Subcommittee, it is treated the same whether it be a letter from one Senator or a letter cosigned by 50 or more Senators.

The Energy Weatherization Grant Program is proposed to receive funds in the President's stimulus package. I would note this program is the subject of an annual letter, usually signed by at least half the Members of the Senate—they are not all on this side of the aisle either by any means—requesting substantial funding increases.

I am puzzled as to Senators who can support that program on the one hand and then 8 months later denounce funding for it in the bill before the Senate.

Last year alone, from members of my own subcommittee, over 700 requests were received totaling some $2.3 billion—just from members of my own subcommittee—totaling some $2.3 billion in requested add-ons. Now, think of that. Both sides of the aisle contribute to this situation. It is not all one side of the aisle—both sides.

The picture does not improve much when one looks at the full committee or the Senate as a whole. Many of the Members with some of the largest requests, the largest requests that come to my subcommittee, are opposing this stimulus package. I will not identify any individual, but I can tell you that some of the very same Members—and we all know who they are—who stand on the floor preaching about fiscal responsibility and the need to cut Government spending do not believe very much in individual responsibility when it comes time to request projects in the Interior appropriations bill.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 14 minutes 12 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. I reserve that time. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. I was not here when the time was arranged. Do we have a certain amount of time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The side of the Senator from New Mexico has 27 minutes 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I certainly do not want to use all of our time. Could I yield myself 5 minutes at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me first start by, in my own way, trying to tell the Senate what this debate is about, and what it is not about.

There are Members who want to compare 10 years ago or 8 years ago or 6 years ago with what is going on now in terms of a growing deficit then and a growing sense of frustration on our side now. I am not accusatory of anyone, but let me first take the deficit as it accrued before 1990 and just make sure that everybody understands that that is not a Republican deficit.

We have heard so many times that that deficit is a Reagan or a Bush deficit. Let me just repeat, if you are talking about the Reagan tax cut, the vote was 89 to 11. Many Democrats voted for that tax cut. So why do we call it a Reagan tax cut? All those Democrats who voted for it, did somebody say to them, if you do not vote for that, something is going to happen to you?

They voted for it. Now they are saying that lost us our resources, so that is why we need to raise taxes.

Frankly, I do not want to argue that point. But the truth of the matter is that revenues never went down in America. They went up. It is just that spending did not come down. I really am not accusatory at all of the appropriations process in that dramatic increase. What I do get a bit upset about is that the fiscal plan the President has sent us does not do anything but cut appropriations, and in that regard it cuts only defense. It does not permanently change the entitlements, I say to my friend from West Virginia. It does not permanently change any mandatory spending. So actually we are not going to be any further along once we are off this stimulus package and when we implement the rest of the President's plan because it is all essentially taxes, and the deficit is going to be right back up in 4 years. It is not going to be down. It is going to start up. And in 6 years, 7 years it is going to be close to where we started.

Now, having said that, there also has been some discussion that we have done this kind of urgent supplemental, maybe even some have said emergency supplementals, many times in the past.

Well, I have checked that, and frankly I am not going to argue whether there were many of them in the past. My research indicates that most cases since the 1990 budget agreement had to do with Desert Storm and other real natural disasters.

Why do I say that? Because in 1990, we entered into a new agreement. The President spoke of a new covenant. There was a new covenant, I say to my friend from West Virginia, in 1990, not 1980 or 1983—in 1990. We said we are going to pay as you go if you have new programs, or if you want to exceed the statutory spending caps in the law, pay for it. That was known as pay-as-you-go.

That was the rule, pay-as-you-go. What else did we say? We said you have to have a real emergency to break the caps and not have to pay-as-you-go—in other words to break those mandatory spending limits.

Why would we change that now? Does anybody really believe that this $16.3 billion in new spending, other than the $4 billion unemployment compensation funds, is really beset with a national emergency that such spending is going to resolve? I do not believe that. I am beginning to think the American people are agreeing with us. They do not believe that. It is an effort to spend more money, and, yes, spend more money and not pay for it.

Some might say it is a small amount. I am not so sure the American people expect us to get a deficit under control by cutting $100 billion here, $100 billion there. I think they are thinking $16 billion here and $16 billion there is the way we are going to do it. And this so-called stimulus package is saying that aside from the unemployment compensation funds about $12 billion in new program funding is not going to be paid for, we are going to spend it, and you are not even subjecting it to the discipline of the 1990 agreement. You are going to break the statutory spending caps.

The Republicans are saying, and I think rightly so, the American people are frightened to death of the awesome noise of this huge tax package coming down, energy taxes in excess of $75 billion on everybody, almost nobody escapes it, the remainder of this package of $267 billion in new taxes and user fees. They are wondering what in the world is happening? Where are the cuts? That is why they are responding when we are saying cut this so-called stimulus package. And any rhetoric that says the President is paying for it with his overall plan is merely saying we are taxing the American people more to pay for this. That is in the scheme of the President's plan. He is going to reduce deficits almost totally by increases in taxes.

If you get the Congressional Budget Office to tell you about the overall budget, the big package, it is about $9 billion in domestic cuts and defense cuts net combined—about $9 billion with $267 billion in taxes.

They are saying, wait a minute. Let us not spend more money. Let us cut spending. We are saying let us dramatically cut the President's so-called stimulus package, and we are saying, in essence, not only do we want a smaller one, but we want to pay for all of it except unemployment compensation, which has already been declared emergency spending.

So we want to use the rules that exist today in the budget process, the 1990 agreement, that says pay-as-you-go. We are paying as we go.

Having said that, I am not going to go into the details of the new Byrd-Mitchell amendment. Suffice it to say that it comes nowhere close to the Republican package in terms of cutting spending. I have kind of a new idea that this package is not necessarily the two sponsors' plan for the future, but it is what the President's is.

It seems to me we were accused of trickle-down economics. I think we have a new version, which is trickle-up economics: You tax the public, take it to the Government, then you spend it; thus, it will trickle up in jobs. Very interesting.

I think we can tell why that means that the package—and I have not done a new model on Senator BYRD's amendment—but the original President's package cost $90,000 a job. That ought to be a forerunner and a warning that you are not going to build jobs and strengthen the American economy and its job production qualities by spending more money, because you are going to have to tax way too much for what you spend, and the net result will be less growth, not more.

So I compliment Senator HATFIELD, our leader, on this amendment, and this particular exercise of the last few weeks wherein the Republicans have clearly differed with reference to this so-called stimulus package. I further compliment him for the items that he put in our package along with our Republican leader, Senator DOLE, as its cosponsor.

Frankly, I do not know that we need new immunization money, because I think we might have enough for the rest of the year. We will have another appropriations vehicle, but we want to make sure. So we say we will go along with putting that in the bank, so to speak.

On highways, we think we ought to put in money that will spend out as fast as possible, and I think that is what our leaders are trying to do in moving toward maintenance money. Then the other items within it, including some money for the SBA to make guaranteed loans, which will generate in my opinion the jobs, are underestimated there. I think it will produce some real economic vitality.

So I am not so sure we are going to win with our amendment. I do not know whether our friend from Oregon has speculated on whether we are going to win or not. But I think we proposed some real constructive thoughts for the American people, and I think they are joining us. Why spend more money when you are taxing America to get the deficit under control? Why not tax them less and spend less?

Second, we are making the point that most of the spending package that the President has proposed under the guise of stimulus are really ongoing programs of the Government, very typical to what we do every year, that we appropriate for. And they are not very different. We are already in the red $323 billion. That is the amount of stimulus in the form of the deficit that is already in the fiscal plan of this Nation. Why would we really believe we ought to spend $16 billion, $19 billion, or $20 billion more, and that that might significantly stimulate the economy?

So I thank the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee for leaving enough time for me to say a few words.

Mr. President, I have another issue I would like to raise with my colleagues. It has been said we ought to really stimulate our economy like the Japanese have proposed. I have a brief analysis of how different the two economies are. You are going to stimulate the Japanese economy, which has very little deficit as a proportion of their GDP in debt, and talk about America doing the same when we have almost five times the proportion of debt compared

to Japan, and our deficit is almost eight times as high as theirs in terms of ratios.

Some who are promoting the President's spending plan say: If Japan can announce a big new Government spending package, why can't we.

It is estimated that Japan plans about $70 billion in new spending. I believe that if United States accounting methods were used to evaluate the real stimulus components of the Japanese plan, their proposal would be much smaller than is currently advertised—maybe half as large, closer to $35 billion.

But the size of their package compared to the President's is not what's important here.

The important point is that there is a world of difference between Japan's fiscal situation and ours—a difference that argues for exactly opposite fiscal policies for the two countries.

Government borrowing demands are low in Japan. The Japanese Government projects their budget deficit to be 8.1 trillion yen for 1993. That's about $45 billion or 1½ percent of their GDP compared to an estimated 5.2 percent for the United States in 1993.

Saving rates in Japan are among the highest in the industrialized world, partly explained by their low Government borrowing demands.

Excess saving in Japan is currently being used to finance large trade surpluses. In fact, they are the world's largest net foreign lender.

The point is, Japan's excess saving could easily be used instead to stimulate their own economy through a sizable Government stimulus program.

Our situation is exactly the opposite—too little national saving. Our 5 percent household saving rate is one-third of Japan's and our national savings rate is half theirs.

Low national saving here results from our large Federal deficits that syphon off private saving. This leaves little for U.S. capital formation.

Unpaid for new spending would make the situation worse by increasing the Federal deficit.

Japan has the fiscal latitude to take that option; we do not.

The President's package of spending increases, left unpaid for, will only leave us in a worse situation with less saving available for private sector growth in the future.

In the latter half of the 1980's, declining trade and Government imbalances among countries—in particulars, declining trade surpluses in Japan and smaller Federal deficits as a share of GDP in the United States—helped to extend the record-breaking global expansion. Let us not forget that lesson.

Promoting increased Government spending in Japan will reduce their trade surpluses and help to lift export growth elsewhere, including the United States Promoting decreased Government spending in the United States will restrain borrowing from abroad, improve United States capital formation, and lift our long-term growth.

Sometimes opposites are most compatible.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am sure all of us on both sides of the aisle have come to understand that when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] speaks to matters relating to the budget, he speaks as probably one of the leading authorities in this body and probably one of the leading authorities in the entire Congress and perhaps the entire Federal Government. I listen always with great attention because of the fact that he has this expertise and it is well to heed his counsel.

Madam President, I want to just make a few responding remarks to those recently made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, my close companion as well as friend on most matters relating to appropriations. At the risk of being redundant, I heard the call saying: Where were the voices on this side of the aisle during the years of Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush when these deficits were escalating at astronomical figures? Where were the voices of moderation or restraint as related to adding to those horrendous deficits?

Madam President, first of all, if I might personalize it for a moment, I stand here as one of those voices. I stand here as one of those voices because I voted against every one of those appropriations bills that related to this vast, unnecessary military buildup that, in major part, created the red part of those charts which the chairman has been demonstrating.

But I also want to say, at the fear of being redundant, that those budget appropriations and actions of the Congress in moving that upward was a partnership with a dynamic White House calling for such increased appropriations and actions by the Congress. And that partnership further broke down not only between the Congress as a whole, who has this power of the purse strings, a part of that red ink, without the role of the Congress in some form or another, and the White House, but there were additional partnerships within the Congress.

During all 12 years of the Reagan-Bush years, the Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, and those bills of appropriations had to initiate there. They had to be approved here on the Senate side and had to get the signature of the President. And each time there were efforts not only on the part of a few of us on this side to reduce those requests further, particularly in the military area—again, I recite, SDI, MX missile, and nerve gas—we had a handful of votes here. We controlled the Senate for those 6 years. But it was the two handfuls from the other side of the aisle that made the partnership that gave President Reagan every single one of those weapons. The House itself was totally controlled by the Democrats for 12 years, and the Senate was controlled by the Republicans for 6 of those years and, yet, the gang of six on our side that dissented from our party was offset by the partnership of Democrats and Republicans giving to the President every one of those items.

So, again, as the President said in his State of the Union Address, there is enough blame to go around. But to somehow imply the idea that these deficits were created by a Republican White House without that full partnership of the Congress and that full partnership of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress is unfair. So there is that sufficient blame.

I hear the voice saying, well, perhaps then we are learning a new song, a new gospel. But I think we all heard about this last election turning in part on a time for change, new ways of doing things. Maybe we were more converted than the other side of the aisle to that new change, because we suggest that changes start today. Pay for it, and not add to the deficits through Republican and Democratic administrations through the past with the actions of the Congress who cooperated with the Republican and Democratic Presidents. Maybe this is the time for the change. Maybe this is the new song of change that we represent here today.

I think that the President has failed in saying, in effect, that he needs this money now as represented in his programs.

Let me take a particular area that the chairman has indicated in the Interior Subcommittee programs of the Appropriations Committee, which he chairs, of which I wanted to be a part. And for his great sensitivity to western land problems, I give him accolades. No one in this Senate equals the sensitivity of the Senator from West Virginia to western land problems. He is truly our friend. But is that additional money the President has asked for in his package demanded today? That is the question. Have we run out of money in those programs? Again, I am referring to Mr. Panetta's document as to the obligations of those appropriations of 1993 that have been obligated thus far.

Let us take the road maintenance and repair that we heard today as being important—and they are; we know of the backlog. Madam President, out of the 1993 appropriations measure, 10 percent has been expended on road maintenance and facility repair in the Interior Department; 10 percent in the first quarter. Let us double that, just to be fair about this. We are approaching the 6-month period, the halfway place in the appropriations year. Let us double that and say 20 percent. Madam President, that fails the test of money

requirement now to sustain that program, with the moneys already in that account.

Let us take the National Park Service, repair and maintenance, Interior. Twenty-two percent of that appropriation of 1993 has been committed in the first quarter. Let us again apply the second-quarter analysis at the end of this month. Let us say 44 percent. That is a failure to prove the need for money in that account as of now in this package.

I could go on and indicate, as I did, especially in the Community Development Block Grant Program with $8.8 billion of carryover yet unexpended, unobligated funds in that account as of the first quarter—no, the end of February on that one.

So the question is not whether we support road maintenance and upgrading and safety measures in our national parks, in our western land programs, et cetera. The question is: Do they need the money now, as represented and incorporated in the President's proposal?

Let me also go back to one basic definition in the Budget Act of 1974 that we are operating under. This is an emergency supplemental. "Emergency" is defined as some unexpected, sudden change in program that requires additional money. This is an emergency by a declaration of the President. But it does not really follow that definition in the Budget Act, because these statistics, and others that I have indicated before, do not prove a sudden change in effect. Even if you take the whole economy and give it the worst case scenario, as the President has done to justify a jobs bill, there is money in the account. There is unexpended, unobligated funds in many, if not most, of those accounts.

It does not follow the definition. Why is it used? Simply for this reason: We do not have to account for it under the current caps. We merely add it to the accumulated deficit. That is why the term "emergency" was used, to get around the Budget Act in counting this against the current caps that were adopted in the 5-year plan, the summit plan, some 3 years ago. That has been used. This is not the first time it has been used. The Senator from West Virginia has indicated foreign aid, on which so-called emergency was used to get around the caps.

But that is the old way of doing it. This is a new day, a new day of change. This is a new gospel we hear now in the political arena. Stop the old ways of adding to the deficit; borrow and spend, borrow and spend.

We say, spend for these specific needs where definition can be complied with the budget resolution and at the same time represent the needs of people. Keep within the caps. That is the distinction between these two programs.

Plus the fact we are only about $1.5 billion apart, if you want to break the 2-year program of the President down to 1 year, and this is a 1-year program initially as we presented it.

But I just want to say again, there is no way you can put all of the onus of deficit making on one side of the aisle or the other or on a White House, unrelated to the support of the Congress and the support of a bipartisan Congress.

I want to just add one other historical note. If you really want to predate and find the date of origin of this kind of deficit spending, you have to go back to 1932. You have to go back to 1932 when Mr. Hoover, the outgoing President, had elevated the deficit for that year to about $3.2 billion for job creating activity, and the Democratic candidate, in attacking Mr. Hoover's record, called him a deficit-spending President.

But then, Madam President, as you see us going through an attempt to recover from that Depression, moving into World War II, moving into the cold war, moving into the Korean war, moving into the Vietnam war, moving into the Great Society, all of these programs, after 50 years of that coming down the track, this locomotive is about ready to crush us. And through that period of time, there was only 1 year, as I recall, of the Eisenhower 8-year administration that balanced the budget—only 1 year.

So we have had a Democrat, a Republican, Democrats, Republicans, and we are bearing today the burden of that history. But it is not just recent history of 12 years. This is 50 years of history. And perhaps we are a little slow to hear a call for change.

But that is why I feel we can stand here with an option and alternative that is responsible to the people's call to prove your ability to cut spending before you talk to us about new taxes. We are doing that here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, a question has been raised with reference to unobligated balances.

Unobligated balances occur when appropriations remain uncommitted to specific programs, projects, or activities. This does not mean that the funds will not be spent for a productive purpose. Different programs use appropriations at different rates. Some spend at an even rate over the fiscal year; others spend out late in the year or in future years.

Because Government agencies cannot enter into contracts until appropriations are made, sometimes several months pass before plans are drawn, public hearings are held, and contracts are awarded.

For instance, my friend from Oregon cited the Community Development Block Grant Program as having a large, unobligated balance. I believe he used the figure of $8 billion. The Department of Housing and Urban Development tells us the balance is $3.1 billion.

While these funds remain unobligated, they are not unspoken for. Eight hundred and eighty-nine cities and counties are entitled to receive these funds. They are drawing their plans, holding their hearings, preparing their contracts for sewer systems, improving neighborhood facilities, and Government services. When their work is done, they will call upon these funds to accomplish these tasks and, therefore, I think we should not equate the word "unobligated" with the word "unneeded."

Now, as I said earlier, the distinguished Senator from Oregon has mentioned the fact that we were quick to forgive some of our foreign friends, foreign indebtedness. Let me say again on this point that the 1990 budget agreement was a bipartisan agreement. We all remember that there were some prior revisions that the Bush administration wanted that exempted certain discretionary items from the caps completely, yet they were added to the deficit.

These were $12,313,857,000 for the U.S. share of the IMF—International Monetary Fund—increase as provided for in the fiscal year 1993 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act and as permitted under section 251(b)2(c) of the Budget Enforcement Act. Second, forgiveness of $6,998,100,000 of Egypt's foreign military sales indebtedness to the United States, as provided for in the fiscal year 1991 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act and permitted under section 251(b)2(b) of the Budget Enforcement Act.

Remember, the Bush administration wanted these items exempted from the caps.

Forgiveness of $1.593 billion of Poland's indebtedness to the United States as provided for in the fiscal year 1991 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

These funds did not even need to be designated as emergency requirements, Madam President. These provisions were not added at my request, but at the request of the Republican administration, the Bush administration.

Congress, in the fiscal year 1991 Dire Emergency Supplemental, also appropriated a total of $850 million for grants to Israel and to Turkey. These funds were designated as emergency requirements.

So there you have it. The Bush administration was quite willing to help foreign governments to the extent of canceling out their indebtedness in some instances, exempting those costs from the caps. So it is an emergency when it applies to helping foreign countries, but when it comes to helping our own country and our own people, it is pay-as-you-go.

There is going to be another supplemental bill coming along here shortly, Madam President, and contained in it will likely be aid for Russia. On April 2, the distinguished minority leader came to the floor and said President Clinton had the support of his side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, for assisting Russia.

Well, I do not know whether or not I am optimistic—I may not be too optimistic—about the prospects for that Russian aid. I may be wrong, but I think many Members of the Senate and many Members of the other body, the House of Representatives, may have a tough time supporting that aid when we cannot support help for our own people.

So killing this package may just make the Russian aid package harder to swallow, harder to pass. I wonder if our friends who expressed such support for assisting Russia thought of that. I wonder if they considered how hard they are making it on the prospects for Russian aid with their unyielding opposition to a jobs bill, a jobs bill for the American people, to give aid to the American people.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 7 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, this is all the time I will be able to yield because the majority leader is coming to the floor, also. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the distinguished floor manager because I really just want to touch on one part of this bill so that everybody will understand what is at stake here.

First of all, I want to say it is probably a tragedy that this was called a stimulus bill. It should have been called a jobs bill. Everybody is talking about how the President's rating is going down and how there is no support for the stimulus program back home. But do not call it a stimulus program when you ask the question. Call it a jobs bill. You will find that about 70 percent of the people favor that.

Let me tell you what that one little $141 million in the Byrd-Mitchell substitute does. The Small Business Administration is being overwhelmed by requests for loans. Do you know why? Because the banks will not loan them money. Do you know something else? We have used up all the money for the last quarter of this year—July, August, and September—used up because the demand is so overwhelming. And if something does not pass out of here by 1 week from yesterday, the SBA is out of the loan business.

You are always looking for good deals to invest in. Here is a deal. I defy anybody on either side of the aisle to refute these figures. I defy anybody to go home and say I voted against that appropriation for the Small Business Administration because we could not afford the $141 million.

Madam President, the way OMB scores the SBA loan program for that $141 million we get $2.6 billion in loans. Hopefully that will carry us through the rest of the year. I do not know whether it will or not because the demand for the program is so great. What do you get for that $2.6 billion in loans? You will not believe this. The first year you get 27,500 jobs. That is not my computation, that is Price Waterhouse's. It is OMB's scoring that for $141 million you get $2.6 billion in loans. And when the banks loan that money, that creates 27,500 jobs the first year, and over a period of 4 years, it creates 110,000 jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing projected jobs resulting from the small business portion of the stimulus bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—GENERAL BUSINESS (7A) LOAN INFORMATION (BY STATE) TOTAL REQUEST: $2.6 BILLION

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1993 supplemental request	Employee growth	
		1st year	4th year
Alabama	46.9	505	1,984
Alaska	17.5	188	740
Arizona	25.9	279	1,096
Arkansas	26.6	286	1,125
California	441.7	4,757	16,688
Colorado	52.8	569	2,234
Connecticut	32.2	344	1,362
Delaware	5.4	58	228
District of Columbia	18.8	203	795
Florida	88.1	949	3,727
Georgia	101.2	1,089	4,282
Hawaii	5.1	55	216
Idaho	19.9	214	842
Illinois	75.1	809	3,177
Indiana	25.9	279	1,096
Iowa	51.1	550	2,162
Kansas	34.1	367	1,443
Kentucky	20.0	215	846
Louisiana	37.5	404	1,587
Maine	19.7	212	833
Maryland	8.4	91	355
Massachusetts	33.1	357	1,400
Michigan	41.9	451	1,773
Minnesota	44.4	478	1,878
Mississippi	32.9	354	1,392
Missouri	83.7	901	3,541
Montana	39.9	430	1,688
Nebraska	20.1	216	850
Nevada	12.5	135	529
New Hampshire	40.6	437	1,718
New Jersey	41.4	446	1,752
New Mexico	27.7	298	1,172
New York	137.0	1,475	5,796
North Carolina	34.9	376	1,477
North Dakota	18.9	204	800
Ohio	54.2	584	2,293
Oklahoma	23.6	254	999
Oregon	36.1	389	1,527
Pennsylvania	55.0	592	2,327
Puerto Rico	40.1	432	1,697
Rhode Island	17.9	193	757
South Carolina	21.7	234	918
South Dakota	19.2	207	812
Tennessee	45.2	487	1,912
Texas	230.4	2,481	9,748
Utah	23.2	250	982
Vermont	25.3	273	1,070
Virginia	21.1	227	893
Washington	94.4	1,017	3,994
West Virginia	14.0	151	592
Wisconsin	81.9	882	3,465
Wyoming	9.4	101	398
National totals	2,575.6	27,735	106,968

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, look right here on the chart. They say you ought to pay for it. That it is just a tax and spend thing. Tell the people of California who are going to get 16,688 jobs out of just this small portion of the stimulus bill—California, which is going to loose 80,000 jobs just for defense base closings alone. Or, tell Michigan, which has been an economic basket case, that they do not need 11,773 jobs. All the rest of them—just look at the chart. It is on everybody's desk.

The real proof of the pudding is that at the end of 4 years the people who borrowed that $2.6 billion will begin to pay income taxes to the U.S. Treasury in the sum of over $300 million. They do not just do it the fifth year, they do it every year thereafter. You are talking about Federal Express, Apple Computer, Cray Research—all of those people started with these small loans. There are 10 companies that got loans from SBA that pay more in income taxes every year than it costs to run the whole Small Business Administration.

So do not tell me this is not a bargain that everybody here can buy into, when you get twice as much back the fifth year as the whole program costs and twice as much or more every year thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has used the time yielded to him.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes and 1 second on this side and 2 minutes 39 seconds on the other side.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I yield the remaining time on this side to Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOLE and I—Senator DOLE first, and then I follow him—be recognized for 5 minutes, with the time above the remaining time to come from our respective leader times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, first I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and particularly the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] for his efforts and his willingness to be on the floor and to provide the leadership on this side of the aisle.

Despite the best efforts of the White House to make more Government spending look like a good idea, the American people are not buying it. That is why Republicans are continuing to stand with the overwhelming majority of America on the issue of so-called economic stimulus. The choice

remains as clear today as it was when President Clinton introduced his $19 billion spending spree at the expense of the taxpayers and future generations of Americans—it is a fundamental difference, the White House still wants to spend money we do not have, and Republicans want to cut spending.

The American people are hoping that the Democrats will finally get the message—it is time to cut up Uncle Sam's credit card once and for all. The Republican alternative is paid for, and gives them that simple choice.

During this debate, we have heard all kinds of false advertising about the President's spending plan, and all kinds of reckless innuendo about Senate Republicans. Of course, all this hype is coming from inside the beltway, from professional politicians and their spin doctors. But, meanwhile, out in the real world, the spin is a lot different. Let me share with the Senate a few comments I have received from real people sending real telegrams:

The stimulus package is another tax and spend hoax.

Fourty three percent is no mandate for tax and spend.

Curtail the wasteful legislation in the Senate.

Hold fast. Cut the budget.

Kill the pork. Hang tough.

My wife and I want to surrender to you and the Republican Party any connection we have ever had with the Democratic Party. Keep up the good work.

So, let us take a moment to review where we are. The President proposed adding $19.5 billion to established and previously funded programs for the purpose of creating jobs and stimulating the economy. The proposal by the President contained no provision to pay for this nearly $20 billion in increased spending, it would merely have been charged to the deficit, added to the national debt, and sent to our children and grandchildren for payment.

The Republican response was twofold: First, we doubted whether spending $20 billion in a $6 trillion economy would do much to stimulate economic growth. Second, we demanded the package be reduced to programs that would create jobs in the near term—after all, that's why we were told this was an emergency in the first place. And third, and most importantly, we asked that everything other than unemployment insurance be paid for. That should be paid for, too, but we have already had that battle.

The President responded with a proposal that trimmed some of the spending, but not a single penny of the President's revised package was paid for. Apparently, the White House had not gotten the message all of us have been hearing loud and clear in our home States the past 2 weeks—cut spending first, and if we cannot cut it, pay for new programs with offsetting cuts in other programs.

The American people now know that gridlock starts in the Oval Office. By absolutely refusing to pay for billions and billions of dollars in new spending, the White House has turned its back on the millions of Americans who thought they were voting for change. Meanwhile, Republicans have been offering constructive opposition—good government—to protect the American taxpayers, and promote reasonable alternatives.

Therefore, we reviewed the President's requests and did what we had asked the administration to do in the first place, and what the American people have been demanding. To start, we propose to cut spending drastically. Our alternative would spend a total of $2 billion in only five programs—interstate maintenance in the highway program, immunization, summer jobs, Small Business Administration loans and natural resource protection. All but immunization are job creating programs.

This Republican alternative package, we believe, is far more appropriate to our immediate needs than throwing $15.5 billion at the more than 60 programs contained in the President's original bill.

But the biggest difference between our plan and the President's proposal is we propose paying for our package with spending cuts.

It is a clear choice, Mr. President: You can vote to increase the deficit for a big spending bill that represents everything the American people voted against last November. Or, you can vote to create jobs without threatening the economy and future generations of Americans with another increase in the deficit.

I know there has been a lot of debate about this topic. There has been a lot of discussion during the recess. But I must say this economic stimulus bill is just not a good idea. You can repackage it any way you want, the American people are not going to buy it. They want us to cut spending. If we cannot cut it, we ought to pay for it.

I know there have been hundreds of arguments made in support of this bill, and I have looked at some of them closely. There has been reference made to a jobs bill that passed Congress in 1983. There has been reference made to all these emergency bills that have passed the Congress over the past several years.

Most of the recent emergency funding was for Desert Storm. I assume we wanted to take care of our servicemen who were in that part of the world.

Of the 10 emergency bills that passed since the 1990 Budget Act, 86 percent of the funding was for Desert Shield, 14 percent was for domestic emergencies, such as Hurricane Andrew, agriculture disaster assistance, and the Los Angeles riots, and 1.51 percent was for international emergencies such as Kurdish relief. So these bills were true emergencies and that is what separates previous emergency bills from this particular bill.

And with reference to the jobs bill that passed back in 1983, I must say I think a lot of us made a mistake in voting for that. The Government Accounting Office did a review of that bill. I would like to put a summary of the GAO report in the RECORD at this point:

GAO found the package only resulted in 35,000 additional jobs by June 1984.

In a survey of selected programs, GAO found that no more than 35 percent of the people employed by these programs were previously unemployed.

The funds in the bill were spent extremely slowly—2 years and 3 months after the bill's passage, about half the funds were unspent.

The money was not spent where unemployment was the highest. An average of about $415 was allocated for each unemployed person, however, nine of the sixteen states with unemployment rates above 12 percent, received less than $400 per unemployed person. Michigan had an unemployment rate of 17 percent and received $289 per unemployed person.

We spent all that money, almost $5 billion, and created 35,000 jobs. Now we want to spend $15 or $16 billion to create half a million jobs—500,000 jobs. If anybody believes that, they will believe almost anything. It is not going to happen. It did not happen with the 1983 jobs bill.

What we have attempted to do on our side of the aisle is to pick out some programs that might create jobs, that perhaps will create jobs. It is a $2 billion jobs creation program. It includes highways and summer jobs. Two programs that will certainly translate into jobs.

I listened to the President at the Easter egg roll saying, in effect, if anything happens to any of these children it would be our fault because they are not going to be immunized. We have taken care of that. We put in the full $300 million the President requested for childhood immunizations. For summer jobs, we have included more than can be spent. We have also added funding for natural resources and Small Business Administration for the very reason the Senator from Arkansas just stated—these programs are opportunities to create jobs and new businesses. We think we can spend about $718 million for highway maintenance; that's an area that will create jobs right now. So we included a billion dollars in highway funding.

I guess the point of our alternative package is this: When it is all said and done, I think the American people have said, let us just slow down. Let us just put on the brakes. Let us have a little focus on spending.

Every day we have a new tax idea. On April 15, of all days, we have a new proposal from the administration for a value-added tax. It is a very regressive tax. It hits low-income people. It is just another tax that the people at the White House thought we ought to tell

the American people about—on April 15, which is not a happy day for most Americans when it comes to taxes. Then to suggest one more, really kind of ruins your whole day.

So we have had all these new tax ideas, all these new spending ideas. We have a new budget, the so-called economic plan, that gives you $3.23 in new taxes for every dollar in spending cuts, and the American people are beginning to find out what is in these packages. They do not like it. They are Democrats, they are Republicans, they are Independents.

We have proposed an amendment that is really focused on jobs creation, and we think it ought to pass. We think everybody ought to come together and vote for it.

Everybody knows we are going to take care of the unemployment portion. That is not part of the jobs package, that is just paying extended benefits for those who do not have jobs. There is no quarrel with including unemployment benefits even though it is not paid for. Some of us originally voted against the unemployment extension bill because it was not paid for, but we have lost that battle.

So Madam President, I have talked to the President a couple of times. We had good visits. We talked about whether or not there could be any negotiation. I told him I did not think so unless we could figure out some way to pay for the package. Our guiding principle remains: cut it first and then pay for whatever is left.

We have tried to keep the amount—$2 billion—small so people will understand what it is going for. And we think we have made a pretty good case to the American people.

We may not be right very often. In my view on this particular issue, we are on the right side of the issue.

So I just say to my colleagues, we certainly are prepared to vote on our amendment, and we hope it will be adopted. We hope the other amendment will be defeated, and then we will be in a position to move this bill very quickly and move on to other business coming before the Senate.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Hatfield-Dole alternative be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HATFIELD/DOLE ALTERNATIVE

Amendment. Retains Unemployment Extension and provides for the following programs.

	In millions
Highways	$1.000
Summer Jobs	.450
Immunization	.300
Natural Resources	.150
SBA	.100
	2.000

*Package paid for with reductions in agency administrative costs.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I reserve any time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining on this side.

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, and Members of the Senate, there is a fundamental difference in the approaches presented here today. On the one side, the approach is to do nothing; on the other side, it is to do something. That is really the difference here.

For the past 4 years, the economic policy of the administration has been to do nothing. We were told over and over again that the recession is over, the recovery is here, the best thing to do is nothing. What we are being offered by our distinguished Republican colleagues is more of the same. It is as though last November's election did not occur. It is as though President Bush were still in office. It is as though the economic policies of the last administration were so successful that we should simply continue them for the next 4 years.

Well, Madam President, that is not what happened in November. President Clinton was elected, and he was elected because he promised to change the economic policies of the previous administration, and this is the first time that this Senate will have to demonstrate whether it agrees that we ought to change the economic policies, which is the President's program, or whether we want the same policies that we had for the past 4 years.

I would like to address in the time remaining the argument we have heard so often: "It is not paid for," we are told.

Madam President, and Members of the Senate, it is paid for. President Clinton submitted a budget which over the next 5 years will reduce spending by more than $300 billion in four major areas: Defense spending is down; mandatory spending programs, like Medicare and Medicaid, down; nondefense domestic programs down; and debt service payments resulting from a lower debt down.

In addition, the President did propose in his campaign and after he took office to increase spending in certain areas that he deemed important, including this jobs bill. The net effect of the President's proposals is to reduce spending by $205 billion over the next 5 years. And when that is added to the increased revenues of $275 billion, the result is to reduce the deficit by $480 billion over 5 years, the largest deficit reduction program proposed by any President in our Nation's history.

Our distinguished Republican colleagues all voted against the President's deficit reduction program. Now having voted against the program to reduce the deficit, they oppose this part of the President's program on the grounds that it does not reduce the deficit even though it clearly is intended to produce jobs now, jobs that are desperately needed in an economy that is suffering from a jobless recovery. And so the fundamental issue facing the Senate today is whether we ought to do nothing, as we have been urged to do for the past 4 years and as our colleagues continue to urge, or are we to do something as President Clinton has proposed to do.

He has not even been in office for 100 days, and our Republican colleagues do not want to give him a chance to get started. They do not want to give the President a chance. They do not want to give the President's program a chance. They want to embarrass the President, to defeat the President, and to cause his program to fail.

Madam President, that is the issue here: Doing nothing or doing something; turning around the economic policies that led us into the current situation or sticking with those same policies; giving the President and his program a chance or not. I think the choice is clear. It is the choice the American people made last November. We should honor that choice in the Senate.

I reserve the remainder of my time if any time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty seconds remain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield back the remainder of my time and we can proceed to vote.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 301. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent due to a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MIKULSKI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 103 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Bradley	Conrad
Baucus	Breaux	Daschle
Biden	Bryan	DeConcini
Bingaman	Bumpers	Dodd
Boren	Byrd	Dorgan
Boxer	Campbell	Feingold

Feinstein	Krueger	Pell
Ford	Lautenberg	Pryor
Glenn	Leahy	Reid
Graham	Levin	Riegle
Harkin	Lieberman	Robb
Heflin	Mathews	Rockefeller
Hollings	Metzenbaum	Sarbanes
Inouye	Mikulski	Sasser
Johnston	Mitchell	Simon
Kennedy	Moseley-Braun	Wellstone
Kerry	Moynihan	Wofford
Kohl	Murray	

NAYS—45

Bennett	Faircloth	McCain
Bond	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Gramm	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Chafee	Gregg	Nunn
Coats	Hatch	Packwood
Cochran	Hatfield	Pressler
Cohen	Helms	Roth
Coverdell	Jeffords	Shelby
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
Danforth	Kerrey	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Exon	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Durenberger	Simpson

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 301) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent due to a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Breaux	DeConcini
Baucus	Bryan	Dodd
Biden	Bumpers	Dorgan
Bingaman	Byrd	Feinstein
Boren	Campbell	Ford
Boxer	Conrad	Glenn
Bradley	Daschle	Graham
Harkin	Lieberman	Reid
Heflin	Mathews	Riegle
Hollings	Metzenbaum	Robb
Inouye	Mikulski	Rockefeller
Johnston	Mitchell	Sarbanes
Kennedy	Moseley-Braun	Sasser
Kerry	Moynihan	Simon
Krueger	Murray	Wellstone
Lautenberg	Nunn	Wofford
Leahy	Pell	
Levin	Pryor	

NAYS—46

Bennett	Feingold	McCain
Bond	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Gramm	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Chafee	Gregg	Packwood
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
Danforth	Kerrey	Thurmond
Dole	Kohl	Wallop
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Exon	Lugar	
Faircloth	Mack	

NOT VOTING—2

Durenberger	Simpson

So the amendment (No. 300) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CREATING POLITICAL GRIDLOCK

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the past 3 weeks, the President and Senate Democratic leadership have been accusing Republicans of undercutting the President's economic program and creating political gridlock. They say that a minority of the Senate is challenging the Clinton mandate and thwarting the will of the majority of Americans.

The fact is that President Clinton only got 43 percent of the vote in last year's election. And he got that vote based upon his promises to cut Government spending, reduce the deficit, and to only tax those who made over $200,000 per year. No candidate ran last year's campaign on a platform of higher taxes on Americans making as little as $10,000 per year and more Government spending.

The only mandate the American people sounded during the last election was to cut spending first. The so-called stimulus package that Republicans are objecting to only increases Government spending—mostly on a wide range of traditional Democratic pork barrel projects. This isn't gridlock, it's porklock.

It's true that some polls have shown that a majority of Americans support the President's economic plan. But it's also true that these same polls show that a strong majority of Americans do not support the President's program when they learn that it raises taxes by $3.50 for every dollar in spending cuts, that it increases taxes on Social Security, that it calls for those who make as little as $10,000 to sacrifice to support new Federal spending, that it will add nearly a trillion dollars to the Federal deficit. More importantly, very few people that I've spoken to during the past weeks believe that this so-called stimulus package needs to be enacted, especially by further raising the deficit.

As Citizens Against Government Waste notes in their letter in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, while investment, and stimulus, and emergency, may sound like noble endeavors, taxpayers understand that they are simply justifications for spending and larger deficits.

This is also a matter of national priorities. For example, the Democrats would rather deny our Nation's civil servants and men and women who serve in the armed services, many of whom makes less than $20,000, a basic cost of living raise, and instead spend the money on Amtrak subsidies, the District of Columbia, weather service computers, fish atlases and historic preservation. These are skewed priorities and they are wrong.

There are several specific reasons to oppose the supplemental appropriations bill, or so-called stimulus package, whether it is $16.3 billion as first proposed, or $12.2 billion as now suggested:

First, it is not essential, emergency spending. On the contrary, most of the spending will go to pure pork barrel Government projects—political handouts to mayors and other special interest groups.

Examples of some of this spending include: $28 million for the District of Columbia; $23 million for historic preservation; $47 million for weatherization projects; $87 million for fish and wildlife, including fish atlases; $4 million for meat inspectors; $23 million for EPA green programs; $188 million for Amtrak subsidies; $14 million for worker profiling; and $148 million for tax modernization.

Plus: bike paths, softball fields, graffiti abatement, swimming pools, water tank repainting, golf courses, an art ark.

Can any Member of this body seriously argue that these kinds of projects require emergency action, that they will stimulate the economy, that they will result in long-term structural job creation, or that they should be paid for by the Federal Government by further increasing the deficit? And if any Member of this body is willing to make such an argument, do they seriously think the American people will buy it?

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will argue that you can look through the emergency supplemental appropriations bill until you are blue in the face and you

won't find any mention of some of the more egregious of the above-listed pork projects.

They are correct as far as it goes. The appropriations bill does contain only broad spending categories—with no specific guidance as to how the Federal dollars will be spent. On the other hand, the kinds of pork barrel projects I have referenced are part of the proposals that the President forwarded to Congress, and they are part of the proposals that the Nation's mayors have forwarded to the administration.

Thus, the administration has said this is how it intends the Federal money to be spent. The Nation's mayors have said this is how they intend to spend the Federal largess. It is somewhat disingenuous then of my colleagues to say that the appropriated funds will not be spent in the manner the administration and the recipients intend for it to be spent.

Is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee willing to state for the record that no Federal moneys will be spent on any of the projects mentioned above? Does he know how exactly how all the appropriated funds will be spent?

The proponents of the stimulus package can't have it both ways. Either we know where appropriated moneys are going, in which case we should be willing to make a determination whether certain projects should be funded on an emergency basis, or we have no idea how taxpayer dollars are being expended, which raises an entirely new set of problems.

Second, the so-called stimulus bill will do nothing to stimulate the economy. In fact, many economists have suggested that the overall Clinton package, with its emphasis on higher taxes and higher Government spending, will actually retard economic growth. It's also intuitively obvious that new spending on projects like graffiti abatement, bike paths, softball fields, and tree planting initiative will not do much to generate economic growth.

As has been well documented, the Bush recovery is well underway and the economy is gathering strength, with robust growth during the last quarter of 4.8 percent. An additional stimulus to the economy is simply not needed, and will actually be counterproductive if it increases the deficit, as this bill would do.

Additional deficit spending, whether it's $12 billion or $16 billion will simply serve to crowd out a similar amount of private sector investment. The economy will benefit only if the Federal Government spends the money more wisely and productively than the private sector. I suspect that there aren't more than a handful of my colleagues who would try to suggest that Congress can actually make better investment decisions than the private sector.

Third, despite administration claims to the contrary, this is emphatically not a jobs bill. By the administration's own estimate, the bill would create only 200,000 jobs during 1993, and 500,000 jobs overall. By comparison, the private sector created 365,000 jobs during February alone. And 19 million new jobs were created during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Moreover, as noted in a recent Wall Street Journal article, some economists are now arguing that the overall Clinton economic program will actually result in fewer jobs, unless income and corporate taxes are delayed. The DRI/McGraw Hill forecasting firm has calculated that the plan would not add any jobs this year and would result in 250,000 fewer jobs next year than would otherwise be the case.

In addition, most of the jobs that will supposedly be created by the bill are either summer jobs or short-term Government make work projects. This year, for example, many of the jobs are only 8 weeks long for teachers and inner-city teenagers in summer school and Head Start. In fact, of the 219,000 jobs that are intended to be created during 1993, 144,000 are accounted for by low paying summer jobs for inner-city youth.

Most economists have questioned the benefits of pumping millions of dollars into a summer jobs program, noting that it will provide little more than fire insurance for cities, rather than long-term job creation. According to Gary Burtless, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution who has monitored these programs since the 1960's, "it's like baby-sitting to reduce the risk of urban conflagration."

As noted in a recent Washington Post article, Burtless reflects the views of a number of economists who view the administration's youth jobs plan as an income transfer program that does little to advance Clinton's broader goals of providing useful job training or adding a new gateway for long-term employment.

Other jobs, will result from Government projects such as street paving, tree planting, and graffiti abatement. However, these jobs will disappear as soon as the project is completed or the money runs out. Interestingly enough, President Clinton is intending to create new Government jobs at the same time he is proposing to cut the Government payroll by 100,000 jobs during the next 4 years.

Fourth, most importantly, this legislation is not paid for—it simply increases the deficit by over $16 billion. This comes directly on the heels of a budget resolution which supposedly demonstrated our commitment to reducing the deficit.

This represents perhaps the clearest example of the difference between our parties. While we support some of the programs contained in the supplemental appropriations measure, and are willing to fund them, we recognize that Congress has a fundamental obligation to the American people to reduce the deficit and get our financial house in order.

If the projects in the supplemental appropriations measure are important enough, then they should be part of the normal appropriations process and offset by reductions in other Government spending. If the projects in this package are important enough, then we should commensurately reduce spending for other, lower priority programs.

Mr. President, it should also be emphasized that, according to OMB, $93 billion has already been appropriated, but has not been spent, for the programs sought to be funded by the President. This money is already in the pipeline. There is simply no emergency requiring billions of dollars of new funding. Furthermore, OMB estimates that by the end of fiscal year 1993, $8 billion will have gone unspent—before adding one penny in the stimulus package.

Mr. President, a real commitment to spending restraint and real deficit reduction requires that the President's political grab-bag of Federal funds be rejected.

Republicans are willing to work with the President and help make his program work. But he also has to work with Republicans. We will not simply roll over and play dead if the President and congressional Democrats try to ram through policies, under the guise of economic reform, that are not in the best interests of the country.

VETERANS' PROGRAMS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335 because of the important funds it would provide to repair and maintain veterans' hospitals, nursing homes, and other facilities. I am very disappointed that Republican Senators so far have succeeded in blocking this measure, despite the leadership President Clinton has shown in trying to reach a compromise with them.

On April 1, the Senate soundly rejected Republican attempts to delete $25 million from veterans medical care account funds contained in this bill and shift that amount to a Defense Department job training program administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs—a program I strongly support, but one that already has received funding. I think the excellent debate that we had on that rejected amendment exposes as totally misleading the attempts by the other side to portray this bill as nothing but pork.

Mr. President, this package is enormously important for veterans. It contains over $235 million for maintenance and repair of VA facilities—mostly VA medical centers. These projects will help veterans and provide jobs in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. For many years, VA has

deferred important maintenance for medical centers, nursing homes, regional offices, and national cemeteries, in order to divert money to day-to-day operations. They had to do this, but anyone who has driven down a pothole-filled street knows that deferred maintenance is penny wise and pound foolish. VA's backlog of maintenance projects has reached an astonishing $800 million.

Just in my own State of West Virginia, the projects that will be funded by the supplemental appropriation will improve the quality of life for hospitalized veterans and will create many new jobs—including jobs in areas of high unemployment.

VA medical centers in Beckley and Huntington will use the stimulus funds to construct fences that will improve the safety and security of veterans who are in those hospitals. The Huntington VAMC is on a high hill, surrounded by woods, and the Beckley VAMC has a nursing home that houses frail, elderly veterans who deserve to feel secure there. We all know the horror stories of confused patients wandering off into dangerous wooded areas surrounding a VA care facility.

Mr. President, the Huntington VAMC was built in 1932 and, for a long time, it has needed to upgrade its heating and ventilation systems to meet environmental standards and ensure a comfortable environment for its patients. This package includes money to do that. It also would pay for repairing elevators, improving wheelchair accessibility, and installing sprinkler systems.

In the Clarksburg VA medical center, the stimulus money will be used to improve the health of patients and employees by removing dangerous asbestos; improve safety by replacing door latches and leaking fuel tanks; improve patient care by installing a bedside air/oxygen/vacuum system; improve the building's air-conditioning system; extend the useful life of the hospital's vehicles and equipment by building a shelter to house them; and improve energy efficiency by replacing windows.

Mr. President, at the Martinsburg VAMC, VA will use this money to remove asbestos, recaulk and weatherstrip windows, install an alarm system in the on-site domiciliary, replace worn and torn carpeting, improve the drinking water, replace 50-year-old fire sprinklers, and improve access by fixing walkways and curbs.

Mr. President, all of these projects will create jobs—including jobs in areas hit very hard by the deep and lingering recession.

This is not a huge amount of money for VA—$235 million—but it will go a long way toward improving the lives of veterans and increasing the number of jobs in almost every State in the Union. Our Nation's veterans deserve to receive care in a safe, comfortable environment. Government care doesn't have to mean substandard care.

Mr. President, I would say to my colleagues, if you care about the veterans in your State—if you care about their safety, health, and well-being—you will support this package. And in supporting it, you also will be helping to put people back to work in your State.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

CLOTURE VOTE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled for 10 a.m. tomorrow occur at 10:45 a.m., with all other provisions of the previous agreement remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam 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. Madam 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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business until the hour of 6:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 13

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1991 annual report on the Administration of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, pursuant to section 211 of the Act (45 U.S.C. 440(a)).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

REPORT ON MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1991—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 14

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1991 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

REPORT ON PROPOSED RESCISSION AND REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 15

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one proposed rescission in budget authority, totaling $180.0 million, and one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling $7.3 million.

The proposed rescission affects the Board of International Broadcasting. The deferral affects the Department of Health and Human Services. The details of the proposed rescission and the revised deferral are contained in the attached reports.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

At 11:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972, the Speaker, on April 8, 1993, appointed Mr. MCDERMOTT to the Technology Assessment Board on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-642, the Speaker, on April 8, 1993, appointed Mr. SKELTON and Mr. EMERSON, to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 204(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended by section 205 of Public Law 102-375, the Speaker, on April 7, 1993, appointed the following persons

from private life to the Federal Council on the Aging on the part of the House: Mr. Raymond Raschko of Spokane, WA, to a 3-year term; Mr. Max Friedersdorf of Sanibel Island, FL, to a 3-year term; Mr. E. Don Yoak of Spencer, WV, to a 2-year term; Mr. Eugene S. Callender of New York, NY, to a 2-year term; and Mrs. Josephine K. Oblinger of Williamsville, IL, to a 1-year term.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276A–1, the Speaker appoints to the delegation to attend the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in New Delhi, India, from April 12, 1993, to April 17, 1993, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Chairman, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 161(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, and the order of the House of Wednesday April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker, on April 7, 1993, appointed the following members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be accredited by the President as additional official advisers to the U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements on the part of the House: Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 7, 1993, authorizing the Speaker and the minority leader to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Speaker, on April 8, 1993, appointed as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DELAY.

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–729. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 1994; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–730. 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–731. A communication from the Senior Civilian Official, Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the obligation of funds relative to the study, assessment and identification of nuclear waste disposal by the former Soviet Union in the Arctic Region; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–732. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Military Manpower & Personnel Policy), Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the assignment of joint specialty officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–733. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of certified material relative to the Total Army Basing Study; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–734. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to direct spending or receipts legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–735. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities and expenditures of the Independent Television Service for fiscal years 1991 and 1992; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

EC–736. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to clean coal technology; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–737. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the viability of the uranium mining industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–738. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to lease prospectuses; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–739. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, United States Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the proliferation of weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–740. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–741. A communication from the Solicitor of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–742. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–743. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the administration of the Freedom of Information Act in the Department for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–744. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs of the Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the administration of the Freedom of Information Act at the Department for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–745. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report relative to Operation Weed and Seed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of the committee was submitted:

By Mr. PRYOR, from the Special Committee on Aging:

Special Report entitled "Developments In Aging: 1992. Volume 1. A report of the Special Committee on Aging, United States Senate" (Rept. No. 103–40).

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. KRUEGER:

S. 795. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new medical facility for veterans in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 796. A bill to provide for a feasibility study of including Revere Beach in the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROTH:

S. 797. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish an optional early retirement program for Federal Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 798. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself and Mr. SIMON):

S. 799. A bill to require that 4-gallon to 6-gallon buckets distributed in commerce bear a permanent label warning of a potential drowning hazard to young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following Senate resolution was read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 99. A resolution to express the sorrow of the Senate upon the death of George Speaker Mickelson, Governor of the State of South Dakota and other South Dakota leaders; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KRUEGER:

S. 795. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new medical facility for veterans in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RIO GRANDE VALLEY VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY

• Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. President, I introduce legislation to create a Veterans Affairs Medical Facility in the Rio Grande Valley which is located in south Texas.

Veterans residing in south Texas have tried for years to create a full-service veterans' center in the Rio Grande Valley. More than 39,000 veterans permanently live in the area and 10,000 winter Texans live in the valley for 3 to 6 months to benefit from the warmer climate. Yet, south Texas has no place for veterans to receive high-level medical treatment. The nearest veterans hospital is in San Antonio. A 500-mile round trip is required to get the medical treatment so many veterans in the valley need on a regular basis. For an area that is considered to be one of the poorest in the Nation, this trip not only requires an investment in time, but in many cases it requires a travel expense that few can afford.

Our veterans do not deserve this type of inconvenience and hardship. They deserve first-rate health care that is accessible.

Not only is there a large population of veterans in the Rio Grande Valley, but there is a large population of veterans in Texas. Based on the latest VA data, Texas has 1.74 million veterans, ranking second behind California. The trends show that as veterans begin to age, they tend to move to warmer climates. The numbers of veterans are growing in Texas, Florida, and California. The Rio Grande Valley is where the majority of future veteran residents are likely to reside in Texas because of the mild winters. The lack of access to high-level medical care is already a problem in the Rio Grande Valley, and it is likely to get worse as the numbers of veterans increase.

As our country begins to focus attention on the critical lack of access to health care for all citizens, we cannot forget the health needs of our veterans.

Therefore, it is with a sense of urgency that I respectfully request support for the new Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility in south Texas.•

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 796. A bill to provide for a feasibility study of including Revere Beach in the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REVERE BEACH STUDY ACT

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with Senator KENNEDY, which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a 12-month study on the feasibility of including Massachusetts' Revere Beach in the National Park System.

Revere Beach would be an excellent addition to the Park System and I believe that this study will provide the necessary information to show why it is important to incorporate one of the most historically and culturally significant beaches in America.

Located 5 miles north of Boston in the city of Revere, the 3-mile beach along the Atlantic Ocean became our Nation's first public beach nearly 100 years ago. Now, at a time when our beaches are increasingly threatened by erosion, toxic urban runoffs and ill-conceived land use, we must act to protect this precious natural resource on Massachusetts' north shore.

The addition of Revere Beach to the Park System would make more accessible to the Nation some important social and cultural aspects of American history which are not represented elsewhere in the Federal System. Like the historic Boston Commons, Revere Beach has been—in the words of Charles Eliot who initiated the idea for the first public beach back in 1890's—"Set aside and governed by a public body for the enjoyment of the common people." For generations, the citizens of Massachusetts and the Nation have enjoyed the beauty of Revere Beach. The area deserves protection in order that future generations can experience its pleasures and be reminded of the pleasures it provided to earlier generations.

Mr. President, there is considerable local support for this measure. The mayor and the city council of Revere fully support this study. In fact, they came to Washington on more than one occasion to testify in favor of this legislation during the last Congress. In addition, numerous local organizations favor including Revere Beach in the National Park System. I think this legislation again deserves the support of Congress, which passed this bill at the end of last Congress only to have it pocket-vetoed in the waning days of the Bush administration. We should be proud of a resource such as Revere Beach and we must take responsibility for protecting it as well. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.•

By Mr. ROTH:

S. 797. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish an optional early retirement program for Federal Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE EARLY RETIREMENT ACT OF 1993

• Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I introduce legislation to establish an early retirement window for Federal employees. In light of the increasing Federal deficit and the need for innovative solutions, I am hopeful that this legislation will receive serious consideration during the 103d Congress.

Mr. President, this legislation is timely for several important reasons. First, it builds on President Clinton's promise to reduce Federal civilian employment by 100,000 during the next 4 years. The President has also proposed to reduce agency administration expenses by at least 3 percent per year. Both of these goals can be accomplished through expanded early retirement authority as proposed in my legislation.

The new administration has promised change. President Clinton has expressed tremendous interest in making Government more efficient and responsive to the American people. In announcing the national performance review, the President stated:

> Our goal is to make the entire Federal Government both less expensive and more efficient, and to change the culture of our national bureaucracy away from complacency and entitlement toward initiative and empowerment.

At the heart of these efforts must be a thorough examination of our personnel and management system. Layers of bureaucracy have become mired down in the details of process, rather than focusing on service to the public. This is not a criticism of Federal employees—but of the system in which they operate. The Federal employees I have worked with are very able, competent, and public spirited. Unfortunately, they are confined to a system in which regulations are the rule, and creativity and initiative are stifled. This legislation will help to reduce layers of bureaucracy and improve Government performance.

Second, with the deficit expected to exceed $300 billion for the current fiscal year, the Congress should consider the example set by the Postal Service and the billions of dollars it will save through the use of an early retirement program. The Postal Service has recently undergone an aggressive early retirement program, with 47,000 postal employees taking the option. While the Postal Service has recognized a $1 billion up front cost due to the early retirement incentives offered, Postmaster General Marvin Runyon estimates that savings will exceed $800 million in 1993 and $1.4 billion annually starting in 1994. According to postal officials, there is no indication that this has resulted in a reduction in services. This is a program worth repeating throughout government.

I strongly believe that as we continue through the 1990's, the Federal Government must take greater advantage of the technological advances in the workplace, to help improve worker productivity and service to the American people. The use of computers, word processers, faxes, and other technological advances within the work-

place provides a unique opportunity for productivity gains. These advantages should be maximized while permitting a slimming down of the number of employees we need to fulfill our Government's mission. I believe the early retirement bill could provide the transition to this leaner, more productive work force.

In conjunction with technological improvements within the work force, we will have shifts within the Federal Government. Some departments will be increasing their work force, while others, like Defense, will be slimming down. Given the fact that our budget resources are limited, we must focus our personnel resources in those areas with the greatest needs. Shifts within the work force and in the departments provide us with the opportunity to advance the goal of a leaner, more productive work force.

There are several other compelling reasons to consider this legislation. First, to invite employees to accelerate their retirement to avoid possible adverse effects of budgetary decisions. Just as the Department of Defense has recognized the need to offer early retirements, other departments and agencies will begin to feel the pinch of tougher budget realities.

In addition, this bill will accommodate employees who are ready to retire but fall short of current age and service requirements. It will provide job security and career opportunities for women, minorities, and younger workers. I have heard from a number of younger employees who are ready, willing, and able to take more responsibility in their jobs, but are limited in their opportunities—this bill would give them an opportunity.

During the confirmation hearing of James King to be the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, he was asked to respond to the concern that displacement would have an inordinately large impact on women and minorities. In response, Mr. King stated:

> It is disturbing to contemplate that hard-won achievements in workforce diversity would be reversed by an extensive RIF and subsequent bump and retreat. For this reason and others, a RIF should be an option of last resort, to be called upon only after more preferable options more favorable to diversity—including attrition, early retirements and buyouts—have been tried.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to help provide security to those employees who recently joined the Federal Government.

Finally, this bill will help reduce civilian payrolls on a voluntary basis at a time when payrolls are going to be reduced. This legislation follows the lead established by private industry, which uses early retirement as a way to slim down without resorting to layoffs or reductions in force.

Since introducing this legislation several years ago, I have heard from thousands of Federal employees hoping to take advantage of this kind of opportunity. Under this legislation, a 2-month window period is established beginning 30 days after the start of the fiscal year following enactment.

Civilian employees may qualify under any of the following four standards:

Any age with 25 years of service;
Age 50 with 20 years of service;
Age 55 with 15 years of service; and
Age 57 with 5 years of service.

Employees retiring below age 55 take a benefit reduction of 2 percent for each year they are below age 55 just as in current law. Their retirement annuity will be based on their years of service and salary base.

The legislation has built into it a number of provisions to ensure that the efficiency of the Federal Government is not hurt. These include a provision which provides that the President or his designee may exempt up to 25 percent of the agency's eligible early retirees. Exemptions shall be designated by occupational categories deemed to be critical to the mission of the agency. In addition, the exemptions may be made for a particularly critical project or geographic location under the 25 percent rule.

In addition, departments may also hold over, for up to 6 months, an employee who has elected early retirement to ensure the continuous performance of a responsibility or project.

In order to capture the savings from this plan, a department may not replace a worker who retires during the 60-day window period for 5 years beginning at the start of the window period. A department could obviously promote individuals into positions of those who retired, and could fill the positions of those who quit.

To assure the orderly continuation of Government services, the President or Secretary may waive hiring restrictions for occupations critical to the agency's mission. The agency cost of rehiring may not exceed the cost savings resulting from implementation of the legislation.

It is important to point out that savings from this legislation may not be used for other purposes. In other words, this legislation is intended to help reduce our overwhelming deficits. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine the amount equal to the savings resulting from the implementation of this act for the agency and shall notify the President. The President shall cancel an amount of the budget authority of each agency equal to the amount determined by the OMB Director. This will ensure that savings will result from enactment of this legislation.

Current law permits the Office of Personnel Management to authorize early optional retirements for employees of an agency or segment of an agency when it is determined that a major reduction in force, reorganization, or transfer of function is underway. While this authority is sometimes used, this bill will widen the scope of those eligible by making it available throughout the government and could thus result in more retirements.

I strongly encourage this early retirement plan because it is governmentwide and it is an active rather than reactive plan. Like the Postal Service, the Federal Government should take advantage of the savings offered through an early retirement program. As the Postal Service has demonstrated, Federal agencies can perform their mission with less layers of bureaucracy.

Mr. President, as the Congress begins to work on a budget reconciliation bill, I urge all Members of the Congress, particularly those members on the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to seriously consider the budget savings which can be achieved through this legislation.•

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 798. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to establish a program of grants to States for arson research, prevention, and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ARSON PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

• Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, we are all greatly saddened today by the tragic events that unfolded yesterday in Waco, TX. The horrible fire that took the lives of more than 80 men, women, and children shocked us all. It is difficult for us to express our grief for the innocent children, as we watched the Davidian compound engulfed in flames. In the aftermath of this tragedy, I hope Congress will enact legislation that combats the terrible problem of arson.

Today, Senator GORTON and I are introducing the Arson Prevention Act of 1993. The purpose of this legislation is to assist firefighting organizations in preventing, detecting, and prosecuting arson. The cost of arson on our society is staggering.

Fires caused by arson kill approximately 700 people annually in the United States and results in property losses of up to $2 billion. There are more than 500,000 suspected arson fires every year. It is time we devoted more resources to combating this catastrophic crime.

This bill provides for an advanced course on arson prevention and for an expansion of arson investigator training programs at the National Fire Academy and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. I believe such efforts are needed since the National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] estimates only about 2 percent of arson fires lead to convictions.

This bill also establishes a new competitive grants program to States to improve arson training courses with States required to provide a 25-percent match.

Legislation of this type is particularly important in rural areas. Some 60 percent of all fires investigated by the State fire marshall in rural Nevada are arson and the value of property loss in rural Nevada due to arson exceeds that of accidental fires.

Also, few fire personnel in rural Nevada have the necessary investigative skills to assist in the prosecution of arsonists. Many cases are lost due to contamination of evidence. There is difficulty identifying drug related fires, such as fires in drug producing laboratories.

Congressman BOUCHER is today introducing a House companion bill and is chairing a Science Subcommittee hearing. I commend him for his fine work on this issue. I hope my colleagues will join with me in enacting this legislation as quickly as possible.●

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Senator RICHARD BRYAN, in cosponsoring the Arson Prevention Act of 1993. As Chairman, and ranking Republican of the Consumer Subcommittee, Senator BRYAN and I have worked on a number of initiatives to address the Nation's fire problems.

The United States has one of the worst fire records of any country in the industrialized world. More than 2.4 million fires are reported every year and millions more go unreported. Fires result in over 6,000 deaths annually, 30,000 injuries, and billions of dollars of property losses. The Nation's fire service is comprised of approximately 1.2 million professional and volunteer firefighters. These dedicated men and women have one of the most important, yet one of the most hazardous, jobs in our country today.

The Arson Prevention Act will provide for the development of advanced courses on arson prevention. The bill allows for the expansion of arson investigator training programs at the National Fire Academy and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. It establishes a demonstration program of 10 competitive grant awards to States or consortiums of States to improve training of police and firefighters to combat arson. At least 25 percent of the grant must be funded by a non-Federal source. The act authorizes $4 million in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for grants. It also authorizes $2 million in fiscal year 1995 for an expansion of the arson investigator training programs at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The recent outbreak of arson fires in north King and south Snohomish County in my State has focused our attention on the need for expanded arson investigator training and support of arson fire tracking systems. Families and individuals deserve to feel safe and secure in their neighborhoods. Arson fires not only threaten lives, but devastate local communities. This legislation is a positive move to expand coordinated efforts between law enforcement agencies to prevent future arson fires.●

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself and Mr. SIMON):

S. 799. A bill to require that 4- to 6-gallon buckets distributed in commerce bear a permanent label warning of a potential drowning hazard to young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

BUCKET DROWNING PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill with my colleague, Senator SIMON, of Illinois, to help eliminate a hidden in-home safety hazard which threatens millions of American children each day. Not long ago I heard the heartbreaking recording of a young mother who called 911 to report that her toddler had drowned in an industrial bucket the mother had been using for household cleaning.

Since 1985, over 400 children have died in their homes when they toppled head first into industrial-size plastic buckets, drowning in the liquid contents of these buckets. While we cannot bring these children back, we can help prevent such tragedies from occurring in the future.

The bill I am introducing today will require that warning labels be placed on these industrial-size buckets to avoid such tragedies. Most people do not realize it, but every week—every week—at least one toddler drowns in a 4- to 6-gallon plastic bucket. These buckets may be purchased new in stores for doing heavy-duty household chores, but generally millions of them are used each year by industry to transport commercial quantities of products, such as food, paint, or construction materials. When emptied of their original contents, some of these industrial containers wind up in family homes.

The industrial buckets, when used in homes, present a very real danger to small children and infants. Tragic drowning accidents occur because of the limited physical capabilities of the toddlers. We are talking about very small children. Top heavy when small, toddlers can fall head first into a bucket and not be able to get out of it or tip it over. What a horrible tragedy to occur to any child. What a tragedy to occur to the family.

Nearly 80 percent of all the reported drowning victims were between the ages of 8 and 13 months old. Action needs to be taken—must be taken—and I kid you not, passing the legislation I am introducing will not eliminate entirely the problem, but it will do much to alleviate it.

Today, only 10 percent of industry voluntarily labels its buckets to warn of the drowning hazard. While California has enacted a bucket-labeling law, there are no existing national voluntary or Federal mandatory labeling standards. And despite Consumer Product Safety Commission staff recommendations to the contrary, the Commission has been dawdling and dragging its feet. The Commission has not moved forward to mandate warning labels or performance standards for these buckets.

The bill I am introducing today mandates that clearly visible warning labels in both English and Spanish be placed on these industrial buckets. I believe the Spanish language has to be included because 14 percent of the deaths occurred to Spanish-speaking families. The bill also requires the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a performance standard to ultimately change the design of these buckets so that drownings cannot occur.

This bill has the support of the National Safe Kids Campaign, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Congress Watch, and California State Firefighters Association. It is an important piece of legislation. In the overall scheme of things about how you make America better, is it important? Probably not. But if you happen to be the parent, or the family, of one of these children, it is the most important piece of legislation that could possibly be enacted by the Congress of the United States.

This legislation has to do with protecting the children who are totally defenseless. The bill's quick passage will help prevent many tragic childhood drownings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter supporting this bill from several consumer organizations be printed in the RECORD and that the text of the bill be printed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 799

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 "Bucket Drowning Prevention Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that:

(1) Since 1985, approximately 400 infants have drowned in 4-gallon to 6-gallon buckets, or nearly 1 child a week.

(2) Children drowning or hospitalized as a result of falling into a bucket of liquid ranged in age from 1 month to 28 months although nearly 80 percent of all victims were 8 to 13 months old.

(3) Where race was reported in connection with such drownings, African-American infants accounted for more of the drowning

deaths than any other racial group followed by Caucasians and then Hispanics. In approximately 14 percent of the investigated deaths, Spanish was reported to be the spoken language.

(4) Only about 10 percent of 5-gallon buckets manufactured annually are voluntarily labeled, and States are beginning to establish their own labeling standards. There is no mandatory Federal labeling standard regarding buckets.

(5) To prevent infant drownings in buckets and to assure uniformity in bucket labels and a minimal impact on interstate commerce, it is appropriate to establish a Federal labeling standard.

(6) To address the bucket drowning problem in a more permanent way, it is appropriate to establish performance standards.

SEC. 3. LABELING STANDARD REQUIREMENTS.

Effective 180 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, there is established a consumer product safety standard under section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058), to eliminate or reduce the risk of injury or death resulting from children falling into 4-gallon to 6-gallon buckets containing liquid. Such standard, when effective, shall require straight sided or slightly tapered, open head containers with a capacity of more than 4 gallons and less than 6 gallons (referred to in this Act as a "bucket"), to bear 2 warning labels, 1 in English and 1 in Spanish. The labels shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Each label shall be permanent so that such label cannot be removed, torn or defaced without the aid of tools or solvents.

(2) Each label shall be at least 7 inches in height, and 5 inches in width, or any larger size as the labeler may choose. The information on the label shall be proportionate to the label's size.

(3) A label shall be centered on each side of the bucket just below the point where the handle is inserted. The label on 1 side shall be in English and the label on the other side shall be in Spanish.

(4) Each label shall have a border or other form of contrast around its edges to delineate it from any other information on the bucket.

(5) Each label shall bear (A) the signal word "WARNING" in bold uppercase lettering, in black ink, on an orange background, and (B) in upper and lower case lettering in black ink on a white background, the words "Children Can Fall Into Bucket and Drown—Keep Children Away From Buckets With Even a Small Amount of Liquid". The signal word panel shall be preceded by a safety alert symbol consisting of an orange exclamation mark on a black triangle.

(6) Each label shall include a picture of a child falling into a bucket containing liquid. A red prohibition symbol shall be superimposed over, and totally surround the pictorial. The picture shall be positioned between the signal word panel and the message panel.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) REMOVAL OF LABEL.—Once placed on a bucket pursuant to the standard provided pursuant to section 3, it shall be a prohibited act under section 19 of the Consumer Product Safety Act for any person in the chain of distribution of the bucket to intentionally cover, obstruct, tear, deface or remove the label.

(b) CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARD.—The standard established pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall be considered a consumer product safety standard established under the Consumer Product Safety Act.

SEC. 5. EXISTING LABELS.

Any bucket label in use on September 1, 1993, which is substantially in conformance with the requirements in section 3, may continue to be used until 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, buckets subject to this Act must bear both an English and Spanish language label after the effective date of the standard established pursuant to section 3.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS.

Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply with respect to the Consumer Product Safety Commission's issuance of any amendments or changes to the bucket labeling standard required by section 3 of this Act. Sections 7 and 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act shall not apply to such amendments or changes.

SEC. 7. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LABELING.

(a) LABELING.—The standard established by section 3 requires the labeling of buckets covered by such standard to be the responsibility of the manufacturer or distributor of any such bucket without regard to whether or not such bucket is intended for sale by a retailer in an empty state for use as a consumer product, or is intended for sale by a retailer, together with its contents.

(b) TIME FOR PLACING LABELS.—The required label must be on the bucket at the time it is sold or delivered to the end user of the bucket's contents or, in the case of a bucket intended to be sold to the public in an empty state, at the time it is shipped to a retailer for sale to the public.

SEC. 8. PERFORMANCE STANDARD.

Within 30 days following the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a proceeding under the Consumer Product Safety Act for the issuance of a performance standard for buckets to address the drowning hazard associated with this product. Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply with respect to the issuance of such standard. Sections 7 and 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act shall not apply to the issuance of such standard. Such standard shall take effect at such time as may be prescribed by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, but in no event later than 180 days following the date of the enactment of this Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. PUBLIC INTEREST
RESEARCH GROUP,
April 20, 1993.

Hon. HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR METZENBAUM: As organizations working to prevent needless deaths and injuries caused by dangerous consumer products, we applaud your introduction of the "Bucket Drowning Prevention Act of 1993."

Since 1985, approximately 400 infants have drowned in five gallon buckets. In other words, nearly one child per week perishes in this manner. The "Bucket Drowning Prevention Act" will help prevent these tragic deaths by adequately informing parents and others, in both English and Spanish, about the need to keep infants away from these buckets. Additionally, the legislation will assure that the Consumer Product Safety Commission will promulgate a performance standard for buckets to address the drowning hazard.

Senator Metzenbaum, we greatly appreciate your leadership on this issue, particularly given the CPSC's failure to take effective action to address these drownings. We look forward to working with you and your staff to assure passage of this important bill.

Sincerely,

HERTA B. FEELY,
Executive Director, National SAFE KIDS Campaign.
M. KRISTEN RAND,
Counsel, Consumers Union.
MARY ELLEN R. FISE,
Product Safety Director, Consumer Federation of America.
EDMUND MIERZWINSKI,
Consumer Program Director, U.S. Public Interest Research Group.
PAMELA GILBERT,
Director, Public Citizen's Congress Watch.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 13

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 13, a bill to institute accountability in the Federal regulatory process, establish a program for the systematic selection of regulatory priorities, and for other purposes.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 50, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

S. 70

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to reauthorize the National Writing Project, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the

nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to protect children from exposure to environmental tobacco smoke in the provision of children's services, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate guidelines for instituting a nonsmoking policy in buildings owned or leased by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to authorize the establishment of the National African American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] 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. 477

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to eliminate the price support program for wool and mohair, and for other purposes.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards to protect taxpayer rights.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BRYAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Trade Commission regarding fraud committed in connection with sales made with a telephone, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] 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. 602

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of outpatient self-management training services under part B of the Medicare Program for individuals with diabetes.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] were added as cosponsors of S. 680, a bill to provide for toy safety, and for other purposes.

S. 687

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] were added as cosponsors of S. 687, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

S. 737

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 737, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to permit prepayment of debentures issued by State and local development companies.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that standards of identity for milk include certain minimum standards regarding milk solids, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution calling for the United States to support efforts of the United Nations to conclude an international agreement to establish an international criminal court.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week".

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 50, supra.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 58

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 58, a joint resolution to designate the weeks of May 2, 1993, through May 8, 1993, and May 1, 1994, through May 7, 1994, as "National Correctional Officers Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 72

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 72, a joint resolution to designate the last week of September 1993, and the last week of September 1994, as "National Senior Softball Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 73

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 73, a joint resolution to designate July 5, 1993, through July 12, 1993, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques".

SENATE RESOLUTION 64

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 64, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that increasing the effective rate of taxation by lowering the estate tax exemption would devastate homeowners, farmers, and small business owners, further hindering the creation of jobs and economic growth.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEADERS

Mr. PRESSLER (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 99

Whereas, Governor Mickelson had a long and distinguished career, having been born in Mobridge, South Dakota in 1941, earning a law degree from the University of South Dakota in 1965 and serving a tour of duty with the United States Army in Vietnam;

Whereas, he was first elected to the South Dakota State House of Representatives in 1974, where he served 6 years and served as House Speaker in 1979–80;

Whereas, he was elected Governor of South Dakota in 1986 and was reelected in 1990, during which time he was dedicated to numerous initiatives, including economic develop-

ment, education and health care, and served as cochairman of a National Governors' Association task force on health care and as chairman of the Western Governors' Association; and

Whereas, Governor Mickelson and South Dakota State business leaders Roland Dolly, Ron Reed, Angus Anson, Dave Birkeland, Roger Hainje and pilots Ron Becker and David Hansen were killed in a plane crash while returning to South Dakota from a meeting to help advance economic development in the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow and profound regret of the death of Governor Mickelson and expresses its sympathy to his wife, Linda, his daughter, Amy, and his sons, Mark and David.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow and profound regret of the deaths of Roland Dolly, Ron Reed, Angus Anson, Dave Birkeland, Roger Hainje, Ron Becker and David Hansen and expresses its sympathy to the families of these leading South Dakotans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

BYRD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 300

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 283 proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; as follows:

In amendment 283, strike all after the word "That", and insert:

the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities", $37,569,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $4,000,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Watershed and flood prevention operations", $46,961,000 for the costs of emergency watershed protection operations and for small watershed operations, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural housing insurance fund program account", for the costs of very low-income housing repair direct loans, $1,124,000 to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of loans not to exceed $2,818,000; and in addition, $4,297,000 for the cost of guaranteed unsubsidized section 502 loans, for total loan principal not to exceed $234,805,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the "Rural development insurance fund program account", for the costs of water and sewer direct loans, $66,821,000, to subsidize additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $470,000,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Rural water and waste disposal grants", $281,767,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Very low-income housing repair grants", $5,635,000, to remain available until the end of fiscal year 1993.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Child nutrition programs" for the Child and Adult Care Food Program, $56,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For an additional amount for the special supplemental food program, $75,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1994: Provided, That these funds shall be available for grants to States that maintain the standards for eligibility which were in use on January 1, 1993: Provided further, That the Secretary may waive regulations governing allocations as necessary to ensure funds are received by States most in need and able to spend additional funds.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (TEFAP)

For an additional amount for "The emergency food assistance program", $23,481,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 214(h) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, commodities purchased with these funds may be delivered to States through December 31, 1993.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic development assistance programs", $93,922,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Minority business development", $1,878,000 for program management.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, research, and facilities", $80,773,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Scientific and technical research and services", $14,088,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $3,613,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Industrial technology services", $103,315,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $1,400,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING, AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Public telecommunications facilities, planning, and construction", $63,867,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $2,818,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

RELATED AGENCIES

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $8,829,000.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Business loans program account" for the cost of guaranteed loans authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, $140,883,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That up to $2,000,000 of this amount may be made available for administrative expenses of the guaranteed loans program and may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available under Public Law 102-395 for "Salaries and expenses", Small Business Administration.

CHAPTER IV

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" to provide for essential jobs, public safety, health, and other municipal services in the face of its financial crisis, $28,177,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

CHAPTER V

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Construction, general", $3,900,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, for one-half of the cost of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For an additional amount for "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee", $13,525,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $76,497,000, to remain

available through September 30, 1993, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that fund.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research, and development activities", $46,961,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

For an additional amount for "Energy supply, research and development activities", $939,000, to remain available until expended for additional in-house energy management projects.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,878,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For an additional amount for "Oregon and California grant lands", $15,027,547, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resource management", $87,348,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", $146,519,000.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For an additional amount for "National recreation and preservation", $1,409,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Historic preservation fund", $22,072,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which $9,600,000 shall be for the National Trust for Historic Preservation: Provided, That any matching fund requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments shall not apply to this amount.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $83,591,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Operation of Indian programs", $92,044,000, of which $26,257,000 for school operations shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1993 and remain available for obligation until September 30, 1994; and $65,787,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $10,332,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "National forest system", to be used for maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation, and natural resource conservation activities, $150,000,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", to be used for recreation facility and trail construction, $37,844,000, to remain available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For enhanced "Energy conservation" activities, $100,778,000, to remain available until expended, of which $28,177,000 shall be for implementation of titles III, IV, and V of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), including no less than $25,677,000 for the acquisition of alternative-fuel vehicles for the Federal fleet and for the conversion of existing vehicles in the Federal fleet to alternative fuels: Provided, That such funds shall only be used to pay the cost differential between the alternative-fuel vehicle and the same model of vehicle in its conventional-fuel design, not to exceed $3,500 for any vehicle; and of which $18,784,000 shall be for full funding for a one-time special award of grants under the Institutional Conservation Program; and of which $46,961,000 shall be for grants to States for the Weatherization Assistance Program; and of which $5,635,000 shall be available to the Federal Energy Management Program for expanded training, site audit, and other support functions; and of which $1,221,000 shall be available to establish a fund administered by the Federal Energy Management Program to provide financial assistance for cost-effective energy efficiency improvements to facilities of any Federal agencies other than the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Veterans Affairs, and the General Services Administration.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services", $1,000,000,000, to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, of which $10,500,000 is for activities under part D of title IV of such Act, and $989,500,000 for activities under part B of title II of such Act: Provided, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, 30 percent shall be for academic enrichment, as defined by the Secretary: Provided further, That funds used for academic enrichment shall not be used to supplant other Federal funds for existing academic services or activities, and services shall be maintained at least at the level of funding used for these purposes during the summer of 1992: Provided further, That of the funds provided herein for part B of title II, except for the 30 percent expressly used for academic enrichment activities, service delivery areas may transfer up to 10 percent to the program under part C of title II of the Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: Provided further, That up to 3 percent of each State's allotment used for academic enrichment, at the State's discretion, may be reserved for State administration, oversight, and support of a State practitioner's network: Provided further, That the funds provided herein for part B of title II shall be available for obligation upon enactment of this Act.

Funds provided in Public Law 102-394 for part B of title III of such Act shall be available for obligation upon enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", $32,131,000, of which $25,062,000 is for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under section 506(a)(1)(A) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended; and of which $7,069,000 is for grants to States under section 506(a)(3) of said Act.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", $14,300,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to fund worker profiling activities and for oversight of employment programs: Provided, That of the funds provided herein up to $2,700,000 may be transferred to the Program Administration account.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount to carry out title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, $200,000,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount to carry out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to high-performance computing applications, $9,392,000.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health" for carrying out childhood immunization activities under title III and subtitle 1 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, $300,000,000, of which $282,800,000 shall be transferred to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, of which $4,200,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and of which $7,000,000 shall be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Payments to the Social Security Trust Funds" to reimburse the trust funds for administrative expenses to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

For an additional amount for "Supplemental security income" for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses, $150,000,000; and, in addition, to provide for making, after June 15 of the current fiscal year, benefits payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For an additional amount, $302,000,000, of which $142,000,000 shall be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund; and of which $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for carrying out the Head Start Act, $500,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For an additional amount for concentration grants under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $500,000,000, which shall become available upon enactment and shall remain available to local educational agencies through September 30, 1993: Provided, That the number of children counted for section 1006(a) shall be the same as counted for 1993 section 1005 basic grants: Provided further, That no State shall receive less than $250,000 of such funds: Provided further, That such funds shall only be made available by State educational agencies to local educational agencies upon assurance that at least 80 per centum of such funds shall be liquidated by such agencies by September 30, 1993: Provided further, That such funds shall be used for activities that benefit educationally deprived children as authorized under section 1011 and other related activities such as food services, school health services, arts education, and transportation, without regard to whether such activities are otherwise authorized under such section: Provided further, That a State educational agency may reallocate any portion of such funds that are not able to be used by local educational agencies in the State to other such agencies on the basis of their relative needs, as determined by the State educational agency, without regard to section 1403(b)(2) of such Act: Provided further, That such funds may be used only to supplement, and not to supplant any other funds, including other funds made available under chapter 1 of title I of such Act or under any other Federal program: Provided further, That such funds, and the activities carried out with such funds, shall not be subject to or considered in applying section 1006(a)(1)(B)–(D), 1019, 1020, 1021, or 1432(b) of such Act or to section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act: Provided further, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purpose of section 1403, 1404, 1405, or 1432(b)(1) of such Act: Provided further, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

For an additional amount for grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to carry out subpart 1 of part A of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $234,805,000, which shall be allocated to such jurisdictions, notwithstanding any other provision of law, so that all counties that, under title III of Public Law 102–394, are allocated less than 92 per centum of the amount they were allocated under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall be allocated, under Public Law 102–394 plus this additional amount, 92 per centum of the amount such counties received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992: Provided, That such allocations to States shall be ratably reduced if necessary: Provided further, That each State shall distribute its portion of such funds to local educational agencies in the State so that all such agencies that, under title III of Public Law 102–394, are receiving less than 92 per centum of the amount they received under such subpart for fiscal year 1992 shall receive, under Public Law 102–394 plus this additional amount, an amount not to exceed 92 per centum of such fiscal year 1992 amount, which percentage shall be ratably reduced as necessary: Provided further, That such funds shall not be treated as funds appropriated, allocated, or received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the purposes of sections 1403, 1404, and 1405 of such Act: Provided further, That such funds shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the allocation of funds for any fiscal year under any Federal program.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Student financial assistance" for payment of awards made under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $1,863,730,000, which shall be available through September 30, 1994, of which $493,000,000 shall be available for such awards made for award year 1993–1994, and $1,370,730,000 shall be available for such awards for the 1992–1993 and prior award years.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by—

(a) deleting "$2,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,250,000,000"; and

(b) deleting "$1,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,050,000,000";

Provided, That the increase in commitment authority made available by this Act shall be credited entirely to the discretionary fund established by section 507(c)(1) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(1)), without regard to apportionment under sections 507(a) and 507(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(a) and 2206(b)), or minimum distributions required by sections 507(c)(2) through 507(c)(4) and 508(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. App. 2206(c)(2)–2206(c)(4) and 2207(d)).

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$15,326,750,000" and inserting "$18,303,000,000": Provided, That section 310(c) of said Act is amended by renumbering existing subsection (2) as subsection (2)(B) and by adding a new subsection (2)(A) as follows:

"(2)(A) ninety days after distribution of any increase in the fiscal year 1993 obligation limitation, as enacted October 6, 1992, revise the distribution of such increased funds under subsection (a) if a State has not obligated and received bids on projects for the increased amount distributed, and redistribute amounts to all States able to obligate amounts on projects for which bids can be received no later than August 1, 1993;".

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation", for capital improvements grants, $187,844,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FORMULA GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Formula grants" for capital grants, $466,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993, of which $17,423,000 shall be apportioned under section 16, $26,420,000 under section 18, and $422,647,000 under section 9 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended: Provided, That, if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under such Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$1,700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,182,340,000".

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$1,134,150,000" and inserting "$1,150,000,000" and by deleting "$1,049,025,000" and inserting "$1,064,875,000": Provided, That these additional funds shall be apportioned under section 9 of the Federal Transit Act, as amended: Provided further, That if any such funds are not obligated within 90 days of enactment of this Act, such funds shall be allocated for any eligible capital project under the Federal Transit Act, at the discretion of the Secretary.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Discretionary grants", $270,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993: Provided, That none of the funds may be available for grants under section 3(k)(1)(A) or section 3(k)(1)(B) of the Federal Transit Act, as amended.

CHAPTER IX

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

For an additional amount for "Information systems", $43,600,000, to fund procurement of computer and telecommunications equipment and services.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", $201,933,000, for nonrecurring maintenance projects in Department of Veterans Affairs' health care facilities.

For an additional amount for "Medical care", $751,000, to remain available until expended, for additional projects to improve energy efficiency at Department of Veterans Affairs facilities.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Construction, minor projects", $32,873,000, for miscellaneous projects and the National Cemetery Program.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program", $423,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: Provided, That the Secretary shall fund approvable applications for such additional amount in the order submitted, in accordance with requirements established by the Secretary: Provided further, That the Secretary may waive, in whole or in any part, any requirement set forth in subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, if the

Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 426(a)(3) of that Act, the applicant shall own or control the site at the time of application: Provided further, That the total amount approved for any one applicant may not exceed $10,000,000: Provided further, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Community development grants", $2,536,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1994: Provided, That from the foregoing amount, $25,360,000 shall be available for grants to Indian tribes in compliance with section 106(a)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, $4,000,000 shall be available for grants under section 107(b)(1) of such Act, and the remainder shall be for States and units of general local government that are eligible under section 106 of such Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may waive entirely, or in any part, any requirement set forth in title I of such Act, except a requirement relating to fair housing and nondiscrimination, the environment, and labor standards, if the Secretary finds that such waiver will further the purposes of this appropriation: Provided further, That after December 31, 1994, any of the foregoing amount that is obligated, but which the grantee has not drawn down from its letter of credit, shall be deobligated by the Secretary and shall expire.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Programs and activities", $15,000,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", $20,663,000.

PROGRAM AND RESEARCH OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Program and research operations", $2,818,000.

STATE REVOLVING FUNDS/CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make grants under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $845,300,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(2) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 602(b)(3) of such Act, States shall enter into binding commitments to provide assistance in an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of each grant payment within one year after receipt of such grant payment from this additional amount.

For an additional amount for "State revolving funds/construction grants", to make grants authorized under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $46,961,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 319(h)(3) of such Act, no State match shall be required for this additional amount.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Research and development", $4,696,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Research and related activities", $197,230,000.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES AND INSTRUMENTATION

For an additional amount for "Academic research facilities and instrumentation", $4,696,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $4,696,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. All funds provided under this Act are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" for all purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 203. (a) None of the funds under the head "Community Development Grants" in this Act may be used to assist a golf course or cemetery project that would otherwise be eligible for assistance under section 105(a)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended: 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.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act may be used to support whitewater canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River, fisheries atlases and studies of the sicklefin chub, and payments for a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research class VI computer.

SEC. 204. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for this Act, the Office of Management and Budget shall administer the obligation of all funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act in a manner that will ensure that no wasteful, unnecessary, or non-meritorious programs, projects or activities are approved. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the intent of this section.

SEC. 205. In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act under the heading "Community Planning and Development Community Development Grants", an additional amount of $200,000,000 shall be available under such heading, to remain available until December 31, 1994, only for eligible communities to hire police officials: Provided, That such additional funding shall be available subject to the second and third provisos under such heading.

SEC. 206. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (including limitations on obligations) for programs, projects or activities shall be reduced by 42.95 per centum: Provided, That this section shall not apply to funds provided under the following headings: "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds"; "Federal Highway Administration Federal Aid-Highways (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)"; "Employment and Training Administration Training and Employment Services"; "Assistant Secretary for Health Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health (Including Transfer of Funds)"; "Health Resources and Services Administration Health Resources and Services"; "Environmental Protection Agency State Revolving Funds/Construction Grants" only for sums provided for activities under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; "Small Business Administration Business Loans Program Account"; "Food Safety and Inspection Service Salaries and Expenses"; and funds provided in section 205: Provided further, That reductions under this section shall apply to each amount specifically identified within the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act: Provided further, That in applying the reductions required by this section, the sum remaining after such reduction shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993".

HATFIELD (AND DOLE) AMENDMENT NO. 301

Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. DOLE) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 283 proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra, as follows:

In amendment 283, strike all after the word "That" and insert:

the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for "Business loans program account" for the cost of guaranteed loans authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, $100,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That up to $2,000,000 of this amount may be made available for administrative expenses of the guaranteed loans program and may be transferred to and merged with, appropriations made available under Public Law 102–395 for "Salaries and expenses", Small Business Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", $75,000,000.

FOREST SERVICE

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for "National forest system", to be used for maintenance, repairs, rehabilitation, and natural resource conservation activities, $75,000,000 to remain available for obligation until and end of fiscal year 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and Employment Services", $450,000,000, to carry out activities under part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act: Provided, That of the funds provided herein, 30 percent shall be for academic enrichment, as defined by the Secretary: Provided further, That funds used for academic enrichment shall not be used to supplant other Federal funds for existing academic services or activities, and services shall be maintained at least at the level of funding used for these purposes during the summer of 1992: Provided further, That of the funds provided herein, except for the 30 percent expressly used for academic enrichment activities, service delivery areas may transfer up to 10 percent to the program under part C of title II of the Act, if such

transfer is approved by the Governor: Provided further, That up to 3 percent of each State's allotment used for academic enrichment, at the State's discretion, may be reserved for State administration, oversight, and support of a State practitioner's network.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Advances to the unemployment trust fund and other funds", $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH—OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health" for carrying out childhood immunization activities under title III and subtitle 1 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, $300,000,000, of which $282,800,000 shall be transferred to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, of which $4,200,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and of which $7,000,000 shall be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The language under this heading in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, is amended by deleting "$15,326,750,000" and inserting "$16,326,750,000": Provided, That section 310(c) of said Act is amended by renumbering existing subsection (2) as subsection (2)(B) and by adding a new subsection (2)(A) as follows:

"(2)(A) ninety days after distribution of any increase in the fiscal 1993 obligation limitation, as enacted October 6, 1992, revise the distribution of such increased funds under subsection (a) if a State has not obligated and received bids on projects for the increased amount distributed, and redistribute amounts to all States able to obligate amounts on projects for which bids can be received no later than August 1, 1993;";

Provided further, That the additional authority provided under this heading shall be for maintenance activities only.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 202. (a) Of the amounts provided in previous fiscal year 1993 appropriations acts and available budget authority under previous appropriations acts, such amounts of budgetary resources are rescinded so as to equal $295,000,000 in outlays as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make uniform percentage reductions in budget authority in Federal agency administrative expenses, except that no reduction shall be made in current rates of pay under current law.

(c) For the purposes of this section, Federal agency administrative expenses are defined as object classes 10 (excluding object classes 12.1, 12.2, and 13.0), 20 (excluding object class 23.1), and 30.

(d) To the extent budgetary resources are not provided in appropriations acts, the Director shall make the same uniform percentage reduction as required in subsection (b) in Federal administrative expenses as determined in section 256(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993".

McCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 302

Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 283 proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. .That—

(a)(1) notwithstanding any other provision of law, when any general or special appropriation bill or any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations, as well as any revenue affecting bill or joint resolution, passes both Houses of Congress in the same form, the Secretary of the Senate (in the case of a bill or joint resolution originating in the Senate) or the Clerk of the House of Representatives (in the case of a bill or joint resolution originating in the House of Representatives) shall cause the enrolling clerk of such House to enroll each item of such bill or joint resolution as a separate bill or joint resolution, as the case may be.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that is required to be enrolled pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be enrolled without substantive revision,

(B) shall conform in style and form to the applicable provisions of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code (as such provisions are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), and

(C) shall bear the designation of the measure of which it was an item prior to such enrollment, together with such other designation as may be necessary to distinguish such bill or joint resolution from other bills or joint resolutions enrolled pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to the same measure.

(b) A bill or joint resolution enrolled pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) with respect to an item shall be deemed to be a bill under Clauses 2 and 3 of Section 7 Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States and shall be signed by the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress and presented to the President for approval or disapproval (and otherwise treated for all purposes) in the manner provided for bills and joint resolutions generally.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The term "item" means any numbered section and any unnumbered paragraph of—

(1) any general or special appropriations bill, and

(2) any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or containing appropriations.

(d) The provisions of this Section shall apply to bills and joint resolutions agreed to by the 103d Congress.

DANFORTH AMENDMENT NOS. 303 THROUGH 305

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DANFORTH submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 283, as amended, proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 303

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that an economic program that does not control the growth of entitlements cannot strengthen our economy.

AMENDMENT NO. 304

At the end of the amendment, add the following new section:

SEC. . (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated unless the President certifies that the economy is in a recession at the time the funds are to be obligated.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to additional amounts for "Advances to the unemployment trust funds and other funds".

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "recession" means an economic period that would trigger a low-growth report as described in section 254(j) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT NO. 305

At the end of the amendment add the following new section:

SEC. . The additional amounts provided under the following headings in this Act are canceled:

(1) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Operations, Research and Facilities; National Institute of Standards and Technology, Scientific and Technical Research and Services.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—$34,230,000 of amounts for Federal Railroad Administration, Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

(4) INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Research and Development.

GRAMM AMENDMENTS NOS. 306 THROUGH 321

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAMM submitted 16 amendments intended to proposed by him to amendment No. 283, as amended, proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 306

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 74.2 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 307

At the end, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 74.2 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 6) 16

AMENDMENT NO. 308

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 82.7 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 309

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 74.2 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 310

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 82.7 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 311

At the end, insert:

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 82.7 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 312

On page 31, line 7, strike "1993" and insert, "1993.

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 82.7 per centum.

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the savings from this across-the-board reduction shall be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from a two year delay in the implementation of the 85% inclusion of Social Security benefits for purposes of the individual income tax."

AMENDMENT NO. 313

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . INDEXING OF CERTAIN INVESTMENTS AFTER APRIL 15, 1992 FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of Investments Acquired After April 15, 1992 for Purposes of Determining Gain.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) Indexed Basis substituted for Adjusted Basis.—Solely for purposes of determining gain on the sale or other disposition by an individual of an indexed asset which has been held for more than 1 year, the indexed basis of the asset shall be substituted for its adjusted basis.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RECAPTURE GAIN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of recapture gain on the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset, but the amount of any such recapture gain shall increase the adjusted basis of the asset for purposes of applying paragraph (1) to determine the amount of other gain on such sale or other disposition.

"(B) RECAPTURE GAIN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'recapture gain' means any gain treated as ordinary income under section 1245, 1250, or 1254.

"(b) INDEXED ASSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' means—

"(A) any stock in a corporation, and

"(B) any tangible property (or any interest therein),

which is a capital asset or property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(B)) and the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992.

"(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' does not include—

"(A) CREDITOR'S INTEREST.—Any interest in property which is in the nature of a creditor's interest.

"(B) COLLECTIBLES.—Any collectible (as defined in section 408(m)(2) without regard to section 408(m)(3)).

"(C) OPTIONS.—Any option or other right to acquire an interest in property.

"(D) NET LEASE PROPERTY.—In the case of a lessor, net lease property (within the meaning of subsection (i)(3)).

"(E) CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—Stock which is fixed and preferred as to dividends and does not participate in corporate growth to any significant extent.

"(F) STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Stock in a foreign corporation.

"(G) STOCK IN S CORPORATIONS.—Stock in an S corporation.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATION WHICH IS REGULARLY TRADED ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL EXCHANGE.—Paragraph (2)(F) shall not apply to stock in a foreign corporation the stock of which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, or any domestic regional exchange for which quotations are published on a regular basis or is authorized for trading on the national market system operated by the National Association of Securities Dealers other than—

"(A) stock of a foreign investment company (within the meaning of section 1246(b)),

"(B) stock in a passive foreign investment company (as defined in section 1296), and

"(C) stock in a foreign corporation held by a United States person who meets the requirements of section 1248(a)(2).

"(c) INDEXED BASIS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS.—The indexed basis for any asset is—

"(A) the adjusted basis of the asset, multiplied by

"(B) the applicable inflation ratio.

"(2) APPLICABLE INFLATION RATIO.—The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be determined by dividing—

"(A) the CPI for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the disposition takes place, by

"(B) the CPI for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the taxpayer's holding period for such asset began.

The applicable inflation ratio shall not be taken into account unless it is greater than 1. The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be rounded to the nearest one-hundredth.

"(3) CONVENTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), if any asset is disposed of during any calendar year—

"(A) such disposition shall be treated as occurring on the last day of such calendar year, and

"(B) the taxpayer's holding period for such asset shall be treated as beginning in the same calendar year as would be determined for an asset actually disposed of on such last day with a holding period of the same length as the actual holding period of the asset involved.

"(4) CPI.—For purposes of this subsection, the CPI for any calendar year shall be determined under section 1(f)(4).

"(d) SHORT SALES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a short sale of an indexed asset with a short sale period in excess of 1 year, for purposes of this title, the amount realized shall be an amount equal to the amount realized (determined without regard to this paragraph) multiplied by the applicable inflation ratio. In applying subsection (c)(2) for purposes of the preceding sentence, the date on which the property is sold short shall be treated as the date on which the holding period for the asset begins and the closing date for the sale shall be treated as the date of disposition.

"(2) SHORT SALE OF SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL PROPERTY.—If the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse sells short property substantially identical to an asset held by the taxpayer, the asset held by the taxpayer and the substantially identical property shall not be treated as indexed assets for the short sale period.

"(3) SHORT SALE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the short sale period begins on the day after property is sold and ends on the closing date for the sale.

"(e) TREATMENT OF REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENTS AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the adjustment under subsection (a) shall be allowed to any qualified investment entity (including for purposes of determining the earnings and profits of such entity).

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATE SHAREHOLDERS.—Under regulations in the case of a distribution by a qualified investment entity (directly or indirectly) to a corporation—

"(i) the determination of whether such distribution is a dividend shall be made without regard to this section, and

"(ii) the amount treated as gain by reason of the receipt of any capital gain dividend shall be increased by the percentage by which the entity's net capital gain for the taxable year determined without regard to this section exceeds the entity's net capital gain for such year determined with regard to this section.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, any amount includable in gross income under section 852(b)(3)(D) shall be treated as a capital gain dividend and an S corporation shall not be treated as a corporation.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFICATION PURPOSES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of sections 851(b) and 856(c).

"(D) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TAXES IMPOSED AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(i) TAX ON FAILURE TO DISTRIBUTE ENTIRE GAIN.—If any amount is subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) for any taxable year, the amount on which tax is imposed under such section shall be increased by the percentage determined under subparagraph (B)(ii). A similar rule shall apply in the case of any amount subject to tax under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 857(b) to the extent attributable to the excess of the net capital gain over the deduction for dividends paid determined with reference to capital gain dividends only. The first sentence of this clause shall not apply to so much of the amount subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) as is designated by the company under section 852(b)(3)(D).

"(ii) OTHER TAXES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by paragraph (4), (5), or (6) of section 857(b).

"(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO INTERESTS HELD IN ENTITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Stock in a qualified investment entity shall be an indexed asset for any calendar month in the same ratio as the fair market value of the assets held by such entity at the close of such month which are indexed assets bears to the fair market value of all assets of such entity at the close of such month.

"(B) RATIO OF 90 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 90 percent or more, such ratio for such month shall be 100 percent.

"(C) RATIO OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 10 percent or less, such ratio for such month shall be zero.

"(D) VALUATION OF ASSETS IN CASE OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall require a real estate investment trust to value its assets more frequently than once each 36 months (except where such trust ceases to exist). The ratio under subparagraph (A) for any calendar month for which there is no valuation shall be the trustee's good faith judgment as to such valuation.

"(3) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified investment entity' means—

"(A) a regulated investment company (within the meaning of section 851), and

"(B) a real estate investment trust (within the meaning of section 856).

"(f) OTHER PASS-THRU ENTITIES.—

"(1) Partnerships.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the partnership level shall be passed through to the partners (but only for purposes of determining the income of partners who are individuals).

"(B) SPECIAL RULE IN THE CASE OF SECTION 754 ELECTIONS.—In the case of a transfer of an interest in a partnership with respect to which the election provided in section 754 is in effect—

"(i) the adjustment under section 743(b)(1) shall, with respect to the transferor partner, be treated as a sale of the partnership assets for purposes of applying this section, and

"(ii) with respect to the transferee partner, the partnership's holding period for purposes of this section in such assets shall be treated as beginning on the date of such adjustment.

"(2) S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an S corporation, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the corporate level shall be passed through to the shareholders. This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by section 1374 or 1375.

"(3) COMMON TRUST FUNDS.—In the case of a common trust fund, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the trust level shall be passed through to the participants (but only for purposes of determining the income of participants who are individuals).

"(g) DISPOSITIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—This section shall not apply to any sale or other disposition of property between related persons (within the meaning of section 465(b)(3)(C)) if such property, in the hands of the transferee, is of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167.

"(h) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE ASSET.—In the case of any asset, the following shall be treated as a separate asset:

"(A) A substantial improvement to property.

"(B) In the case of stock of a corporation, a substantial contribution to capital.

"(2) ASSETS WHICH ARE NOT INDEXED ASSETS THROUGHOUT HOLDING PERIOD.—The applicable inflation ratio shall be appropriately reduced for periods during which the asset was not an indexed asset.

"(3) NET LEASE PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'net lease property' means leased property where—

"(A) the term of the lease (taking into account options to renew) was 50 percent or more of the useful life of the property, and

"(B) for the period of the lease, the sum of the deductions with respect to such property which are allowable to the lessor solely by reason of section 162 (other than rents and reimbursed amounts with respect to such property) is 15 percent or less of the rental income produced by such property."

"(b) GAINS AND LOSSES FROM INDEXED ASSETS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT UNDER LIMITATION ON INVESTMENT INTEREST.—Subparagraph (B) of section 163(d)(4) (defining investment income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Gain from the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset (as defined in section 1022) held for more than 1 year shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence. The preceding sentence shall not apply to gain from the sale or other disposition of any such asset if the taxpayer elects to waive the benefits of section 1022 in determining the amount of such gain."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1021 the following new item:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of investments acquired after April 15, 1990 for purposes of determining gain."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to dispositions of any property the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any property acquired after April 15, 1992, from a related person (as defined in section 465(b)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if—

(A) such property was so acquired for a price less than the property's fair market value, and

(B) the amendments made by this section did not apply to such property in the hands of such related person.

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 37.7 per centum.

AMENDMENT NO. 314

SEC. . INDEXING OF CERTAIN INVESTMENTS AFTER APRIL 15, 1992 FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of Investments Acquired After April 15, 1992 for Purposes of Determining Gain.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) Indexed Basis substituted for Adjusted Basis.—Solely for purposes of determining gain on the sale or other disposition by an individual of an indexed asset which has been held for more than 1 year, the indexed basis of the asset shall be substituted for its adjusted basis.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RECAPTURE GAIN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of recapture gain on the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset, but the amount of any such recapture gain shall increase the adjusted basis of the asset for purposes of applying paragraph (1) to determine the amount of other gain on such sale or other disposition.

"(B) RECAPTURE GAIN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'recapture gain' means any gain treated as ordinary income under section 1245, 1250, or 1254.

"(b) INDEXED ASSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' means—

"(A) any stock in a corporation, and

"(B) any tangible property (or any interest therein),

which is a capital asset or property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(B)) and the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992.

"(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' does not include—

"(A) CREDITOR'S INTEREST.—Any interest in property which is in the nature of a creditor's interest.

"(B) COLLECTIBLES.—Any collectible (as defined in section 408(m)(2) without regard to section 408(m)(3)).

"(C) OPTIONS.—Any option or other right to acquire an interest in property.

"(D) NET LEASE PROPERTY.—In the case of a lessor, net lease property (within the meaning of subsection (i)(3)).

"(E) CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—Stock which is fixed and preferred as to dividends and does not participate in corporate growth to any significant extent.

"(F) STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Stock in a foreign corporation.

"(G) STOCK IN S CORPORATIONS.—Stock in an S corporation.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATION WHICH IS REGULARLY TRADED ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL EXCHANGE.—Paragraph (2)(F) shall not apply to stock in a foreign corporation the stock of which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, or any domestic regional exchange for which quotations are published on a regular basis or is authorized for trading on the national market system operated by the National Association of Securities Dealers other than—

"(A) stock of a foreign investment company (within the meaning of section 1246(b)),

"(B) stock in a passive foreign investment company (as defined in section 1296), and

"(C) stock in a foreign corporation held by a United States person who meets the requirement of section 1248(a)(2).

"(c) INDEXED BASIS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS.—The indexed basis for any asset is—

"(A) the adjusted basis of the asset, multiplied by

"(B) the applicable inflation ratio.

"(2) APPLICABLE INFLATION RATIO.—The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be determined by dividing—

"(A) the CPI for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the disposition takes place, by

"(B) the CPI for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the taxpayer's holding period for such asset began.

The applicable inflation ratio shall not be taken into account unless it is greater than 1. The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be rounded to the nearest one-hundredth.

"(3) CONVENTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), if any asset is disposed of during any calendar year—

"(A) such disposition shall be treated as occurring on the last day of such calendar year, and

"(B) the taxpayer's holding period for such asset shall be treated as beginning in the same calendar year as would be determined for an asset actually disposed of on such last day with a holding period of the same length as the actual holding period of the asset involved.

"(4) CPI.—For purposes of this subsection, the CPI for any calendar year shall be determined under sections 1(f)(4)

"(d) SHORT SALES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a short sale of an indexed asset with a short sale period in excess of 1 year, for purposes of this title, the amount realized shall be an amount equal to the amount realized (determined without regard to this paragraph) multiplied by the applicable inflation ratio. In applying subsection (c)(2) for purposes of the preceding sentence, the date on which the property is sold short shall be treated as the date on which the holding period for the asset begins and the closing date for the sale shall be treated as the date of disposition.

"(2) SHORT SALE OF SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL PROPERTY.—If the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse sells short property substantially identical to an asset held by the taxpayer, the asset held by the taxpayer and the substantially identical property shall not be treated as indexed assets for the short sale period.

"(3) SHORT SALE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the short sale period begins on the day after property is sold and ends on the closing date for the sale.

"(e) TREATMENT OF REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENTS AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the adjustment under subsection (a) shall be allowed to any qualified investment entity (including for purposes of determining the earnings and profits of such entity).

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATE SHAREHOLDERS.—Under regulations in the case of a distribution by a qualified investment entity (directly or indirectly) to a corporation—

"(i) the determination of whether such distribution is a dividend shall be made without regard to this section, and

"(ii) the amount treated as gain by reason of the receipt of any capital gain dividend shall be increased by the percentage by which the entity's net capital gain for the taxable year determined without regard to this section exceeds the entity's net capital gain for such year determined with regard to this section.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, any amount includible in gross income under section 852(b)(3)(D) shall be treated as a capital gain dividend and an S corporation shall not be treated as a corporation.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFICATION PURPOSES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of sections 851(b) and 856(c).

"(D) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TAXES IMPOSED AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(i) TAX ON FAILURE TO DISTRIBUTE ENTIRE GAIN.—If any amount is subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) for any taxable year, the amount on which tax is imposed under such section shall be increased by the percentage determined under subparagraph (B)(ii). A similar rule shall apply in the case of any amount subject to tax under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 857(b) to the extent attributable to the excess of the net capital gain over the deduction for dividends paid determined with reference to capital gain dividends only. The first sentence of this clause shall not apply to so much of the amount subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) as is designated by the company under section 852(b)(3)(D).

"(ii) OTHER TAXES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by paragraph (4), (5), or (6) of section 857(b).

"(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO INTERESTS HELD IN ENTITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Stock in a qualified investment entity shall be an indexed asset for any calendar month in the same ratio as the fair market value of the assets held by such entity at the close of such month which are indexed assets bears to the fair market value of all assets of such entity at the close of such month.

"(B) RATIO OF 90 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 90 percent or more, such ratio for such month shall be 100 percent.

"(C) RATIO OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 10 percent or less, such ratio for such month shall be zero.

"(D) VALUATION OF ASSETS IN CASE OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall require a real estate investment trust to value its assets more frequently than once each 36 months (except where such trust ceases to exist). The ratio under subparagraph (A) for any calendar month for which there is no valuation shall be the trustee's good faith judgment as to such valuation.

"(3) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified investment entity' means—

"(A) a regulated investment company (within the meaning of section 851), and

"(B) a real estate investment trust (within the meaning of section 856).

"(f) OTHER PASS-THRU ENTITIES.—

"(1) PARTNERSHIPS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the partnership level shall be passed through to the partners (but only for purposes of determining the income of partners who are individuals).

"(B) SPECIAL RULE IN THE CASE OF SECTION 754 ELECTIONS.—In the case of a transfer of an interest in a partnership with respect to which the election provided in section 754 is in effect—

"(i) the adjustment under section 743(b)(1) shall, with respect to the transferor partner, be treated as a sale of the partnership assets for purposes of applying this section, and

"(ii) with respect to the transferee partner, the partnership's holding period for purposes of this section in such assets shall be treated as beginning on the date of such adjustment.

"(2) S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an S corporation, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the corporate level shall be passed through to the shareholders. This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by section 1374 or 1375.

"(3) COMMON TRUST FUNDS.—In the case of a common trust fund, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the trust level shall be passed through to the participants (but only for purposes of determining the income of participants who are individuals).

"(g) DISPOSITIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—This section shall not apply to any sale or other disposition of property between related persons (within the meaning of section 465(b)(3)(C)) if such property, in the hands of the transferee, is of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167.

"(h) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE ASSET.—In the case of any asset, the following shall be treated as a separate asset:

"(A) A substantial improvement to property.

"(B) In the case of stock of a corporation, a substantial contribution to capital.

"(2) ASSETS WHICH ARE NOT INDEXED ASSETS THROUGHOUT HOLDING PERIOD.—The applicable inflation ratio shall be appropriately reduced for periods during which the asset was not an indexed asset.

"(3) NET LEASE PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'net lease property' means leased property where—

"(A) the term of the lease (taking into account options to renew) was 50 percent or more of the useful life of the property, and

"(B) for the period of the lease, the sum of the deductions with respect to such property which are allowable to the lessor solely by reason of section 162 (other than rents and reimbursed amounts with respect to such property) is 15 percent or less of the rental income produced by such property."

(b) GAINS AND LOSSES FROM INDEXED ASSETS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT UNDER LIMITATION ON INVESTMENT INTEREST.—Subparagraph (B) of section 163(d)(4) (defining investment income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences:

"Gain from the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset (as defined in section 1022) held for more than 1 year shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence. The preceding sentence shall not apply to gain from the sale or other disposition of any such asset if the taxpayer elects to waive the benefits of section 1022 in determining the amount of such gain."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1021 the following new item:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of investments acquired after April 15, 1990 for purposes of determining gain."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to dispositions of any property the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any property acquired after April 15, 1992, from a related person (as defined in section 465(b)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if—

(A) such property was so acquired for a price less than the property's fair market value, and

(B) the amendments made by this section did not apply to such property in the hands of such related person.

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 56.8 per centum.

AMENDMENT NO. 315

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, insert:

SEC. . INDEXING OF CERTAIN INVESTMENTS AFTER APRIL 15, 1992 FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of Investments Acquired After April 15, 1992 for Purposes of Determining Gain.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS SUBSTITUTED FOR ADJUSTED BASIS.—Solely for purposes of determining gain on the sale or other disposition by an individual of an indexed asset which has been held for more than 1 year, the indexed basis of the asset shall be substituted for its adjusted basis.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RECAPTURE GAIN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of recapture gain on the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset, but the amount of any such recapture gain shall increase the adjusted basis of the asset for purposes of applying paragraph (1) to determine the amount of other gain on such sale or other disposition.

"(B) RECAPTURE GAIN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'recapture gain' means any gain treated as ordinary income under section 1245, 1250, or 1254.

"(b) INDEXED ASSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' means—

"(A) any stock in a corporation, and

"(B) any tangible property (or any interest therein),

which is a capital asset or property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231(b)) and the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992

"(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' does not include—

"(A) CREDITOR'S INTEREST.—Any interest in property which is in the nature of a creditor's interest.

"(B) COLLECTIBLES.—Any collectible (as defined in section 408(m)(2) without regard to section 408(m)(3)).

"(C) OPTIONS.—Any option or other right to acquire an interest in property.

"(D) NET LEASE PROPERTY.—In the case of a lessor, net lease property (within the meaning of subsection (i)(3)).

"(E) CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—Stock which is fixed and preferred as to dividends and does not participate in corporate growth to any significant extent.

"(F) STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Stock in a foreign corporation.

"(G) STOCK IN S CORPORATIONS.—Stock in an S corporation.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATION WHICH IS REGULARLY TRADED ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL EXCHANGE.—Paragraph (2)(F) shall not apply to stock in a foreign corporation the stock of which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, or any domestic regional exchange for which quotations are published on a regular basis or is authorized for trading on the national market system operated by the National Association of Securities Dealers other than—

"(A) stock of a foreign investment company (within the meaning of section 1246(b)),

"(B) stock in a passive foreign investment company (as defined in section 1296), and

"(C) stock in a foreign corporation held by a United States person who meets the requirements of section 1248(a)(2).

"(c) INDEXED BASIS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS.—The indexed basis for any asset is—

"(A) the adjusted basis of the asset, multiplied by

"(B) the applicable inflation ratio.

"(2) APPLICABLE INFLATION RATIO.—The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be determined by dividing—

"(A) the CPI for the calender year proceeding the calendar year in which the disposition takes place, by

"(B) the CPI for the calender year preceding the calendar year in which the taxpayer's holding period for such asset began.

The applicable inflation ratio shall not be taken into account unless it is greater than 1. The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be rounded to the nearest one-hundredth.

"(3) CONVENTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), if any asset is disposed of during any calendar year—

"(A) such disposition shall be treated as occurring on the last day of such calendar year, and

"(B) the taxpayer's holding period for such asset shall be treated as beginning in the same calendar year as would be determined for an asset actually disposed of on such last day with a holding period of the same length as the actual holding period of the asset involved.

"(4) CPI.—For purposes of this subsection, the CPI for any calendar year shall be determined under section 1(f)(4).

"(d) SHORT SALES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a short sale of an indexed asset with a short sale period in excess of 1 year, for purposes of this title, the amount realized shall be an amount equal to the amount realized (determined without regard to this paragraph) multiplied by the applicable inflation ratio. In applying subsection (c)(2) for purposes of the preceding sentence, the date on which the property is sold short shall be treated as the date on which the holding period for the asset begins and the closing date for the sale shall be treated as the date of disposition.

"(2) SHORT SALE OF SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL PROPERTY.—If the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse sells short property substantially identical to an asset held by the taxpayer, the asset held by the taxpayer and the substantially identical property shall not be treated as indexed assets for the short sale period.

"(3) SHORT SALE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the short sale period begins on the day after property is sold and ends on the closing date for the sale.

"(e) TREATMENT OF REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENTS AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the adjustment under subsection (a) shall be allowed to any qualified investment entity (including for purposes of determining the earnings and profits of such entity).

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATE SHAREHOLDERS.—Under regulations in the case of a distribution by a qualified investment entity (directly or indirectly to a corporation—

"(i) the determination of whether such distribution is a dividend shall be made without regard to this section, and

"(ii) the amount treated as gain by reason of the receipt of any capital gain dividend shall be increased by the percentage by which the entity's net capital gain for the taxable year determined without regard to this section exceeds the entity's net capital gain for such year determined with regard to this section.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, any amount includible in gross income under section 852(b)(3)(D) shall be treated as a capital gain dividend and an S corporation shall not be treated as a corporation.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFICATION PURPOSES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of sections 851(b) and 856(c).

"(D) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TAXES IMPOSED AT ENTITY LEVEL.—

"(i) TAX ON FAILURE TO DISTRIBUTE ENTIRE GAIN.—If any amount is subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) for any taxable year, the amount on which tax is imposed under such section shall be increased by the percentage determined under subparagraph (B)(ii). A similar rule shall apply in the case of any amount subject to tax under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 857(b) to the extent attributable to the excess of the net capital gain over the deduction for dividends paid determined with reference to capital gain dividends only. The first sentence of this clause shall not apply to so much of the amount subject to tax under section 852(b)(3)(A) as is designated by the company under section 852(b)(3)(D).

"(ii) OTHER TAXES.—This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by paragraph (4), (5), or (6) of section 857(b).

"(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO INTERESTS HELD IN ENTITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Stock in a qualified investment entity shall be an indexed asset for any calendar month in the same ratio as the fair market value of the assets held by such entity at the close of such month which are indexed assets bears to the fair market value of all assets of such entity at the close of such month.

"(B) RATIO OF 90 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 90 percent or more, such ratio for such month shall be 100 percent.

"(C) RATIO OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 10 percent or less, such ratio for such month shall be zero.

"(D) VALUATION OF ASSETS IN CASE OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—Nothing in this

paragraph shall require a real estate investment trust to value its assets more frequently than once each 36 months (except where such trust ceases to exist). The ratio under subparagraph (A) for any calendar month for which there is no valuation shall be the trustee's good faith judgment as to such valuation.

"(3) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified investment entity' means—

"(A) a regulated investment company (within the meaning of section 851), and

"(B) a real estate investment trust (within the meaning of section 856).

"(f) OTHER PASS-THRU ENTITIES.—

"(1) PARTNERSHIPS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the partnership level shall be passed through to the partners (but only for purposes of determining the income of partners who are individuals).

"(B) SPECIAL RULE IN THE CASE OF SECTION 754 ELECTIONS.—In the case of a transfer of an interest in a partnership with respect to which the election provided in section 754 is in effect—

"(i) the adjustment under section 743(b)(1) shall, with respect to the transferor partner, be treated as a sale of the partnership assets for purposes of applying this section, and

"(ii) with respect to the transferee partner, the partnership's holding period for purposes of this section in such assets shall be treated as beginning on the date of such adjustment.

"(2) S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an S corporation, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the corporate level shall be passed through to the shareholders. This section shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of any tax imposed by section 1374 or 1375.

"(3) COMMON TRUST FUNDS.—In the case of a common trust fund, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the trust level shall be passed through to the participants (but only for purposes of determining the income of participants who are individuals).

"(g) DISPOSITIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—This section shall not apply to any sale or other disposition of property between related persons (within the meaning of section 465(b)(3)(C)) if such property, in the hands of the transferee, is of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167.

"(h) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE ASSET.—In the case of any asset, the following shall be treated as a separate asset:

"(A) A substantial improvement to property.

"(B) In the case of stock of a corporation, a substantial contribution to capital.

"(2) ASSETS WHICH ARE NOT INDEXED ASSETS THROUGHOUT HOLDING PERIOD.—The applicable inflation ratio shall be appropriately reduced for periods during which the asset was not an indexed asset.

"(3) NET LEASE PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'net lease property' means leased property where—

"(A) the term of the lease (taking into account options to renew) was 50 percent or more of the useful life of the property, and

"(B) for the period of the lease, the sum of the deductions with respect to such property which are allowable to the lessor solely by reason of section 162 (other than rents and reimbursed amounts with respect to such property) is 15 percent or less of the rental income produced by such property."

(b) GAINS AND LOSSES FROM INDEXED ASSETS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT UNDER LIMITATION ON INVESTMENT INTEREST.—Subparagraph (B) of section 163(d)(4) (defining investment income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences:

"Gain from the sale or other disposition of an indexed asset (as defined in section 1022) held for more than 1 year shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence. The preceding sentence shall not apply to gain from the sale or other disposition of any such asset if the taxpayer elects to waive the benefits of section 1022 in determining the amount of such gain."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1021 the following new item:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of investments acquired after April 15, 1990 for purposes of determining gain."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to dispositions of any property the holding period of which begins after April 15, 1992.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any property acquired after April 15, 1992, from a related person (as defined in section 465(b)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if—

(A) such property was so acquired for a price less than the property's fair market value, and

(B) the amendments made by this section did not apply to such property in the hands of such related person.

SEC. . Each amount provided for discretionary items in this Act shall hereby be reduced by 56.8 per centum.

AMENDMENT NO. 316

At the appropriate place, insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'exemption amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus

"(B) an additional $1,200 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection (c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(a)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" after "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1993, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 317

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subjection, the term 'exemption

amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus

"(B) an additional $1,200 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection (c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(e)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" after "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1993, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 318

In the language proposed to be stricken, strike all after the first word and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'exemption amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus

"(B) an additional $1,200 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection 9(c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(e)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

"(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" after "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1993, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 319

At the appropriate place, add:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'exemption amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus

"(B) an additional $1,000 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection (c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(e)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" after "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1993, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 320

In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'exemption amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus

"(B) an additional $1,000 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection (c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(e)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" after "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1993, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 321

In the language proposed to be stricken, strike all after the first word and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment Act".

SEC. 2. FAMILY INVESTMENT ALLOWANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining exemption amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'exemption amount' means an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) $2,000, plus ±

"(B) an additional $1,000 for each dependent for whom an exemption is allowed under subsection (c) who is a child of the taxpayer and who—

"(i) has not attained the age of 16 before the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, or

"(ii) is permanently and totally disabled (as defined in section 22(e)(3)) at any time during the taxable year."

(b) PHASEOUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 151(d) of such Code (relating to phaseout) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) PHASEOUT OF ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income in excess of the threshold amount for any taxable year, the amount of the additional exemption allowed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this paragraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(B) as—

"(I) the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year over the threshold amount, bears to

"(II) $12,500.

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.

"(iii) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'threshold amount' means—

"(I) $47,500 in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(II) $41,500 in the case of a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)),

"(III) $28,500 in the case of an individual who is not married and who is not a surviving spouse, and

"(IV) $23,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(C) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Adjusted gross income of any taxpayer shall be determined—

"(i) after application of sections 86 and 469; and

"(ii) without regard to sections 135 and 911."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3)(A) of section 151(d) of such Code is amended by inserting "under paragraph (1)(A)" and "exemption amount".

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 151(d)(4) of such Code (relating to inflation

adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) ADJUSTMENT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 1992, the dollar amount contained in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

"(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '1992' for '1989' in subparagraph (B) thereof."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, and before January 1, 1996.

(e) BUDGET EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all reductions in receipts provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of such Act.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any other provision of this Act, none of the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect unless the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all receipts legislation provided by this Act for all fiscal years as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

BROWN AMENDMENT NO. 322

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 283, as amended, proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra, as follows:

At the end of the committee substitute, as amended, add the following:

SEC. . No funds appropriated under this Act shall be considered as an outlay or new budget authority for purposes of sections 250(c)(5), 251(b)(2)(D), and 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 323

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 283, as amended, proposed by Mr. BYRD to the bill, H.R. 1335, supra, as follows:

On page 4, line 10, before the period, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall promptly notify each State of the dollar value of additional commodities that the Secretary will purchase and allocate to each State, using the additional funds made available under this paragraph, and shall permit each State to request, obtain, and use not more than 10 percent of the dollar value of the additional commodities, using the additional funds, in the form of cash payments for costs associated with the distribution of commodities by emergency feeding organizations".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, May 6, 1993, beginning at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills currently pending before the subcommittee. The bills are:

S. 172, a bill to establish the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area in Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 184, a bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 250, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Red River in Kentucky as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes;

S. 489, a bill entitled the "Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993"; and

S. 577, a bill to resolve the status of certain lands relinquished to the United States under the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit a written statement is welcome to do so by sending two copies to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding the hearing, please contact Erica Rosenberg of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-7933.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 20, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled: "Controlling Health Care Costs: The Long-Term Care Factor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 20, 1993, at 2:30 p.m., in open-closed session, to receive testimony from the unified commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements, and the defense authorization request for fiscal year 1994 and the future years defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 20, 1993, beginning at 2:30 p.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building, on S. 521, the Indian Tribal Justice Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 20, 1993, at 10:30 a.m., on NASA budget overview.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet on April 20, 1993 at 10:00 a.m., to hear testimony from Treasury Secretary Bentsen and other witnesses on the subject of the administration's energy tax proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 20 at 10:20 a.m., to hold a hearing on foreign policy overview with the Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 20 at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing on Mr. Thomas Pickering, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Tuesday, April 20, 1993, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on limited partnership rollups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A BICENTENNIAL TRIBUTE TO THE OLD KANAWHA BAPTIST CHURCH

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to recognize a truly historical event that occurs this June 13, 1993, in my State of West Virginia. On this date, the Old Kanawha Baptist Church of Pratt, WV,

will celebrate its 200th birthday in the Kanawha Valley. This church, one of seven Baptist churches in West Virginia organized before 1800, has played a monumental role in providing service to the southern region of the State.

Recognized as the oldest functioning church in the Kanawha Valley, Old Kanawha Baptist was founded in 1793 by Elder James Johnson, the first Baptist minister to penetrate the Kanawha Valley on a religious mission. His sphere of influence was well-received over a region filled with individuals hungry for knowledge, and driven by strong convictions. It is well known that many of the early members of his denominational persuasion were unable to read or write.

As far as documentation is concerned, the oldest existing written record of the Old Kanawha Baptist Church has this entry: "May, 1797; after prayer and preaching, proceeded to business." It's believed that the Pratt congregation was formed when George Washington was President and Philadelphia was the National Capital. Also, 1793 was the same year Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin. That same year the first western newspaper, the Sentinel of the Northwest was published in Cincinnati, OH, a town that itself was settled in 1790. This was 3 years before Old Kanawha Church came into being as a church.

As the church grew, its field of service extended from Gauley Bridge in Fayette County some 60 miles northwest to the State capital of Charleston on both sides of the Kanawha River. In its first century of existence, the congregation did not have any permanent meetinghouse in which to hold worship services and discussions. These were generally held in the homes of its members.

From 1834 to 1857, the congregation met in a building which belonged to Mr. John Hansford, Sr. About 1859, Mr. Felix G. Hansford, Sr., provided the community with another building which was used until the Civil War. Soon after the outbreak of the war, in 1861, the church had to hold only occasional services, as it was on the road used by the contending armies. However, during the fighting, misfortune befell the church as many of its earliest records were ravaged and destroyed by soldiers.

The Old Kanawha Baptist members began a building fund in May 1889, and in this same year, a lot for the church was kindly donated by Mrs. Julian E. Dickinson. Unfortunately, in July of the following year, just before its completion, the entire $800 building was purposely gutted by a fire, and completely destroyed.

Undaunted, the members began anew. After devoted community involvement and support, the congregation was able to dedicate their first church home, free of debt, on the fifth Sunday in October, 1892. Throughout the years, the congregation was grown immensely. It has expanded from its original humble structure, particularly within the past half century, to accommodate its rapidly growing membership. For instance, in 1957, an educational building was constructed to meet the needs of the church's service and vocational events.

By the mid-1960's, the membership had outgrown the church's sanctuary. Under the direction of the current pastor, Rev. Kenneth Brougham, a spacious, brick edifice was erected and dedicated on August 11, 1968. The church was survived to personify strength, perseverance and dignity in an dynamic society.

Old Kanawha is an independent Baptist Church with a strong missionary focus. At this moment, under the auspices of Rev. Richard A. Johnson, the church has 167 registered members, and helps support some 14 various missionaries not only in the West Virginia area, but throughout the United States and the world.

Mr. President, I would like to close by saying congratulations to the Old Kanawha Baptist Church for two eventful, yet highly appreciated, centuries of unselfish devotion and religious and community service to the State of West Virginia. Indeed you have much to be proud of, and with the good Lord's blessing, I hope you will be able to provide many more centuries of service. You have made us so very proud.●

DEVELOPING NATIONAL STANDARDS IN EDUCATION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, I came across a speech by Diane Ravitch, Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement and counselor to the Secretary of Education during the Bush administration.

Her comments address the need for both research and standards for our schools.

It is a remarkably straightforward and solid piece of writing.

I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate and, particularly, their staffs who work in the area of education to read what she has to say.

I ask to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

The speech follows:

DEVELOPING NATIONAL STANDARDS IN EDUCATION

(Speech by Diane Ravitch, Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement and Counselor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education)

I told Jim Coleman that my subject this evening would be "Developing National Standards in Education." I am not a sociologist but a historian, and in my estimation, the prospect of national standards represents a historic change in the way that our far-flung and highly decentralized educational system works.

Before getting into the subject at hand, I would like to offer some background. I have been an Assistant Secretary of Education for slightly more than a year. I came to Washington to run the Office of Educational Research and Improvement—or OERI.

OERI was born some two decades ago; it was originally called the National Institute of Education. In preparing to speak tonight, I reviewed testimony delivered by Daniel Patrick Moynihan to a Congressional subcommittee that was considering the creation of the NIE in 1971. Professor Moynihan appeared before the Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee to describe the need for the new NIE. We can easily date Mr. Moynihan's remarks because he begins by apologizing for the typos in his testimony, which he admits he typed by hand.

In retrospect, there are four striking points to be made about Mr. Moynihan's testimony:

First, he was remarkably optimistic about what could be expected from an investment in educational research. He claimed that there had been "a significant influx of men of large ability" into the field, as a consequence of the intellectual ferment created by the Coleman report of 1965. He predicted that educational researchers were on the verge of major breakthroughs; that within a decade, say by 1981, education researchers would be ready to explain how learning occurs, to identify "what goes on in the chemistry of the brain when a child learns something." "Something happens," he said, "They [the researchers] feel they are going to get it."

Second, Mr. Moynihan suggested that federal expenditures for educational research might begin at about $250 million a year and rise—by 1989—to *not less* than $1.1 billion a year.

Third, Mr. Moynihan believed, as a result of his participation in a reanalysis of the Coleman report of 1965, that "traditional measures of school quality, such as pupil-teacher ratios [and] levels of educational expenditure" had "very little educational effect." He insisted that educational research would help identify what needed to be done to improve educational outcomes. He said, "We have learned that things are far more complicated than we thought. The rather simple input-output relations which naively, no doubt, but honestly, we had assumed to obtain in education simply, on examination, do not hold up . . . we confront school systems that are seemingly increasingly chaotic, even anarchic, and which are widely perceived as failing. It may just be that this is partly a result of the expectations included by the rather simple faith that went into such legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Or the reasons may be altogether unrelated to anything done or tried in the past. But the facts are there. Things aren't very good, or don't seem very good to a great many persons, including a great many students."

And fourth, he asserted that the essential purpose of a National Institute of Education was to aim not just for equality of opportunity but for "parity of educational outcomes" among different social groups. His exact words were, "We must master the art of education to the point that achievement is more or less evenly distributed among the different groups in our society and not too enormously varied within such groups."

As a historian, it is my habit to return to original intentions, and it is necessary there-

fore to note that the federal funding for education research never materialized. After I became Assistant Secretary for OERI, I learned to my dismay that there is virtually no support in Congress for educational research nor has there been for the past 20 years. By using the term "virtually," I fear that I have exaggerated the degree of support for educational R&D. A recent study of our agency by the National Academy of Sciences concluded that funding for educational R&D has declined by 82 percent in constant dollars since 1973. While federal support for R&D has grown steadily in every other field, while the Department of Education's budget has grown steadily, support for educational R&D has declined with monotonous regularity. Today, the Department of Education spends about $58 million for R&D, a laughable amount. The Department's request for an increase for R&D in 1993 was again rejected, although the amounts involved are so small as to be mistaken for a rounding error in the federal budget.

Thus, there has been no significant federal investment in studying how children learn or how to improve teaching, at least not by the Department of Education. The "men of large ability" to whom Dr. Moynihan referred some 21 years ago did not produce the great breakthroughs in educational research that presumably required a large infusion of federal dollars. The woeful description of the schools that he offered has a contemporary ring, many things have changed in these past two decades, but we continue to lament the condition of learning, and for good reason.

What is clear today is that the investment in educational research that was anticipated did not occur. However, our national investment in providing education did continue to grow over these past 21 years. Indeed, our investment in education—the total for all public and private expenditures, from kindergarten through universities—has grown from $263 billion to $425 billion in constant 1991-92 dollars. During this period, the K-12 enrollment has actually declined, from 51 million students to 46 million students, while enrollments in higher education have increased from 8.5 million to 13.5 million. It might interest you to know that higher education, which grew by nearly 60 percent, increased its expenditures in constant dollars by 72 percent, while K-12—where enrollments declined by 10 percent—increased its expenditures by 61 percent.

But we obviously have not achieved "parity of outcomes." We continue to see large discrepancies among groups in educational outcomes.

This is the context in which I wish to discuss the movement to develop national standards. The main impetus for standards, I believe, is the same one that animated the creation of the NIE some two decades ago. It stems from our nation's continuing effort to identify the outcomes that we seek in schooling; it stems, furthermore, from our search for an effective means to provide what Senator Moynihan referred to in 1971 as "parity of outcomes." We cannot, after all, pursue parity of *outcomes unless* we have a sure sense of what those outcomes are.

The movement for national standards has three sources, I believe. First is the impetus that comes from disappointment with American students' performance in international assessments, particularly in mathematics and science.

A second source of this movement emerges from the participation of governors, business leaders, and visionary educators in school reform during the past decade. Those men and women who understood the idea of strategic planning, who knew that a change process must begin by identifying goals, found that education was not accustomed to goal-setting. Those who tried to set goals and to determine appropriate outcomes met resistance and institutional inertia; they realized very quickly that the schools are accustomed to having a multitude of unordered priorities, a multitude of roles, and a plethora of outcomes, none more important than the others. Those who went seriously about the question of reform discovered that American education is characterized by a lack of consensus on desired outcomes and goals. You might even say that there has been a consensus that no need has precedence over any other need; and that this broad receptivity to bearing all burdens and accepting all social responsibilities has served to unfit the schools for achieving any of its ends.

A third reason for the movement for national standards is the example created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, which has successfully developed voluntary national standards over the past several years.

These three causes could be seen at work in the establishment by Congress last year of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, which issued its report in January 1992, calling for the creation of voluntary national standards and a system of national examinations.

If I may, I would like to go through this scenario in closer detail.

First, the international assessments. Over the past 25 years, the United States has participated in half-a-dozen international assessments of student achievement. More often than not, our students rank below the mean, sometimes quite near the bottom. The most recent international assessment of mathematics and science was released earlier this year. It compared 9-year-old and 13-year-old students in 20 countries. Of these countries, 15 tested representative samples. Thirteen-year-old American students ranked 13th out of 15 in science, and 14th out of 15 in mathematics.

Critics of these assessments have been quite vocal, claiming that the tests are invalid and the rankings are insignificant. As I understand them, they have three basic complaints. First, that is not fair to compare our students to students from cultures where education is valued. I would argue, to the contrary, that we should learn to value education, or continue to pay the consequences in low student achievement.

A second criticism is that it is unfair to compare our students to their counterparts from nations that have a strong coherent curriculum in mathematics and science. Again, the critics miss the point. The test is not at fault for having discovered the price that we pay for *not* having a strong coherent curriculum in mathematics and science. If anything, the lesson from these international assessments is that you learn what you study, and you can't learn what you don't study. Indeed, American students are not on a level playing field when they are matched with students from countries that offer a program of studies that is coherent, cumulative, and thoughtful.

A third criticism one hears is that our country teaches everyone and tests everyone, unlike every other country in the assessment. This is simply not true, although its frequent repetition has caused many people to think it is true. In the last international assessment of science and math, for example, 15 of the 20 participating countries tested comprehensive populations, and in all 15 of those nations, 90 percent or more of the age-eligible children are in school.

So, the international assessments laid the groundwork for those who felt that something was fundamentally wrong in our educational system. The momentum for change was picked up by those governors, educators, and business leaders who became involved in school reform after the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. For a decade, the states sought to reform their schools. They began raising graduation requirements, initiating merit pay and career ladders, and trying a host of other reforms; recently they have promoted school-base management and a variety of other efforts to restructure the social organization of schools.

Many reformers came to believe that such changes were too piecemeal, too uncoordinated, too incremental. So, in recent years, we have heard more about the need for *systemic* change, for changes that essentially alter the entire system of education. And systemic reformers characteristically step back to look at the system as a whole and to see how they can intervene in a way that makes the system more coherent and to focus attention on improvement of educational *outcomes*. Bill Honig, the State Superintendent in California, was the first to launch systemic reform focused on outcomes; he focused first on changing *what* children learn, by revising the state's curriculum frameworks; and he then changed *how* students are assessed, so that what is taught in the best classrooms is the same as what is tested by the state. Fortunately, there is good research to support systemic reform, such as the work done by the federally-funded Center for Policy Research in Education at Rutgers University.

Goal-setting went national in 1989, when the President invited the nation's 50 governors to Charlottesville, Virginia, where they agreed on the importance of national goals for education. Of particular note here are goals three and four, which states that all students will demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter, including mathematics, science, English, history, and geography. Goal four somewhat redundantly emphasizes the importance of achievements in math and science. The two goals together have become the basis for much of the broad and bipartisan support to establish national standards in subject areas.

For the fact is that you cannot achieve goal three or goal four unless a consensus is established about what students are expected to learn.

In the absence of a consensus about *what* children should learn, the educational system is inherently incoherent:

Teacher education prepares would-be teachers for indeterminate roles, to carry a variety of social burdens, without any clear definition of what they are to teach.

Textbooks base their content on the combined dictates of 22 states that formally adopt textbooks and on the idiosyncratic demands of large city school districts, not on the content that has been shaped thoughtfully and purposefully by the teachers and scholars who know the field best.

Assessments are prepared by commercial test-makers who seek to provide national norms, and these national tests are not based on what is specified in the curriculum or taught in the classroom. Over time, teachers have been "teaching to the test," so that these tests eventually shape the curriculum, instead of the curriculum determining the tests.

In many states, staff development had no connection to the curriculum, because of the absence of a consensus about what was to be taught.

So how in this highly decentralized nation—a nation of 15,000 school districts and 50 state educational authorities, each jealous of its domain—how in this contentious and individualistic nation were we to derive a consensus about what students should learn?

Fortunately, the math teachers came to the rescue and pointed the way. In the mid-1980s, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (known as the NCTM) began the arduous process of standard-setting on its own. Having experienced the failure of the New Math, which was criticized for being too abstract, and having watched with dismay as the nation's schools went back to basics with a vengeance, the math teachers deliberated about what they could do to change the teaching of math for the better. The math teachers were helped in their deliberations by good educational research, in this case the work of the federally-funded National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education at the University of Wisconsin, proof that even a small investment in good research has been worthwhile.

After many meetings and much discussion, they hit upon the answer: they decided to develop national standards. They devised an elaborate consensus and review process that ultimately involved thousands of math teachers. By 1989, they were able to publish national standards that represented a dramatic change in the teaching of mathematics.

Instead of computation and memorization of abstractions, the new standards emphasize problem-solving, hands-on activities, use of manipulatives, and the development of mathematics as a way of thinking and reasoning.

The new standards encourage the introduction of elements of algebra, geometry, probability and statistics in the elementary grades.

The new standards set high expectations for all children, instead of dividing children into those who are bound for college and those who are not.

The NCTM standards have been widely accepted by math teachers and by educational leaders in districts and states. Consequently, they have had a dynamic effect on the entire educational system. The NCTM standards are changing teacher education, because new teachers will be expected to learn to teach to them. The NCTM standards have changed teacher training in 41 states, which use them as their basic standard. The NCTM standards have changed the way mathematics textbooks are written, with more attention to problem-solving and real-world situations. The NCTM standards are changing the nature of assessments, reinforcing the move away from standardized multiple-choice tests and toward performance assessments that probe for students' explanations, interpretations, decisions and understanding.

I have seen the NCTM standards at work in a variety of settings. At Mission High School in San Francisco, I saw inner-city students working on a fascinating problem that required them to use algebra and geometry to find a solution. These were youngsters who would ordinarily be tracked into remedial math or consumer math. Every one of those students discovered that they could learn more and use their minds well. The NCTM standards caused a change in instructional methods, a change in materials, a change in teacher training, and a raising of expectations.

What the NCTM standards demonstrate is the power of standards. Good standards establish a goal; they create a consensus about what the education outcomes *should* be. It now seems obvious that in the absence of such a consensus, we are left with the unsatisfactory goal of getting high scores on standardized tests of basic skills and allowing students to believe that learning is nothing more than a guessing game, a game that they can win by mastering test-taking techniques.

It seems clear to a growing number of people, at the federal, state, and local level, that good national standards have the power to create a coherent system, to promote purposeful and constructive changes in the system, to establish clear goals for learning, and to raise the overall quality of education.

When Lamar Alexander was appointed Secretary of Education, he determined that one of his goals would be to begin the development of voluntary national standards. Towards that end, he joined with Congress in creating the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, to examine the feasibility and desirability of setting standards and creating a national examination system. That panel, co-chaired by Governors Carroll Campbell of South Carolina and Roy Romer of Colorado, issued its report earlier this year, which strongly endorsed both national standards and a national system of assessment.

At the Department of Education, we have worked to implement the recommendations of the standards and testing panel. Last fall, the Department made a grant to the National Academy of Sciences to develop content standards in science, that is, what American students should know and be able to do in science. This summer, the Academy has gathered representatives from every science education organization, along with teachers and scholars, to work on the consensus-building process.

Also last fall, the Department made a grant, in collaboration with the National Endowment for the Humanities, to the National Center for History in the Schools, based at UCLA to develop voluntary national standards in American history and world history. The Center has brought together every organization concerned with history, social studies, and social sciences in elementary and secondary education and will engage in a broad review process involving thousands of teachers and scholars and members of the public.

This spring, the Department, with support from other federal agencies, has made grants to develop national standards in the arts, in civics, and in geography. It is our hope that before long we will be able to announce a grant in the field of English. In each case, funding went to professional, scholarly organizations that demonstrated the ability to bring the field together to work in concert on the difficult task of building a consensus about what children from kindergarten through 12th grade should know and be able to do.

The purpose of standard-setting, it should be clear, is two-fold; to promote equality of educational opportunity and to raise the academic achievement of all children.

The small federal investment in educational R&D fortunately has included support for a sturdy program of statistics and data-collection. From the valuable work of the National Center for Education Statistics, we know that there are wide disparities in course-taking in our schools. For example, we learn from NELS:88 (National Educational Longitudinal Study) that curricular tracking can be detected as early as the eighth grade, where children get very different exposure to algebra, for example. Only 18 percent of the children whose parents did *not* graduate high school take Algebra I, compared with 43 percent of the children whose parents graduated college, and 59 percent of children of Ph.D.s, M.D.s, and other professionals. Not surprisingly, the same skewing can be found when one looks at family income or race/ethnicity. In the latter category, it is Asian students who are likeliest to take algebra in eighth grade (46.8 percent), followed by white students (33.9 percent), then by black, Hispanic and Native American students (about 25 percent for each group).

By 11th grade, looking now at transcript studies drawn by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, we can see the effects of curricular tracking in public schools. By that time, only 63 percent of the students whose parents did not finish high schools have taken Algebra I, compared with 91 percent of the students whose parents graduated from college.

Does this disparity have to exist? Is it a necessary part of schooling in America? Consider the same two groups of students enrolled in Catholic schools. The figures for Catholic school 11th graders are as follows: of those students whose parents did *not* graduate from high school, 96 percent have taken Algebra I, compared with those whose parents graduated college: 97 percent.

Why is there so much disparity in the public schools, and so little in the Catholic schools? I suggest it is because the Catholic schools did not ask anyone if they wanted to take Algebra I. In other words, they have standards that apply to everyone, and these standards provide a guarantee of educational opportunity and equity.

All of the standard-setting projects are concerned about equity. The math teachers want to break the connection between coursetaking and such factors as socioeconomic status, parent education, income, and ethnicity. They believe that students can learn much more, and that expectations can be raised much higher for all students. Similarly, the leading science organizations want to build knowledge of science and curiosity about natural phenomena throughout the K–12 curriculum.

Each of these professional groups wants to break the iron grip of tracking and to expose more and more children to a rich diet of inquiry, exploration, problem-solving and active learning. There is general agreement among them that we do not need to ration educational experiences and that we can instead make available to all children the opportunity for a full and rich curriculum.

The first critically important step, then, is the creation of a national consensus among teachers, scholars, and the educational community about what students need to know and be able to do. This is beginning to happen. It will succeed to the extent that the products of these consensus-building activities are accepted by the professional field. If the standards are powerful, they will be embraced, as the NCTM standards have been. If they are not, they will be rejected and ignored. They will stand or fall based on professional review, not by any legal mandate.

What must happen next is implementation, and this depends on actions taken by the states, where most educational authority resides. Many states regularly design curriculum frameworks. Some states, notably California, have used the curriculum process to

build high standards for the state's educational system; indeed, the highly regarded California curriculum frameworks are a model for the nation. The National Science Foundation has made sizable grants to 21 states to stimulate systemic reforms, including the development of state curriculum frameworks. Over the next few years, the Department of Education hopes to provide funding for state curriculum frameworks in every important subject area. Over time, the state curriculum frameworks will both reflect and influence the continually evolving national standards.

If the NCTM standards serve as a model, we can expect that the development of high national standards will influence assessments and will drive out the mechanistic standardized tests that have been so long lamented. What will emerge, and what is already emerging in a number of states, is a commitment to constant improvement in assessment, and a commitment to discover ways to gauge student performance that are better than current tests. Of course, we need R&D to encourage the evolution of improved assessments. My agency requested $5 million to invest in such research in 1993, but have thus far not received any support from Congress. States will be hard-pressed to pay for what is rightfully a federal responsibility.

We still need federal support of R&D to achieve the ends we seek. We must continue to work to persuade the Congress that funding is needed in order to understand the consequences of our policies. In the meanwhile, events have moved to bring us to a historic turning of the road through the effort to set voluntary national standards. Perhaps, 20 years from now, someone else will stand before you and assess these efforts harshly. I certainly hope not.

At a recent meeting of the Asia-Pacific nations in Washington, 14 countries—including Japan, Korea, China, Taiwan, Thailand, New Zealand, Canada, Australia, and the U.S.—discussed standards for the 21st century. Every one of the members was either setting or had already established national standards for what students should learn. When asked why they had set these standards, all gave the same answer: first, to raise academic achievement for all students; and second, to provide equal educational opportunity for all students.

It seemed perfectly obvious to those who had done it. We still must persuade many in our country that standards do not mean standardization; that they do not mean setting the bar so high that more children will fail; that they do not mean more reliance on standardized tests. What they do mean is that children, teachers, and parents will understand what is expected to succeed; that textbooks and educational technology will be based on that understanding, that assessments will be based on the curriculum and on what children have been taught, rather than what has been standardized; and that teachers will learn what they are expected to teach.

As a historian, I know where good intentions lead. I know, too, how seldom we achieve what we set out to do. And I understand how often unintended consequences prevail. Yet try we must.

As we promote the development of national standards, we seek the purpose that Senator Moynihan so aptly described in 1971: parity of educational outcomes. To quote the Senator once again: "We must master the art of education to the point that achievement is more or less evenly distributed among the different groups in our society and not too enormously varied within such groups."

Perhaps it is policy, not research, that must lead the way. To be sure, we need both.•

A TRIBUTE TO STANTON

• Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Stanton, a small town located in the heart of Powell County in eastern Kentucky.

Stanton, which is the county seat, has a varied terrain which includes rich, farmable bottom land and steep, rocky mountains. The town is bordered on the north by the Red River. Stanton's southernmost boundary is the Bert T. Combs Mountain Parkway, an interstate built during the 1960's which links Stanton with many central and eastern Kentucky communities.

Stanton was originally known as Beaver Pond. The small community was incorporated in 1854, and was named in honor of Richard M. Stanton, a Kentuckian who served in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Since 1854, there has been little change in Stanton, and residents are happy with this slow-paced lifestyle. Although two industrial parks are located on the outskirts of town, community leaders would prefer to bring in smaller plants employing between 50 and 250 workers. The preservation of Stanton's smalltown atmosphere is more important to the citizens than accelerated growth.

Mr. President, today I honor the good people of Stanton and their smalltown way of life. In a world of fast-paced lifestyles, Stanton's quiet atmosphere is very refreshing.

Mr. President, I ask that an accompanying article from Louisville's Courier Journal be submitted in today's RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville (KY) Courier Journal, Apr. 12, 1993]

STANTON

(By Richard Wilson)

It's hard to find much in this small town just off the Bert T. Combs-Mountain Parkway to contradict the feeling of residents that it's much more than a friendly, laid-back community going its own way and ignoring the hustle and bustle of larger towns down the road in Central Kentucky.

About the only thing generating any impatience seems to be the afternoon traffic backed up at Main Street and College Avenue, where the town's only traffic light slows things down.

But that's only a minor distraction. Otherwise, Stanton is like most other small towns where everybody knows their neighbors and locals seldom hesitate to speak to strangers on the one street in town that has anything close to extensive sidewalks.

The natives say they wouldn't live anywhere else, and the outsiders who have moved in don't seem prone to argue with that assessment.

"This is just a little country town that's doing all right. It's still growing, and a lot of them aren't," says Harding Abner, owner and operator of Abner's Motel, Stanton's only motel.

While the Powell County seat's 4 percent population growth during the past decade may not be phenomenal, it far outstrips that of most of its counterparts in Eastern Kentucky. The growth has been steady since the early-1960s when Combs, the state's last Eastern Kentucky governor, routed the parkway through the area. Ironically, Combs drowned in the rain-swollen Red River a few miles from Stanton on Dec. 4, 1991, while traveling to his log cabin home on nearby Cane Creek.

The parkway that Combs built generated a resurgence that Stanton still capitalizes on. Since that time, numerous Eastern Kentuckians have moved down the parkway and relocated in Stanton to be closer to jobs in Mount Sterling, Winchester, Georgetown and Lexington. And the easy commute has allowed many natives to stay home and head down the parkway every day for the kind of jobs that aren't available in Powell County.

"In the past 20 years we've rapidly become a bedroom community," says Powell County Coroner Carl Wells, a mortician who moved to Stanton from Perry County in 1955.

While Stanton may not be the commuter haven that towns like Nicholasville and Versailles are, "park 'n' ride" lots along the parkway at Stanton and Clay City are filled with cars most weekdays. Even Johnny Napier, Stanton's mayor, commutes to Lexington, where he operates an air-conditioning supply company.

"One of these days I look for Stanton to take off like Nicholasville (one of Kentucky's fastest-growing cities)," says John Cox Jr., a Wolfe Countian who came to Stanton 45 years ago to open his law practice.

"Its potential for growth is unlimited," says Cox, the town's leading University of Kentucky sports fan.

That's way down the road—literally and figuratively. But it didn't have to be that way. If the political winds had blown differently a couple of decades ago, the county might have been a bustling resort area today on the fringes of a large lake created by a dam the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers wanted to build on the Red River.

Environmentalists, politicians and landowners squabbled for years over the dam that opponents said would spoil the nearby Red River Gorge and destroy a collection of flora and fauna unequaled in the Eastern United States in return for questionable benefits. Most locals favored the dam, contending it was needed for flood control and water for a growing Central Kentucky.

The proposal was finally defeated, and the area has continued to remain in the economic development backwaters.

While they may lament what might have been, movers and shakers like Ron Rousey, president of the Powell County Bank, remain optimistic that the town will continue showing the same resiliency that stood it well in the face of past disappointments.

After the discovery of iron pyrite in 1786 near what is now Clay City, the area became the home of one of the first iron forges west of the Alleghenies in 1805. The operation, known as the Red River Iron Works, produced nails and pots and cannonballs used in the War of 1812. Later, when the railroad reached Stanton, the town began reaping the benefits of the coal and lumber industries.

But the lumber industry, like the iron industry before it, declined in the 1920s, and by World War II the rails were taken up and used for scrap. After 20 years of hard times during the 1940s and '50s, Stanton's rebirth

came with the parkway as a few small industries began moving into the area.

Today, two industrial parks sit just outside town, ready and waiting for prospects. Rousey, president of the Powell County Industrial Development Authority, says the town isn't looking for large plants but would welcome ones employing between 50 to 250 workers. A new Beech Fork reservoir and a planned modern water-treatment plant position Stanton for future growth and overcome the concerns of an uncertain water supply from the Red River.

"We want to be able to provide jobs for our young people. In a small community like this, in order to get decent jobs, they have to leave. And they're the future of small communities, or any communities," Rousey says.

But many locals, including Napier, say they don't want fast-paced growth that would ruin the small-town atmosphere.

"I'd like to see it stay rather slow and controlled. There's enough of a rat race when you get down here to a place like Lexington. You don't want to have to go home to it too," the mayor said during an interview in his Lexington office.

While Stanton may lack some of the social and cultural amenities of its Central Kentucky brethren, like a theater or white-tablecloth restaurants, locals say it isn't hurting for entertainment, and Lexington is just 45 minutes away. The three video stores are thriving. The local high school's football and basketball teams draw good crowds, and during warm weather the Mountain View drive-in is well-attended.

The town also has a small but modern library. Residents say the Powell County schools are good, and nearly everyone likes to talk about a special tax enacted a few years ago to modernize the schools. The recent opening of a modern computer laboratory at Powell County Middle School is also a point of pride.

But progress has cost the town some of its landmarks. Years ago, before the Mountain Parkway was built, Dalton's Restaurant was a magnet for motorists traveling winding Ky. 15 in and out of the mountains. Most of the old boarding houses are also gone.

Bruen's Restaurant is still there serving rib-sticking meals, along with Cotton's Restaurant, where locals congregate to discuss the issues and gossip of the day. "That bunch over there's got the answers for any problem you can think of," said Harold Hurst, who runs a furniture and appliance store across College Avenue from Cotton's.

While Stanton has never had a college, College Avenue is named for the old Stanton Academy, a private elementary and secondary school affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. It opened in 1908 and closed in 1931. The local school system used the building as a high school until 1937. The building burned in 1984.

Despite the pleasing small-town atmosphere, Stanton is not without problems. A shortage of housing has plagued the community for years, although construction of several apartment complexes has eased the problem. Several unbecoming mobile home parks dot the city limits, and most new home construction is on the town's outskirts nestled in heavily forested hollows.

Napier, the mayor, says the town's coffers are not flush. Stanton could find plenty of ways to spend more revenue if it had it, he adds. Among the projects he would like to see is a storm-drainage system, new sidewalks and more land for the city park. He would also like to start some beautification projects to dress up downtown. A consultant's report recommended several, including grassy medians between sidewalks and streets that "should create a more efficient and aesthetically pleasing downtown area."

The same report outlined ways to capitalize on tourism, particularly at the gorge, Daniel Boone National Forest and Natural Bridge State Resort Park.

Residents also cite a low crime rate as a plus for the town. Several years ago city police began covering the town 24 hours a day, a move that Police Chief Larry Epperson said has cut down on what crime the town had. Epperson, chief for the past six years, say the biggest problem is marijuana and drug sales. "Most of the young kids are back to Bud Lite, which is bad enough. But I'm glad it's not drugs," he added.

A little over a year ago the community was stunned by a crime that drew statewide attention. Popular Sheriff Steve Bennett and Deputy Arthur Briscoe were gunned down in a rural shoot-out when they attempted to serve a warrant. The man charged in the crime, Ralph Baze Jr., is to go on trial later this year. A granite marker in front of the courthouse commemorates the service of the two lawmen and that of Asa (Host) Pettit, a town marshall killed in 1913.

Nearby is another monument, a granite bust of Woody Stephens noting that the famous thoroughbred trainer was born in Stanton in 1913.

Stanton, a mixture of the old and the new, is slowly changing, but many residents, including Mayor Napier, are ambivalent over how fast they want that change to occur.

"I like a rural area, sparsely populated. But you've got to try to balance that somehow with the availability of jobs so people who live here can make a decent living," he said.

Population (1990): Stanton, 2,795; Powell County, 11,686.

Per capita income (1990) $9,883, or $5,082 below the state average.

Jobs (1990): Manufacturing, 685; state/local government, 522; wholesale and retail trade, 387; services, 180, contract construction, 30.

Big employers: Continental Metal Specialty Inc., metal fabrications, electronic and mechanical assemblies, 485 employees; U.S. Brick Inc., 77; Natural Bridge Stone Co., 50, and Burke-Parsons-Bowlby Corp., wooden posts, timber, lumber, treated wood products, 29.

Transportation; Highways—Bert T. Combs Mountain Parkway; Ky. 11, Ky. 15 and Ky. 213. Truck—15 common carriers serve Stanton. Air—Stanton Airport has a 3,000-foot paved runway. Nearest scheduled commercial service is at Lexington's Blue Grass Airport, 50 miles northwest.

Media: Newspaper—Clay City Times (weekly). Radio—WBFC-AM, Southern gospel; WSKV-FM, country. Lexington TV stations serve the community.

Education: Powell County schools, 2,581 students.

Topography: Varied, ranging from rich, fertile bottom land to hilly and steep mountain terrain.

FAMOUS FACTS AND FIGURES

Powell County was formed in January 1852 from portions of Clark, Estill and Montgomery counties. It is named for Lazarus Whitehead Powell, governor of Kentucky from 1851 to 1855 and a U.S. Senator from 1858 to 1865.

Stanton, the county seat, was incorporated in 1854. It was initially called Beaver Pond and was later renamed in honor of Richard M. Stanton, a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Maysville.

Stanton is one of only five county seats in Kentucky without a daily or weekly newspaper. The others are Catlettsburg, in Boyd County; Newport, in Campbell County; Dixon, in Webster County and Mt. Olivet, in Robertson County. Powell County has a newspaper, the weekly Clay City Times, published in Clay City, the only other major community in the county.●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through April 7, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 287), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by $2.1 billion in budget authority and $0.5 billion in outlays. Current level is $0.5 billion above the revenue floor in 1993 and above by $1.4 billion over the 5 years, 1993–97. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $392.4 billion, $28.4 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1993 of $420.8 billion.

There has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues since the last report, dated April 6, 1993.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 19, 1993.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1993 and is current through April 7, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 287). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated April 5, 1993, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF APRIL 7, 1993

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level [1]	Current level +/− resolution
On-budget			
Budget Authority	1,250.0	1,247.9	−2.1
Outlays	1,242.3	1,241.8	−0.5
Revenues			
1993	848.9	849.4	+0.5
1993–1997	4,818.6	4,820.0	+1.4
Maximum Deficit Amount	420.8	392.4	−28.4
Debt Subject to Limit	4,461.2	4,152.8	−308.4
Off-budget			
Social Security Outlays			
1993	260.0	260.0	
1993–97	1,415.0	1,415.0	
Social Security Revenues			
1993	328.1	328.1	[2]
1993–97	1,865.0	1,865.0	[3]

[1] Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

[2] Less than $50 million.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APRIL 7, 1993

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			849,425
Permanents and other spending legislation	764,283	737,413	
Appropriation legislation	732,061	743,943	
Offsetting receipts	(240,524)	(240,524)	
Total previously enacted	1,255,820	1,240,833	849,425
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Entitlements and mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(7,928)	962	
Total current level [1]	1,247,892	1,241,794	849,425
Total budget resolution [2]	1,249,990	1,242,290	848,890
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	2,098	496	
Over budget resolution			535

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include the following in emergency funding (in millions of dollars):

Public Law	Budget authority	Outlays
102–229		712
102–266		33
102–302		380
102–368	960	5,873
102–381	218	13
103–6	3,322	3,322
Total	4,500	10,333

[2] Includes revision under sec. 9 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Notes.—Amounts in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.•

THE CITY OF WOODINVILLE

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize the recent incorporation of Woodinville, WA. Through the efforts of many dedicated individuals, the incorporation vote passed in May 1992 and on March 31, 1993, Woodinville officially became a city.

While Woodinville only recently became a city, it has been a vital and growing part of Washington State for more than 100 years. Originally founded as a logging community, the fertile river valley surrounding Woodinville laid the foundation for a thriving agriculture industry which dominated the area for many years.

Today, the people who live throughout Woodinville enjoy an exceptionally high quality of life. A suburb of Seattle, this community is the headquarters for many small and large businesses that employ people throughout the Puget Sound region. Retail and industry have built a solid economic base for the people and community of Woodinville.

Parents can take pride in knowing the schools throughout Woodinville give opportunities to students of all ages. The parks and riding trails which dot the landscape provide endless possibilities for recreational activities. Given the many attributes of this fine community, it is no wonder that over 8,000 people call Woodinville home.

The ambitious goals of Woodinville community leaders have produced a clear vision for the future of this new city. I am confident these goals will be fulfilled and that Woodinville will remain an integral part of Washington State for years to come.•

A TRIBUTE TO BOB RUSSELL, SENIOR PASTOR AT SOUTHEAST CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN LOUISVILLE, KY

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Bob Russell, the senior pastor at Southeast Christian Church in Louisville.

Mr. President, in an age when morality and Christian values are often pushed aside, it is refreshing to find a man like Bob Russell who is dedicated to serving God and his church. Bob, who prefers to be called by his first name rather than formal titles like Reverend or Brother, began his life of Christian service at the Cincinnati Bible Seminary in the early 1960's. In 1966, a year after his graduation from the seminary, Bob and his wife, Judy, joined the ministry of Louisville's Southeast Christian Church.

When the Southeast Christian Church congregation first began meeting in 1962, the average attendance at Sunday services was 96. When Bob joined the church staff in 1966, membership hovered somewhere around 125. These numbers began to escalate after his arrival. In his 27 years at Southeast Christian Church, membership has grown to 8,200 people, and in 1992, the average attendance at weekend worship was 7,032.

Mr. President, what draws people to Southeast Christian Church is Bob's ability to present the Bible in a nonthreatening, nonpresumptuous manner. He is not judgmental, nor would he ever bar a member from fellowship for a belief that goes against the church's translation of the Bible. Instead, he uses the Bible's scriptures and his personal experiences to lead church members through life's daily turmoil.

Members can easily relate to Bob because his life parallels so many of their experiences. The son of a factory worker, Bob grew up in a small town and attended church each Sunday with his parents and siblings. He understands the problems most families face, and addresses these issues with sincerity.

Mr. President, under Bob's direction, Southeast Christian Church is planning to build a sanctuary that will seat 9,300. Church members believe this expansion will be a great asset and influence in their community. Although Bob does not consider himself a visionary, I think most will agree that his desire to bring Christianity to the multitudes has indeed inspired the church's growth.

Mr. President, today I honor Bob Russell for his dedication to Southeast Christian Church and the good people of Louisville. He truly is an inspiration to all.

Mr. President, I request that an accompanying article from Louisville's Courier-Journal be included in today's RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Apr. 11, 1993]

JUST PLAIN BOB

(By C. Ray Hall)

A couple of Sundays ago, part of the multitude that worships at Southeast Christian Church emptied into the midday sunlight. On their way out, two boys peered into a scale model of the church's proposed new 9,300-seat sanctuary.

"Wow! You could play baseball in there," one said. "It looks like Rupp Arena!" said another.

Nobody will have to imagine that Southeast Christian and its senior minister, Bob Russell, are holding forth in a basketball venue today. The 8,200-member congregation, too big for everyone to meet all at once in church, will worship at Freedom Hall at 10 a.m. for the third straight Easter Sunday.

Scriptures under the scoreboard may seem surreal, but Russell, who preached to nearly 13,000 there last year, has done some of his most memorable work in basketball arenas, with celestial questions sort of bouncing off the rafters.

As a Cincinnati Bible College player in 1962, he set a school record with 44 points in a game. He not only walked the walk, he talked the talk: Once, playing against a Baptist college in Chattanooga, Russell ragged the refs so much that he drew two technical fouls by halftime.

At intermission, one fan grabbed his jersey and inquired as to the state of his soul.

"Are you saved?" the fan wondered.

Russell, a paragon of understated pleasantness, would never be so rude. His soul-searching and soul-winning are done softly, in a low-key, low-pressure way, suffused with humor, self-deprecation and an utter lack of presumption.

Rather than stating a church position by saying, "This is what God wants," he says,

"It is our understanding from Scripture that * * *."

When one prospective member, aware of the church's stand against abortion, recently asked him, "Do you have to be a pro-lifer?" Russell declared that "being pro-choice is not a bar to fellowship."

Likewise, he said, drinking is not, so to speak, a bar. "I can't find anything in the Bible that says you can't drink a glass of wine," he says. "I wish I could."

Russell is both comfortable and comforting, offering a friendly path toward the firm center of the church. And it is an unyielding center.

"We go against the grain of the secular in issues like abortion * * * pornography * * * homosexuality," says administration minister Michael Graham. "We still believe the Bible is the true word of God, and it hasn't changed. We accept it for what it says and try to follow that teaching. And that makes us somewhat unique, I guess. We are a growing church that has absolutes. Whereas general society doesn't feel there are too many absolutes."

Russell's easy engagability and his long-term wearability surely account, in part, for the church's phenomenal growth during his 27-year tenure: from about 125 to 8,200 members. That makes it the largest church in Kentucky, its leaders say, and its attendance ranks it among the top 15 in the United States.

"The real drawing power is Bob's sermons," says John Coffee, a church leader. "Then the rest of the programs and the worship services, the music, that keeps people."

With a $6.6 million annual budget, the church, at 2840 Hikes Lane, has a mindboggling array of programs—there are about 150 Bible study and fellowship classes alone.

Because the church's 2,400-seat sanctuary cannot accommodate all the members, there are four identical services on weekends. (People may find God, but they sometimes lose each other. One of the charter members, H.W. "Butch" Dabney, says, "I saw one fellow, I thought he'd died—I hadn't seen him in years. I found out he went to the 11 o'clock service.")

On May 15–16, the congregation will vote on a proposal to occupy the 9,300-seat church near the Interstate 64-Blankenbaker Road interchange by 1996.

Russell takes none of the credit for the church's growth.

"I am the pulpit preacher," he says. "I am not the visionary. We have guys in the church who are better visionaries than I."

John Coffee, one of those visionaries, a labor-relations manager with United Parcel Service, says, "I've known a lot of preachers. He is by far the most humble preacher I've ever met.

"He went years and wouldn't accept a raise," Coffee says. "We had to finally force him to take an increase so the rest of the staff could get an increase. It was throwing everything off kilter."

DOWN-HOME VIRTUES

Russell is a 49-year-old man who looks 39 and approaches the world with the wonder of a 9-year-old. His mood swings seem to range from pleasantness to joy to radiance. He rises before dawn and routinely works 15-hour days. The closest thing to a fault anyone ascribes to him is a sharp spirit of competition.

Despite the phone book entry that calls him "Reverend," and the radio-ministry introduction that calls him "Brother," he eschews titles. Just plain Bob will do. He never shouts from the pulpit. A sympathetic critic once chided him for his low key delivery: "I just don't think Bob Russell has ever let himself go in the pulpit." To which Russell replies," for better or worse, "What you see is what you get. I'm giving it everything I've got."

He drives a Honda with 110,000 miles on the odometer. He rarely buys anything for himself, if he wants something, he just asks for it for Christmas. (Usually, he gets golf balls. The more the better, since golf is apparently his only secular passion except for University of Louisville basketball.)

Russell and his wife, Judy, lived in the same house for 21 years while their two sons grew up. Rusty, 25, and his 21-year-old brother, Phil, can recall their childhood days when the rec room was furnished with lawn furniture.

Humility and humor, like charity and the other virtues began at home for Russell. He grew up in the Snow Belt town of Conneautville, Pa., (pronounced "Connie-ought-ville") where his father Charles (pronounced "Chap") worked at a Talon zipper factory for more than 30 years.

"To this day my parents are the best Christian people I know," Russell says. "We went to church every time the doors were open. I was out of high school before I ever saw the end of 'The Wizard of Oz' because that thing came on Sunday afternoon; by the time it was about half-way through, we had to get up and go to church."

One Sunday, he says, "We woke up, there was 18–20 inches of snow. * * * My brother and I thought, well, this is one Sunday we're not going to have to go to church. But that wasn't so. My dad packed us in the car and we took off. We got a half-mile away and got stuck. So we trudged back through the deep snow back home * * *.

"My dad sat us down in the living room with the family. * * * He read the Bible. My sister plunked out some choruses on the piano, and we sang songs with the family. My mother went into the kitchen and got some grape Kool-Aid and some saltine crackers and we had communion in our home."

"And I tell people to this day that was the most memorable church service I've ever been in."

ANSWERING THE CALL

When a weak throwing arm doomed him at a Pittsburgh Pirates tryout camp, Russell thought of pursuing basketball at Clarion College. After visiting the school, he shocked his father and himself by declaring, "This is not where I'm supposed to go to school. I'm supposed to go to Cincinnati Bible Seminary and study for the ministry."

There he met Judy Thomas, a music student from Rushville, Ind. "I was intrigued by him," she says. "He had a sweet personality and a very gentle personality."

They were married the day after he graduated from the seminary. He took a $70-a-week job preaching at Monterey, Ohio. He stayed a year, then came to Southeast Christian in 1966 for about $7,000 a year, enough to allow her to stop working as a brokerage teletype operator. She now works for the church in the "Living World" ministry, sending tapes of her husband's sermons all over the world.

It is a notion scarcely imaginable to a boy who grew up attending a tiny church in rural Pennsylvania.

"I grew up with the concept that the church in which I was involved was about the only one: that you had to be our brand, and if you weren't our brand, your chances of going to heaven were pretty slim," he says.

"I've come to understand that God has people in other folds. I may disagree with some of their doctrinal positions, but I would count them as my brother or my sister in Christ; so I guess I would say concept of God is broader.

"But I have not lost at all the concept of God who is capable of wrath. That's what really concerns me about our country and our churches today, that we've lost any sense of accountability; we've lost our sense of moral values that have been handed down to us from God. And every time in Scripture when a nation or a group of people to whom God, had revealed himself turned their back on Him, there came a judgment."

He says this evenly and rather sadly, without the note of vindication that sometimes colors other evangelists' dark forecasts.

"I'VE GOT A GIFT HERE . . ."

One night a while back, he had trouble sleeping. He went downstairs and slipped a tape into the VCR. The video showed a guest speaker at the church. Unbeknownst to him, the second part of the tape contained one of Russell's sermons.

"It was still 4:30 in the morning," he recalls. "So I thought, well, I'll watch some of this. It was a sermon that I had preached a year and a half or two years ago, and by that time I'm unfamiliar with it * * *.

"As I watched that, I said, 'This is making sense. This sermon is better than I remembered it being.' And then I had that sense, 'That's not me. I'm not capable of doing that.' And it really got to me. I remember sitting there weeping over that thing * * * and I don't cry very often.

"But I remember saying, 'God, what have you done to me?' And there was this feeling of responsibility, with a gift to communicate that I really hadn't fully understood to that point. It wasn't necessarily an ego boost as much as an awareness that I've got a gift here and I'd better use it to the best of my ability. That was an awakening moment for me."

Still, Russell has a hard time explaining why, on the cusp of 50, he continues to work so hard.

"Part of it may be my competitive nature," he says.

How competitive is he?

"Even if it's a game of Monopoly or something," his wife says, "he's out to beat you."

Rusty recails an episode when his dad was about 35. "This high school kid, he was, like, a track star. Thought he was real cool. And my dad challenged him to a race out on the street. And dad whipped him bad."

In some ways, he also competes with himself.

"I can't go back and do old sermons," he says. "Who would know? I mean, who would know? But I don't get that fire within me when I look at old sermons. I think I can do better * * *"

How competitive isn't he?

Some suggested that the proposed new church building might as well be the largest in the country. Russell disagreed.

"I didn't want to have the biggest church building in the United States," he says. "Too dangerous to become a matter of pride. I just want to keep our focus on service and ministering to people."

THE MEGACHURCH

Southeast's elders made a choice in the early 1980s not to spin off a small satellite from their flourishing church. As Dabney explains it: "We got thinking that sometimes a megachurch is a real influence on a community."

Russell says he misses some of the close personal involvement with congregation members, but Southeast Christian is built on a different model. "We've tried to compensate for that in our church by having a lot of small groups and people ministering to each other.

"A big church is misunderstood by a lot of people," he says. "If you picture the church as the pastor in the center and then a circle of 120 people around him, that's one concept. And then if you picture the big church as a pastor in the center with 7,000 people around him, everything looks like it's impersonal, out of proportion.

"But it's not like that. It's a bunch of little concentric circles, interlapping circles of little churches under one big roof."

Some critics have even called the megachurch "Six Flags Over Hikes Point." Does such talk ever bother him?

"It bothers me," he says. "But I think that's one of the prices you have to pay for leadership"

Russell's goal, meanwhile, is to keep his eye on the goal. If that means working 100 hours a week, that's all right.

"Part of it has to do with the work ethic that I learned as a child," he says. "The conscience that keeps driving me. Another part of it * * * is that I see a lot of guys in ministry who peak out early and begin to coast. I remember an illustration I heard about a guy who was 65 and he tried to climb Mount Everest and he fell and he died. And they put on his tombstone. 'He died climbing.'

"I want to die climbing."•

HONORING IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF LOURDES CATHOLIC CHURCH

• Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the Immaculate Conception of Lourdes Roman Catholic Church, on the occasion of their diamond jubilee 75th anniversary celebration.

Founded in 1917 by a small group of Italian Parishioners, the church provided a place of worship under the auspices of Father Anthony Garritano and the St. Anthony's Parish in Chester, PA. On July 3, 1924, Immaculate Conception of Lourdes was established as a separate entity and Rev. Bartole Fioriello was appointed as the inaugural pastor.

Again, I offer congratulations and best wishes to all those associated with this historic institution. May all your future memories of the Immaculate Conception Church be filled with happiness, prosperity, and blessings.•

IN TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK BENSON

• Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Frederick Benson, of Block Island, RI, in recognition of his 98th birthday, which occurred on April 14, 1993.

Fred has long been one of Block Island's most distinguished residents, holding a number of posts involved in almost every level of community activity. He arrived on the island in 1903, at the ago of 8, and lived in the same house there for over 80 years until his recent move to an elderly housing facility.

Fred has been most closely associated throughout his life with the young people of Block Island, from his days as baseball coach, and later teacher of auto shop, in the Block Island School. When he retired at the age of 69, he had branched out into the teaching of carpentry, machine repair, and driving instruction. He even returned to school himself at the age of 55 and gained his high school diploma so he would feel more qualified to teach. But Fred's most significant contribution to the education of the island's youth came in 1977, with the establishment of a scholarship fund for students graduating from Block Island School. This uniquely generous action has facilitated college educations for a number of deserving island residents, contributing directly to the future of our State.

Fred's list of achievements and accomplishments reflect the true nature of a diligent and talented local man. He has served his community in various and distinguished capacities, among which feature the island's civil service director for 12 years, police commissioner, first captain of the local rescue squad, and five times president of the Chamber of Commerce. He has been justly and fittingly rewarded with the appellation "Island Man of the Year."

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join with me and all Rhode Islanders in commending Fred Benson for his many years of generous service to his area and community, and in wishing him continued health and prosperity.•

THE GREATER FRIENDSHIP AZUSA CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to the Greater Friendship Azusa Church of God in Christ. From humble beginnings in 1969 the church has seen tremendous growth as a result of the dedication and hard work of the Shields family, the Cooper family, and Deacon Brown and his family. Today the Greater Friendship Azusa Church is worshiping in a brandnew sanctuary that not only reflects their commitment to serving God but the community as well.

I am delighted to say that countless lives have been touched and changed because of the devotion and faithfulness of those involved in their community efforts. Miraculous things happen when men and women of vision pray and work together, and I am honored to pay tribute to them.

Mr. President, because this church is so important to the community I feel compelled to tell the story of how the church has evolved, as well as how it came to have such a unique name. In August of 1969 the church began as Friendship Chapel C.O. G.I.C. on Lorado St. in Flint. However, over the years the congregation grew dramatically, thus demanding a move to larger quarters. It was because of Elder Shield's vision that Friendship Chapel purchased 30 acres of land on Detroit Street to accommodate the growing needs of the congregation and community.

After the church purchased the land on Detroit Street the congregation needed temporary quarters to worship. The Urban League of Flint's Job Training Center was chosen for that purpose. While at the Urban League the pastor felt that they had outgrown the name chapel. As a result, the congregation decided upon the name of Azusa based upon an upsurge of revivalism on Azusa Street in Los Angeles, CA, at the turn of the century.

It is because of the great importance that this church plays in the community, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude and congratulations on the grand opening and dedication of the Greater Friendship Azusa Church of God in Christ.•

THE DRUG WAR—DEMAND SIDE

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my series of remarks on the future of the drug war. I call my colleagues' attention to an article entitled "'Benign Neglect' Means Danger," by Herbert D. Kleber, that was published in the Tuesday, March 30, 1993, edition of the Washington Post on page A21. This article clearly identifies some of the dangers in following the course of action advocated by Peter Reuter, whose advice on drug matters is apparently held in high regard by the Clinton administration.

In my remarks on March 25, I said that I agreed that victory in the drug war will only be won on the demand side. But I strongly made the point that the supply side should not be raided for funds to augment the demand side.

Those remarks were primarily directed at the international aspects of our supply side efforts. Today, I want to say a few words about our domestic supply side efforts.

First, I could not disagree more strongly with those who want to take a more liberal approach to drug use in our society. What they are proposing to do is to roll back what I believe is the principal reason for whatever success we have had on the demand side. That is, the change in social attitude toward drug use.

Drug use is not only no longer fashionable, it is distinctly unfashionable. The change in message that our popular culture sends to the people at large, and to the young people especially, has had a definite positive impact in reducing the number of people who start abusing drugs. Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" program, one component of

the much larger demand reduction effort, was not the failure its mocking critics claim it was.

If any of my colleagues have forgotten what the popular cultural message was concerning drugs before we expanded the demand side campaign, all he or she has to do is watch a movie dating from the 1970's. Drug abuse was widely portrayed as an acceptable part of an affluent or progressive life style. Some rock and roll song lyrics from the 1960's and 1970's are an even clearer example of popular social tolerance, and even encouragement, of drug abuse.

That has changed. With the exception of material clearly intended to be countercultural, popular culture now conveys the message that drug abuse is not OK, and that people who abuse drugs need help. In fact, with the popularity of so-called "reality programming," many shows feature drug enforcement efforts in a very positive, pro-police light, and show drug dealers and abusers as the criminals, social deviants, and sick people they are.

Dr. Kleber states that this is part of making drugs "* * * 'psychologically unavailable' through denormalization and the stigmatizing of their use." He continues, "[t]he difference in numbers between alcoholics (18 million) and cocaine addicts (2 million) shows what happens when addicting drugs are 'normalized' and not stigmatized."

I strongly agree that we need to keep the pressure on with domestic antidrug law enforcement, instead of retreating to some fantasy land of harm reduction policies. To do so would be to undermine the social message that abuse of illegal drugs is unacceptable as a normal part of everyday life.

Dr. Kleber correctly points out that "[m]ost people using illicit drugs don't come into treatment voluntarily. Many need some push from the criminal justice system. If the justice system relaxes its sanctions, and the addicts know the threat has little to back it up, their willingness to go into involuntary treatment will be substantially less."

And his following point is even more telling: "There is good data showing that individuals who go into treatment under pressure do just as well as those who enter voluntarily. While it makes sense to shift priorities so that treatment, prevention, and research receive 50 percent rather than 30 percent of Federal dollars, this is unlikely to happen unless the public intensifies its pressure rather than just ignoring the drug problem."

It is not just the public that must intensify its pressure—it is law enforcement as well. This means that to reach a 50–50 funding ratio between demand side and supply side, the correct course is to increase funding for demand side while holding supply side steady, not cut funding for the supply side and shift it to the demand side.

This may seem like an unwise course of action under the Federal Government's current fiscal situation. However, let me remind my colleagues that the Health Care Reform Task Force is likely to recommend measures that would provide every American with health care. This number includes drug abusers.

Any decision to shift domestic policy toward a harm reduction posture on drug abuse will cost us an unbelievable—and entirely unaffordable—amount in increased health care cost once universal coverage becomes the rule. There is no valid evidence I know of to support the idea that such a change in policy would actually reduce drug abuse. Without such a reduction, where is the "reduced harm?"

Is it that fewer drug criminals are arrested, prosecuted, and jailed? Is it that drug abusers would be able to keep their jobs without fear of drug-free workplace programs? Is it that numbers of police, prosecutors, judges, and prison guards could be reduced, and funds saved by eliminating their positions could go to hire drug treatment specialists?

Mr. President, I believe the promise of harm reduction policies in fighting domestic drug abuse is an illusion. I strongly believe that our laws against drug trafficking and our social sanctions against drug abuse must be kept strong and be even more effectively enforced. Once that is done, it is appropriate to support enhanced drug treatment and education programs.

One is not a substitute for the other. They complement each other. Each one works better when the other is working well. There is a positive synergy here. If you cut domestic supply side enforcement activities and allow drug abuse to once again become socially acceptable, no matter how much you spend on education and treatment, you will not to be able even to contain the problem, much less reduce it.

Mr. President, I ask that Dr. Kleber's article be printed the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

I again urge my colleagues to read Dr. Kleber's article and to think about the future. The new administration's policies in this area are not yet shaped. I believe those of us with experience and expertise in this area have a clear duty to speak up and make our views clear. I have spoken out again today in the hope that the new administration will not be talked into a major drug policy failure. This Nation simply cannot afford either the human or the financial costs of going back to the beginning and starting to fight drugs all over again.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1993]

"BENIGN NEGLECT" MEANS DANGER

(By Herbert D. Kleber)

Peter Reuter, describing the country's drug policies of the 1980s as "costly and largely ineffectual," suggested in a recent Outlook piece that the drug issue could do with a little benign neglect—that is to say, a change in focus from public intolerance of drugs to reducing the harm they cause society.

Specifically, this would mean cutting down on enforcement activities and improving the public treatment system—including use of law enforcement to push addicts into treatment instead of jailing them. While Reuter's goal of expanded treatment is good, his suggestions for getting us there don't stand up to much scrutiny. In fact, if the country adopts a posture of benign neglect and backs away from public intolerance, there is a big danger that the recent progress made against drugs will be slowed or reversed.

Reuter attributes the sharp decrease in drug use in the general population to increased health concerns and greater awareness of the dangers of cocaine and marijuana. But he leaves out a more crucial factor: "denormalization." In the 1960s, '70s and early '80s, drug use became normalized throughout our country. It was acceptable behavior in many circles to use marijuana and cocaine at school, in the workplace and at social gatherings.

The change in this point of view was brought about by a number of factors, including the work of the Partnership for a Drug Free America, the public pronouncements of both Democratic and Republican leaders, the stance taken by our last two presidents and, most important, outspoken community leaders, parents and teachers. Not only were employers no longer willing to tolerate drug use in their workplaces, the workers themselves became more intolerant of use by their co-workers, recognizing both the heightened accident risk and the likelihood that their companies would become less competitive. Social norms at parties changed, as did teenagers' tolerance for drug use among their peers.

To assume that these events occurred simply because of changing several attitudes about health is to misread the message of these years.

Reuter pointed out, and I agree, that we have not been successful in making drugs physically unavailable. But we can help make them "psychologically unavailable" through denormalization and the stigmatizing of their use. The difference in numbers between alcoholics (18 million) and cocaine addicts (2 million) shows what happens when addicting drugs are "normalized" and not stigmatized.

Nor would the funds badly needed for treatment be forthcoming under benign neglect. As Reuter pointed out, many of the people who need drug treatment are not seen as worthy recipients by the public at large. Funding for treatment has been a bipartisan failure, with Republican administrations asking for inadequate funds and Democratic Congresses providing even less. Would neglect improve this situation?

It is also evident to treatment professionals that, while many people need treatment for drug abuse, the demand for it is not great. Most people using illicit drugs don't come into treatment voluntarily. Many need some push from the criminal justice system. If the justice system relaxes its sanctions, and the addicts know the threat has little to back it up, their willingness to go into involuntary treatment will be substantially less.

There is good data showing that individuals who go into treatment under pressure do just as well as those who enter voluntarily. While it makes sense to shift prior-

ities so that treatment, prevention and research receive 50 percent under the 30 percent of federal dollars, this is unlikely to happen unless the public intensifies its pressure rather than just ignoring the drug problem.

The effectiveness of the European harm reduction attempts that Reuter advocates is also overstated. The Swiss recently closed their "needle park" because the tolerance of drug abuse it represented had led to up to 20,000 people congregating there, instead of the few thousands they had predicted. The Italians have paid for their decriminalizing possession of small amounts of heroin for personal use with the highest heroin overdose death rate and one of the highest addiction rates in Western Europe.

It is difficult to determine just what drug policy will be like in this era of new leadership. While the Office of National Drug Control Policy has been proposed for Cabinet level, it has been reduced in size, and no one has yet been named to head it. The House of Representatives has voted to eliminate its Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

The change at the drug policy office may not be for the worse if a strong and articulate leader there has President Clinton's support and sufficient funding. But the elimination of the House select committee could do great harm. While 18 or so congressional committees and subcommittees have some aspect of the drug issue within their purview, drugs cannot be adequately covered in such a fragmented fashion, the problem that brought the select committee into being. One committee in Congress needs to remain focused on the drug issue.

While the economy and health care reform get the headlines, neither will be adequately resolved without attention to substance abuse. Every drug treatment professional, every law enforcement officer on the beat, every family with a member struggling to overcome the problem of drug abuse, every social service worker who must go into homes racked by drugs, AIDS and tuberculosis, every community leader worried about drugs and crime in his or her neighborhood should be worried about benign neglect.•

THE REVEREND DR. ROOSEVELT AUSTIN, SR.

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today I rise to honor Rev. Dr. Roosevelt Austin, Sr., an outstanding spiritual and community leader whose contributions to his hometown of Saginaw as well as the State of Michigan reflect the true spirit of Christianity.

Reverend Austin began serving as pastor of Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Saginaw in 1956. As pastor of one of Saginaw's most prestigious churches, he has ministered to countless numbers of individuals and families. Under his leadership, Zion Missionary Baptist Church has undergone many changes to make the church not only more beneficial to the congregation but to the community as well.

As a prominent member of the religious community Reverend Austin has been most generous with his time, giving to causes and endeavors which mirror his strong religious beliefs. Reverend Austin served as president of the Wolverine State Baptist Congress of Christian Education, as well as vice president of Saginaw's Clergy Coalition Against Crack Cocaine.

As a citizen concerned with the well-being of others, Reverend Austin has lent his leadership to many organizations. He has been involved in the NAACP for years and he founded the Opportunities Industrialization Center of Metropolitan Saginaw. Moreover, Reverend Austin has been very involved with the Saginaw public schools and is a former member of the Saginaw City Council.

Reverend Austin's commitment to his parishioners as well as his community provides an example to us all. He has shown remarkable courage and dedication throughout his distinguished career. It is therefore fitting and appropriate that the Austin Fellowship Hall be named and dedicated in his honor, upon this, his 37th anniversary as pastor of this great congregation, at the Zion Missionary Baptist Church.•

REGARDING S. 184

• Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the 102d Congress, Senator Jake Garn and I sponsored S. 2577, known as the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1992. Our colleagues in the House of Representatives introduced similar legislation, H.R. 5118. The legislation provided for the exchange of Utah State School Trust Lands located inside Utah's national parks, national forests, and Indian reservations for Federal lands and interests in lands located elsewhere within the State of Utah. The legislation, as passed by the Senate on October 7, 1992, represented the final product of longstanding negotiations between the State of Utah, various Federal agencies, and the appropriate committees of Congress.

Unfortunately, the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1992 was not acted upon by the House of Representatives last year simply because time ran out at the end of the session. The officials of the State and the Federal agencies agreed to request identical legislation during the 103d Congress since they were satisfied with the final text of H.R. 5118 as amended.

On January 26, 1993, Senator BENNETT and I introduced S. 184, the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1993. Our intent was to introduce the identical language of H.R. 5118 as amended as the text for S. 184. However, technical and conforming changes were made by staff which altered the language from the draft we submitted of H.R. 5118 as amended. When the text of S. 184 was finally printed, many of the people who participated in the negotiations complained to me and the staff that the language agreed to last year had been altered and was unacceptable.

In an effort to prevent further misunderstanding, Senator BENNETT and I wrote Senators JOHNSTON and WALLOP, chairman and ranking member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, asking that language identical to last year's legislation be offered as a substitute when the Committee considers S. 184 this year.

Since there are so many people interested in S. 184 that has been tentatively scheduled for a hearing before the committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests on May 6, 1993, I deem it prudent to insert in the RECORD at this time the entire substitute text for S. 184 as taken from last year's H.R. 5118 as amended. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute text of S. 184 be printed in the RECORD at this time. I am hopeful those providing testimony or comments at the May 6 hearing will address their comments to the substitute text. I intend to request that the committee adopt this text when S. 184 is marked up later this year.

The text of S. 184 follows:

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 "Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. UTAH-NAVAJO LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) ADDITIONS TO RESERVATION.—For the purpose of securing in trust for the Navajo Nation certain lands belonging to the State of Utah, which comprise approximately thirty-eight thousand five hundred acres of surface and subsurface estate, and approximately an additional nine thousand five hundred acres of subsurface estate, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Utah-Navajo Land Exchange", dated May 18, 1992, such lands are hereby declared to be part of the Navajo Indian Reservation in the State of Utah effective upon the completion of conveyance from the State of Utah and acceptance of title by the United States.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire through exchange those lands described in subsection (a) which are owned by the State of Utah, subject to valid existing rights.

SEC. 3. STATE LANDS WITHIN THE GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION.

(a) ADDITION TO RESERVATION.—For the purpose of securing in trust for the Goshute Indian Tribe certain lands belonging to the State of Utah, which comprise approximately nine hundred eighty acres of surface and subsurface estate, and an additional four hundred and eighty acres of subsurface estate, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Utah-Goshute Land Exchange", dated May 18, 1992, such lands are hereby declared to be part of the Goshute Indian Reservation in the State of Utah effective upon the completion of conveyance from the State of Utah and acceptance of title by the United States.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire through exchange those lands described in subsection (a) which are owned by the State of Utah, subject to valid existing rights.

(c) OTHER LAND.—(1) The following tract of Federal land located in the State of Nevada,

comprising approximately five acres more or less, together with all improvements thereon is hereby declared to be part of the Goshute Indian Reservation, and shall be held in trust for the Goshute Indian Tribe: Township 30 north, range 69 east, lots 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 14 of section 34.

(2) No part of such lands shall be used for gaming or any related purpose.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION.

The exchanges authorized by sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be conducted without cost to the Navajo Nation and the Goshute Indian Tribe.

SEC. 5. STATE LANDS WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the school and institutional trust lands owned by the State of Utah within units of the National Forest System, comprising approximately seventy-six thousand acres as depicted on a map entitled "Utah Forest Land Exchange", dated May 18, 1992.

(b) STATUS.—Any lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this section shall become a part of the national forest within which such lands are located and shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable to the National Forest System.

SEC. 6. STATE LANDS WITHIN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States all school and institutional trust lands owned by the State of Utah located within all units of the National Park System, comprising approximately eighty thousand acres, located within the State of Utah on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) STATUS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all lands of the State of Utah within units of the National Park System that are conveyed to the United States pursuant to this section shall become a part of the appropriate unit of the National Park System, and be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to that unit of the National Park System.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall, as a part of the exchange process of this Act, compensate the State of Utah for the fair market value of five hundred eighty and sixty-four one-hundredths acres within Capitol Reef National Park that were conveyed by the State of Utah to the United States on July 2, 1971, for which the State has never been compensated. The fair market value of these lands shall be established pursuant to section 8 of this Act.

SEC. 7. OFFER TO STATE.

(a) SPECIFIC OFFERS.—Within thirty days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to the State of Utah a list of lands, or interests in lands, within the State of Utah for transfer to the State of Utah in exchange for the State lands and interests described in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6 of this Act. Such list shall include only the following Federal lands, or interests in lands:

(1) Blue Mountain Telecommunications Site, fee estate, approximately six hundred and forty acres.

(2) Beaver Mountain Ski Resort Site, fee estate, approximately three thousand acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Beaver Mountain Ski Resort" dated September 16, 1992.

(3) The unleased coal located in the Winter Quarters tract.

(4) The unleased coal located in the Crandall Canyon tract.

(5) All royalties receivable by the United States with respect to coal leases in the Quitchupah (Convulsion Canyon) tract.

(6) The unleased coal located in the Cottonwood Canyon tract.

(7) The unleased coal located in the Soldier Creek tract.

(b) ADDITIONAL OFFERS.—(1) In addition to the lands and interests specified in subsection (a), the Secretary shall offer to the State of Utah a portion of the royalties receivable by the United States with respect to Federal geothermal, oil, gas, or other mineral interests in Utah which on December 31, 1992, were under lease and covered by an approved permit to drill or plan of development and plan of reclamation, were in production, and were not under administrative or judicial appeal.

(2) No offer under this subsection shall be for royalties aggregating more than 50 per centum of the total appraised value of the State lands described in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6.

(3) The Secretary shall make no offer under this subsection which would enable the State of Utah to receive royalties under this section exceeding $12,500,000 annually.

(4) If the total value of lands and interests therein and royalties offered to the State pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) is less than the total value of the State lands described in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6, the Secretary shall provide the State a list of all public lands in Utah that as of December 31, 1992, the Secretary in Resource Management Plans prepared, pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, had identified as suitable for disposal by exchange or otherwise, and shall offer to transfer to the State any or all of such lands, as selected by the State, in partial exchange for such State lands, to the extent consistent with other applicable laws and regulations.

SEC. 8. APPRAISAL OF LANDS TO BE EXCHANGED.

(a) EQUAL VALUE.—All exchanges authorized under this Act shall be for equal value. No later than ninety days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Governor of the State of Utah shall provide for an appraisal of the lands or interests therein involved in the exchanges authorized by this Act. A detailed appraisal report shall utilize nationally recognized appraisal standards including, to the extent appropriate, the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition.

(b) DEADLINE AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—(1) If after two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the parties have not agreed upon the final terms of some or all of the exchanges authorized by this Act, including the value of the lands involved in some or all of such exchanges, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division, shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the value of any and all lands, or interests therein, involved in the exchange.

(2) Any action provided for in this subsection can be filed with the court no sooner than two years and no later than five years after the date of enactment of this Act. Any decision of a district court under this Act may be appealed in accordance with the applicable laws and rules.

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—If the State shares revenue from the selected Federal properties the value of such properties shall be the value otherwise established under this section, less the percentage which represents the Federal revenue sharing obligation, but such adjustment shall not be considered as reflecting a property right of the State of Utah.

(d) INTEREST.—Any royalty offer by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 7(b) shall be adjusted to reflect net present value as of the effective date of the exchange. The State shall be entitled to receive a reasonable rate of interest at a rate equivalent to a five-year treasury note on the balance of the value owed by the United States from the effective date of the exchange until full value is received by the State and mineral rights revert to the United States as prescribed by subsection 9(a)(3).

SEC. 9. TRANSFER OF TITLE.

(a) TERMS.—(1) The State of Utah shall be entitled to receive so much of those lands or interests in lands and additional royalties described in section 7 that are offered by the Secretary of the Interior and accepted by the State as are equal in value to the State lands and interests described in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6.

(2) For those properties where fee simple title is to be conveyed to the State of Utah, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest, subject to the provisions of subsection (b). For those properties where less than fee simple is to be conveyed to the State of Utah, the Secretary shall reserve to the United States all remaining right, title, and interest of the United States.

(3) All right, title, and interest in any mineral rights described in section 7 that are conveyed to the State of Utah pursuant to this Act shall revert to the United States upon removal of minerals equal in value to the value attributed to such rights in connection with an exchange under this Act.

(4) If the State of Utah accepts the offers provided for in this Act, the State shall convey to the United States, subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the State to all school and institutional trust lands described in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6 of this Act. Except as provided in section 7(b), conveyance of all lands or interests in lands shall take place within sixty days following agreement by the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State of Utah, or entry of an appropriate order of judgment by the district court.

(b) INSPECTIONS.—Both parties shall inspect all pertinent records and shall conduct a physical inspection of the lands to be exchanged pursuant to this Act for the presence of any hazardous materials as presently defined by applicable law. The results of those inspections shall be made available to the parties. Responsibility for costs of remedial action related to materials identified by such inspections shall be borne by those entities responsible under existing law.

(c) CONDITIONS.—(1) With respect to the lands and interests described in section 7, enactment of this Act shall be construed as satisfying the provisions of section 206(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 requiring that exchanges of lands be in the public interest.

(2) Development of any mineral interest transferred to the State of Utah pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to development of non-Federal mineral interests, including, where appropriate, laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such development within national forests.

SEC. 10. LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after enactment, a map and legal description of the lands added to the Navajo and Goshute Indian Reservations and all lands exchanged

under this Act shall be filed by the appropriate Secretary with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and each such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the appropriate Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in each such legal description and map. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and the Utah offices of the appropriate agencies of the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture.

(b) PILOT.—Section 6902(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "acquisition." and inserting in lieu thereof "acquisition, nor does this subsection apply to payments for lands in Utah acquired by the United States if at the time of such acquisition units, under applicable State law, were entitled to receive payments from the State for such lands, but in such case no payment under this chapter with respect to such acquired lands shall exceed the payment that would have been made under State law if such lands had not been acquired.".

(c) INTENT.—The lands and interests described in section 7 are an offer related only to the State lands and interests described in this Act, and nothing in this Act shall be construed as precluding conveyance of other lands or interests to the State of Utah pursuant to other exchanges under applicable existing law or subsequent Act of Congress. It is the intent of Congress that the State should establish a funding mechanism, or some other mechanism, to assure that counties within the State are treated equitably as a result of this exchange.

(d) COSTS.—The United States and the State of Utah shall each bear its own respective costs incurred in the implementation of this Act.

(e) DEFINITION.—As used in this Act, the term "school and institutional trust lands" means those properties granted by the United States in the Utah Enabling Act to the State of Utah in trust and other lands which under State law must be managed for the benefit of the public school system or the institutions of the State which are designated by the Utah Enabling Act.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.●

NATIONAL FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR RECOGNITION DAY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, on April 9, America honored U.S. citizens who have been prisoners of war. These men and women deserve profound recognition and gratitude for the sacrifice which they made for all Americans. These people gave their freedom and often their lives for the democratic ideals for which this Nation stands. Their courage and bravery stand as a true monument to the American spirit.

In World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and in the Persian Gulf, more than 70,000 brave American men and women were taken prisoner of foreign powers. Many suffered cruel and inhumane treatment at the hands of their captors. Much of this cruelty violated several international treaties and customary norms regarding the treatment of prisoners of war. We honor these people for their valor in the face of adversity.

April 9 was chosen as the day of recognition because of its particular significance to former American prisoners of war. On that day in 1942, over 20,000 GIs fell into the hands of the enemy after the fall of Bataan. These courageous soldiers were forced to bear the now infamous Bataan Death March and nearly 4 years of captivity in harsh conditions. Many died and many more suffered permanent injuries as a result of this tragic and unconsionable event. This day should continue to serve as a reminder of the tremendous sacrifice of former prisoners of war.

In 1992, I supported a bill introduced by Senator BOREN and others which would have increased the medical care that former prisoners of war would receive from the Department of Veterans Affairs. This legislation would have provided these veterans with added outpatient medical care for any disability which they might have suffered. While this bill passed the Senate in an amendment to a larger bill, it was not passed by the House. I will continue my efforts to see that this important piece of legislation becomes law. In some small way, I hope that this piece of legislation might pay back the enormous debt that all Americans owe to these men and women.

This day also provides the opportunity to pay tribute to the more than 2,000 Americans still missing in action in the wake of the conflict in Southeast Asia. A newly discovered Russian document, reportedly a translation of a Vietnamese memorandum, states that Vietnam continued to hold hundreds of American service personnel in prisons when Hanoi and Washington were asserting that all POW's had returned home. While some doubt the validity of this document, its existence only underscores the imperative that we must make every effort to ensure a full accounting of those whose fate is still unknown.

This day of tribute and remembrance should also stand as a reminder of the ongoing effort required to ensure humane treatment of prisoners of war. Wars are tragic events, but all too often they have to be fought in order to ensure a nation's independence and liberty for that nation's people. Let us view this day not only as a tribute to those brave Americans who have made sacrifices as POW's, but also as a symbol of our effort to halt forever the use of military force as a means to solve disputes between nations.●

TRIBUTE TO MEL SEMBLER

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate one of my constituents, Mel Sembler, a long-time activist in the Nation's antidrug movement, a successful businessman, and most recently, the former United States Ambassador to Australia and Nauru.

Mel is known for his strong commitment to his community. Seventeen years ago he and his wife Betty formed STRAIGHT, an adolescent drug rehabilitation program. Since its inception, STRAIGHT has graduated more than 12,000 youths, and has come to be recognized as one of the most successful programs of its type in the country. In 1988, Mel served on the White House's Conference for a Drug Free America, and on the Bush Coalition for a Drug Free America.

Mel is recognized in business as one of the Nation's leading shopping center developers. In the last 30 years, he is responsible for 39 major retail projects. His success in business led to his serving as the president of the International Council of Shopping Centers in 1986–87. He now serves on the council's board of trustees.

Mel's success in his community and in business forged a path for him into Government service. His belief in democracy and freedom, and his work to promote these ideals, ultimately led him to be asked to serve as a cochairman of the American Bicentennial Presidential Inauguration. Perhaps Mel's crowning achievement came in 1989, when he was appointed by President Bush as the United States Ambassador to Australia and Nauru where he served his country with distinction until this year.

As Mel returns home from Australia, I believe it is only proper that the United States Senate recognize Mel Sembler for his service to his community and his country, and I am pleased to stand here today in honor of my good friend.●

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I now 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. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 103–5

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the 1990 Protocol to the 1983 Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region Convention (Treaty Document No. 103–5), transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and

ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, done at Kingston on January 18, 1990. Included for the information of the Senate is a Procès-verbal of Rectification correcting technical errors in the English and Spanish language texts. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the Annexes to the Protocol which were adopted at Kingston June 11, 1991, and the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Protocol elaborates and builds on the general obligation in the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, which calls for parties to establish specially protected areas in order to protect and preserve rare or fragile ecosystems, as well as the habitats of threatened or endangered species of fauna and flora. Species of plants and animals that the parties believe require international cooperation to provide adequate protection are listed in three Annexes developed in implementation of the Protocol. The initial version of the Annexes was adopted in 1991. Annexes I and II list species of special concern, including endangered and threatened species, subspecies, and their populations of plants (Annex I) and animals (Annex II). Species included in these Annexes are to receive protection within the geographic area of the Protocol comparable to that for species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act, or protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Annex III lists plants and animals requiring some management, but not necessarily full protection.

The Protocol is considered a major step forward in protecting wildlife and habitats of special concern in the Caribbean. Early ratification will demonstrate our continued commitment to the goal of sound regional environmental management and protection. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and give its advice and consent to ratification, subject to the understanding and reservations described in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

Mr. FORD. 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. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 21; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond 9:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each, and with Senator Gramm of Texas being recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes; and that at 9:45 a.m., the Senate return to the pending business, H.R. 1335, the economic stimulus supplemental appropriations bill, with the time between 9:45 a.m. and 10:45 a.m., for debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the committee substitute, as amended, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators BYRD and HATFIELD on their designees; that with reference to the cloture vote scheduled to occur at 10:45 a.m., as provided for under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, that Senators may file second degree amendments until 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—1992 PROTOCOL TO THE 1966 CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS CONVENTION TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 103–4

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the 1992 Protocol to the 1966 Conservation of Atlantic Tunas Convention, Treaty Document No. 103–4, transmitted to the Senate by the President today, and ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Protocol adopted June 5, 1992, by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries of the Contracting Parties to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) to amend paragraph 2 of Article X of ICCAT. The Protocol was signed by the United States on October 22, 1992. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Protocol would amend the subject Convention to modify the formula used to calculate the budgetary obligations of the parties to the Convention. The ICCAT, which establishes a Commission to address the conservation and management of highly migratory fisheries stocks in the Atlantic Ocean, has an accumulated debt of over $700,000 due to the inability of some of its very poor member states to meet their obligations to contribute to the annual budget of the Commission. At a Conference of Plenipotentiaries of the States Party to the Convention, held in Madrid June 4 through 5, 1992, a Protocol was adopted which, along with a new financial contribution scheme to be set forth in the ICCAT Financial Regulations, amends the Convention in such a way as to reduce the contributions of the developing countries to make it easier for them to meet their assessments. The Protocol and the new financial contribution scheme will base assessments on the GNP per capita and on tuna production.

The Protocol amending the budget scheme is necessary to ensure the continued viability of ICCAT, which is responsible for the conservation of highly migratory fisheries stocks of great value to the United States. Ratification by the United States will be necessary before the Protocol can enter into force. I recommend that the Senate give early consideration to the Protocol and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1993.*

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of Senator METZENBAUM's remarks, the Senate stand in recess, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. 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. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. METZENBAUM pertaining to the introduction of S. 799 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and on behalf of the majority leader, I would like to clarify that the time between 9:45 a.m. and 10:45 a.m. tomorrow is for debate only prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, at 6:09 p.m., the Senate recessed until Wednesday, April 21, 1993, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ROSALYNN CARTER

HON. MICHAEL J. KOPETSKI
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, our most important leaders are those who speak out on behalf of those who have been ignored or are disadvantaged. I consider former First Lady, Mrs. Rosalynn Carter, to be one of these leaders. Throughout her involvement in public life over the past two decades, she has been a strong advocate on behalf of one of the most discriminated against and most needy segments of our population: Those with mental health and addictive disorders. She was directly involved in the formulation and passage of the landmark Mental Health Services Act, has received numerous awards for her work as an advocate, and has testified before Congress many times on mental health issues and appropriations.

On March 24, 1993, Mrs. Carter continued her efforts in coming up to Washington, DC, at my invitation, to meet with Senate Majority Leader GEORGE MITCHELL and Speaker of the House THOMAS FOLEY, and to speak at a luncheon for Members of Congress. The message she conveyed was simple: Mental health care services for those who need them must be included in health care reform. The mentally ill have suffered enough. We have the means to help them, and we now have the opportunity to make treatment available. For those who missed the opportunity to hear Mrs. Carter at the luncheon, I am introducing into the RECORD her remarks.

COMMENTS OF ROSALYNN CARTER BEFORE THE HOUSE WORKING GROUP ON MENTAL HEALTH

It is a pleasure for me to be here today to talk with you about the inclusion of mental health in the health care reform effort. I want to express my appreciation to President Clinton and to Hillary for presenting us * * * all of us * * * with the opportunity to undertake the important and challenging task of including all Americans in an equitable, effective and efficient health care system. I also want to thank Tipper Gore for her leadership of the work on mental health.

The goal of universal access to health care, first proposed by President Truman, has proven more difficult to achieve than most could have imagined. The idea that we are now poised to achieve this goal represents an historic occasion. For the millions of Americans who have not had care or who have had limited access to care, the idea that they will now be included is significant.

For those millions of Americans with mental illnesses who have felt specifically excluded from the mainstream of health care, the idea that we will now include them has special significance.

We must develop mental health care that is on a par with physical health care. We must develop mental health care for people with the most severe mental illnesses and for those with less severe illness for whom treatment can be clearly effective. And we must develop the kind of mental care that provides the range of treatments and supports adequate to meet the needs of those who are suffering. These key features have been captured in the wording of HCR 52, introduced by Representative Kopetski. And an article I read last week in the New York Times suggested that these ideas are being actively considered in the current deliberations about reform.

Inclusion of mental health care will signal again our intent as a society to end discrimination against people with mental illnesses. In the tradition of the Fair Housing Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act, we can again confirm our belief in the value of each person to have equal opportunity under the law.

Inclusion will also show our determination to cast aside the old stereotypes and myths that have long worked against adequate care for people with mental illnesses * * * to cast them aside just as years ago we cast off the chains that constrained them.

There have been tremendous strides made in treatments in recent years. The old assumptions about the need for purely custodial care for persons with serious mental illnesses are fading with the development of effective treatments and medicines. We have learned a great deal about the mind, the scope of problems faced by people with mental illnesses and the supports they and their families need, but too many people remain uninformed about the progress. If we are to have sound mental health policy, indeed, a sound health policy, we all must move beyond historic prejudices, misconceptions, and stigma.

Inclusion will signal our willingness to apply the new knowledge we have gained that tells us we must treat the whole person. It is now clear that mental health is an integral part of health and must be an integral part of health care. With all of the recent advances in knowledge, the historic justifications for dealing with mental health differently from physical health are eroding. We know so much more than we did just a decade ago about how our mental state affects our bodies, and about how physical changes in the brain affect mental and emotional functioning. While systems of care for physical illness and mental illness tended to evolve separately, we now see that the basic functions performed by the physical health care system * * * preventive, curative, rehabilitative * * * are the same basic functions that must be performed by a health care system for people with mental illness.

This view has important implications for policy and for the design of delivery systems and financing mechanisms. If similar systems of care are to be provided for physical and mental illnesses, one of the major implications is that there should be parity in coverage. Mental health benefits and physical health benefits should be subject to the same limitations and conditions. We should put an end to the special and arbitrary limits traditionally imposed on mental health benefits, whether in the form of so many days of hospitalization, or a certain number of outpatient visits, or the total amount that may be spent for a person in a year or a lifetime.

Another implication is that mental health benefits must be available for people with serious mental illness and for others with less severe illnesses for whom timely and cost-effective treatment is clearly beneficial. The criterion for coverage should be medical and psychological necessity—not one diagnosis versus another, not one form of pain instead of another. Let us not develop criteria that invite temptations to play games with eligibility and diagnosis in order to push costs from one budget to another.

For those individuals who suffer through a lifetime of serious mental illness and whose loved ones have exhausted every resource, we have a special obligation to provide treatment and supports that maximize their functioning. The recent advances in medications and developments in psychosocial rehabilitation have shown that these people can be helped, and that many can be helped in ways that are cost effective. Indeed, proper combinations of active treatment and rehabilitation demonstrate that community-based services are, for many persons, more humane, more effective and cheaper than institutionalization which is frequently required when we fail to provide the proper services. What we may be discovering is that the old, traditional practice of placing special limitations on benefits packages for mental illnesses, which was done to contain costs, have been penny-wise and pound-foolish—that the savings achieved in the short run will be significantly exceeded by costs in the long run.

With regard to people who experience mental problems that may be less severe than those I have just referred to, it seems neither acceptable nor practically sensible to exclude them from treatments that we know to be effective, efficient, and which can enable them to resume their role as effective contributing citizens in society—whether at home, in school, or at work. Common sense tells us that we should help those at risk of more serious preventable problems to avoid later suffering, dysfunction, and great cost. People with these less severe disorders who receive timely and effective care can be more caring parents, or more alert school children, or more productive workers, and we should enable them to be so through enlightened health policy and accessible care.

A further implication is that the range of services must be adequate to the task. A full range of services for the diversity of problems and people are needed. We should develop a single universal health care system based on real needs. And we should—we must—be as efficient as we can be.

In the matter of financing, I would like to make note of the extremely important role that existing State systems play in both the delivery of services and the financing of services. This role is unique, unlike anything in the public health arena. As deliberations over health care reform proceed, these existing State resources must be given special consideration. They need to be marshaled for maximum impact upon the needs of people with mental illnesses, and harnessed in a way that will not compound the fiscal bur-

den on States, but will engage them as true partners in the reform. The experiences of State mental health systems in designing and managing whole systems of care may also provide useful lessons for the design of the overall health care system.

We have a challenging task ahead, and there will be very difficult decisions to be made. I know you are aware that the entire mental health community views this time as a rare opportunity. It is an opportunity that has unified the mental health community as never before. While there may not yet be complete consensus about every detail of mental health inclusion in health care reform, there is now—for the first time in my memory—considerable agreement about both the principles at stake in reforming the health care system, and the broad outline of a benefit package to implement those principles.

Hopefully, the proposal that emerges will be one that the entire mental health community can fully support in the coming days. And hopefully, the proposal which is finally adopted by this Nation will be one that future generations of Americans will look back upon as a landmark in the history of enlightened care for our fellow citizens who suffer from mental illnesses.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH CARE REFORM NO. 5: FAMILY FACES 86-PERCENT INCREASE IN 26 MONTHS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, just another example of why we desperately need health reform and health cost containment in the Nation, ASAP. The letter is from a family in southern California that makes the case more eloquently than I can.

Because of their fear of losing the insurance that they have, I have changed the names to protect the truly innocent. The numbers cited in the letter are accurate.

Excerpts from the letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: My wife was a full-time employee of X until we had our first boy, Tom, in 1987. The medical, dental and vision care we received through X was excellent.

My wife resigned from X in September 1988, and we came under the COBRA umbrella until December 1, 1989. During that time we paid $275.83 a month for our family coverage with Y.

Because our COBRA coverage with X ended, we converted to a Y "individual conversion plan" effective December 1, 1989. Our family premium with Y on the "individual" plan rose to $1,053 per quarter or $351 a month.

In October 1990, Y notified us that their "individual conversion" plan was changing. That meant the loss of prescription drug coverage, the addition of hospital co-payments and an increase in our doctor visit co-pays.

On our one-year anniversary with Y on our "individual" plan, our premiums increased from $351 to $493.99 a month, a 40 percent increase.

That 40 percent increase coupled with the decreased coverage started me looking for other health care program options. However, my wife was four months pregnant with our second child and no insurance company would cover us on the childbirth. Since the pregnancy was considered a "prior condition," we decided to wait until after the birth to change insurers.

On April 12, 1991 our second son, Bob, was born with congenital heart disease. Y was great about his medical care. At five months old Bob had open heart surgery. But aside from the ever-increasing premiums, the change in coverage that year resulted in an extra $1,000 in costs (Co-pays of $500 each for the birth and the surgery.) In addition, Bob's medicines cost $50 to $60 a month, which are no longer covered by our "individual" plan.

Fortunately, Bob's doing great. He is thriving and growing nicely. Unfortunately, because of his congenital heart disease we have not been able to find an insurance company to give us family coverage and we have not been able to switch from Y as planned.

On January 1, 1992, our family rate increased from $493.99 to $581. On January 1, 1993, our family rate increases from $581 to $654.43.

To recap our increases under the "individual conversion" plan:

From December 1, 1989 to November 30, 1990 the monthly premium was $351.

From December 1, 1990 to December 31, 1991, the monthly premium was $492.72—an increase of 41 percent.

From December 1, 1992 to December 31, 1992 the monthly premium was $581—an increase of 17 percent.

January 1, 1993 the monthly premium increased to $654.43—an increase of 13 percent.

The total increase over that 26 months period was 86 percent—from $351 to $654.43.

As a comparison, Kaiser Permanente is currently charging $350.49/month for a family, but they will not accept us because of Bob's heart condition.

Are there any other alternatives available to us?

Please don't hesitate to call if my family can be of any assistance in your efforts on the behalf of all families to bring some sense and fairness to the health insurance industry.

THERE'S STILL NO FREE LUNCH

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, as this body prepares to address health reforms, we must remain aware of the substantial costs and dislocation that would result from imposing expensive mandates upon business.

In an article which I would like to submit for the RECORD, Robert J. Samuelson lucidly describes the hidden role that increasing health care costs have played in holding down growth in the wages of middle-class American workers over the past 20 years. He argues that health care mandates imposed upon business have prevented real wage increases at a level commensurate with rising worker production.

I commend the article to my colleagues.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 12, 1993]

THERE'S STILL NO FREE LUNCH

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

One of Americans' constant complaints is that our incomes aren't growing rapidly. Between 1972 and 1990, median family income rose 8 percent compared with 89 percent between 1950 and 1970. The usual explanation for this is that the productivity slowdown has hurt wage growth. But something else has also happened. Perhaps half of normal wage growth has been absorbed by things we don't see in our paychecks: the rising costs of health care, environmental regulation and the legal system.

As a society, we have decided—though not in any conscious way—to take more of our pay in forms other than money. We have gotten more medical care, cleaner air and water and easier recourse to law for everything from divorce to product liability. There's nothing inherently wrong with this. Higher health spending has improved millions of lives. Our air and water have become cleaner. But along with the benefits, we need to be more aware of the costs. They affect our debates of everything from health care to legal reform, and yet their magnitude is not widely recognized. Let's see why.

Productivity (the economy's efficiency) is the wellspring of higher living standards. As we produce more, there's more to buy, and living standards rise. Indeed, productivity and family income increased more or less in lock step for the first 25 years after World War II. Since then, the relationship has come unstuck. Even with slower productivity growth, we should have achieved sizable income gains. Between 1972 and 1990, productivity rose 18 percent, about twice the growth of median income.

What happened? America has hordes of economists (116,000 in 1991), and yet this question—the breakdown between productivity and income growth—has been virtually ignored. But a big part of the answer is bound to be the surge of nonwage spending.

There's been a massive spending shift of nearly 7 percent of GDP. In a $6 trillion economy, that means we now spend about $420 billion more annually on these activities than we would have. For all the benefits, this sort of spending erodes take-home pay in two ways.

First, companies channel more of workers' compensation into health insurance, not into paychecks. And second, companies recover higher environmental, regulatory and legal costs by raising prices. Either way, workers' incomes suffer. (A good example of the price effect is the requirement of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, which will force oil companies to produce a less-polluting gasoline. The added costs may raise pump prices by 5 to 10 cents a gallon in 1995.)

Suppose that none of these changes had occurred and that, as a result, family incomes had risen another 7 percent between 1972 and 1990. Then, the gain would have been 15 percent (the actual income gain of 8 percent plus 7 percent more), close to the 18 percent productivity increase. From this, I conclude that rising health, environmental and legal costs cut income gains by roughly half.

BIG LOSS

Now let me hedge a bit. This is a crude estimate. It may not be precisely right. Growing income inequality may explain some of the slow rise of median family income (half of all families are above the median, half below); high-income families have done better than average. I have also made a lot of simplifying assumptions. Some exaggerate the impact of health, legal and regulatory spending; others understate it. Finally, I ignore the effect of the growth of two-earner couples on family incomes.

But my hunch is that, if some diligent economist made all the proper adjustments,

the basic conclusion wouldn't change. Maybe the wage loss would be as small as one quarter or as large as two thirds. (the Congressional Budget Office estimates that rising health-insurance costs alone have cut real wage gains by half since 1973.) Whatever the details, the loss of money income is a big one.

We need to acknowledge it. Instead, we deny and compartmentalize. We complain that our incomes aren't rising fast enough. Meanwhile, we want extensive health-care benefits, a cleaner environment and more legal "rights" of all sorts. There's only a loose understanding that these matters are ultimately connected. There's a tendency to snicker at businesses that say they can't afford a new fringe benefit, or that they're being overregulated and swamped with paperwork. The assumption is that companies are just whining, that they can absorb the extra costs.

But in the end, the companies don't absorb the costs. We all absorb the costs, which are passed along in one way or another. The cost of any single benefit or regulation isn't typically large. But lots of small costs ultimately become big costs, and they grow over time. The lesson is especially apt now, because we're on the threshold of a major debate about health care. We need to find ways to restrain rising costs. Likewise, we need to avoid the temptation of simply imposing expansive mandates on business—whether for health care or other employee benefits.

The same lesson applies to all regulatory and legal activities. We ought to search for opportunities to make our laws work with more speed and less expense. Reform of product-liability laws (a bill has just been introduced in Congress) is long overdue. In general, we need to be more cost-conscious. The expense of perfection can be exorbitant: for example, eliminating the final ounce of pollution. "However desirable the goal, the question has to be asked: is the last step toward achieving it worth what you're giving up?" says economist Milton Russell, director of the Joint Institute for Energy & Environment. We can disguise or ignore the costs; but we can't eliminate them. That old and clichéd axiom still applies: there's no free lunch.

WINNING SPEECHES OF JILL POLCHAK AND GEORGE M. ZETTS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Jill Polchak and George M. Zetts, two outstanding young people from my district.

Mr. Speaker, every year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their ladies auxiliaries sponsor "The Voice of Democracy" speech writing contest. This contest, in cooperation with the State and National Associations of Broadcasters, gives thousands of high school students the opportunity to voice their opinions on their responsibilities to and reflections of our great country. The winning speeches are then transmitted via broadcasting media across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Jill Polchak and George M. Zetts wrote the winning speeches in Mahoning County. Here, for your enjoyment, are these two inspirational works:

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By George M. Zetts)

The United States of America is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, country in the world. Our nation has been in this position for many, many years now. It is up to this young generation, my generation, to work hard to keep America at the top of the totum pole. It is up to us to keep the United States on the right track and make sure that we never get off of it. It is up to us.

It is up to my generation to keep America rolling on. We are Her future; Her tomorrow. Many of the issues that are the burden on today's back must be lifted off and solved by us. It will be our responsibility to get our economic system back on the road to success. It will be our responsibility to educate our children so that they may learn and live a good life for themselves. It will be our responsibility to be positive role models for generations to come so that they will see the light in us and follow it instead of turning towards the darkness. It will be our responsibility to help save our environment so that future generations will have an earth that is safe for living. These will be our responsibilities in the future.

Even though the United States is a great nation, it is obvious that we have some problems. Our economy is not in the greatest state to say the least. With an astronomical national debt, a seemingly valueless dollar, and a high unemployment rate, the economic status is a feable one. It is up to my generation to take this slumping economy by the horns and turn our situation around. We must jump start our economy so that we can once again have a prosperous country.

Education is a key to our future. Without an education, there is no tomorrow. Nowadays, any decent paying job will be occupied by a person with some type of further education. That is why it is our job to start instilling in the generations to come a fervor to learn. The power of learning brings up self-confidence, discipline, and respect. With these characteristics implanted in our children there will be no stopping their progression into the future. But without it we will only slip back into the past.

My generation will be looked upon as the leaders of this country soon. We will be making the decisions that not only will affect us but also the generations coming. That is why we must prove that we are strong, positive examples to our children so that they will have footsteps to walk in as they become the leaders of this nation. Our decisions now will affect their outlook on things to come, so let's get a good lead in this race and pass the baton on with things to look forward to.

As each day passes it seems as though the well-being of our earth is deteriorating. This was never a problem before like it is today. Our disrespect for our planet has put us in a terrible predicament. We must try to put back a respect for this wonderful earth. It will be our responsibility to turn this tide of carelessness around and once again establish a love and respect for our planet.

All too often our elders blame each other for the failures of the American Dream. Group blames group and no progress at our problems takes place. My generation is fully cognizant of the fact that excuses and recriminations will not suffice. We are ready to ignore the foibles of the past and move to correct the problems that shall be our legacy. Let us turn away from the cliches of the past and show that our generation is better than that. We will meet and correct these problems head on and we shall prevail.

This country of ours, the United States of America, is still a great country. It is our responsibility, the responsibility of my generation, to make sure that the United States stays the great country that it is. It is all up to us and my voice in America's future.

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Jill Polchak)

It slowly yet steadily begins to trickle down, drip by falling drip. What was once only a few small beads instantaneously turned into vicious brooks, brooks streams, and streams torrents. This vivacious flooding embodies every aspect of his wrinkled face. His face grows pale, pale with confusion, and his hands, his hands tremble as he ponders over which one he will discard. His eyes wonder while his body twitches with frustration. Every breath he takes he savors as if it were to be his last. Even the blink of an eye tortures every nerve in his body. For he realizes unless he speaks out soon to say "I fold" he will leave entirely everything up to fate. He silently begins prays to "Lady Luck" in hope of making the right decision.

As he relentlessly abandons five more poker chips my heart begins to flutter with joy and relief. I feel as if a heavy load has just been removed from my back, and my body leaps with ecstasy as I lay down my hand and begin to pursue the jackpot. Filled with sudden bliss I shout out, "I've won Yes, I've really won." While my voice is still echoing in the stale air I begin to hear the splicing sound of the cards being shuffled once again. As the new hand is being dealt my opponent utters: "You may have won this battle, but the war has not yet fully begun.

Our life, too, is a card game we must all play. One full of challenges and worthy opponents we must all face. Our world is like the cards we are dealt. Sometimes we have a "royal flush" and at other times it seems we have nothing. But our voice like the poker chips can determine if our voices will be the one's saying, "Yes, I've won" or mournfully stating, "Maybe next time."

Our country is faced with many decisions, like a player must decide whether or not to continue the bitter game. But I feel winning can be made easier by looking at our opponents straight in the eyes and seeing what chips he has to wager with. Today, our country is one of the greatest around, but it is not necessarily flawless. To gain the ultimate jackpot we must rid it of the "three of Spades" and acquire the Ace of Diamonds, which is composed of efforts that need to be made in the government, and economy of this nation.

First, our government. Some may see it as untouchable as winning in a game of poker when your opponent has a hand of four queens. But with a little perseverance and effort the hand can be won. I believe I can gain access to new cards just by the use of my solemn voice. Although I am not old enough to vote, my voice can be used to: encourage, petition, protest, inspire, teach, and even campaign for what I believe in. The U.S. Government is this Nation's future. Yet many do not realize our government was created "For the people, by the people, and of the people." I feel our future lies in the hands of this generation, and even though I alone can not do everything I made the first step. The first leap to inspire others to take a stand for what our forefathers so bravely died on the battlefield for. They died for this nation, and our inalienable rights which is the greatest jackpot of all this universe will ever see.

A second challenge we must face before we pick up the Ace is poverty. Over thirty million people live below the minimum poverty

level and of those thousands upon thousands are Americans. Yet we insist upon aiding foreign countries instead of those within our nation. I feel we should ban together and help out our neighbors first instead of those hundreds of miles away. I speak out to promote the need for more charity and volunteer work within the community, support groups for those disabled or just in need, and even just a little respect for those less fortunate than ourselves. See while we are playing cards in the comfort of our own homes, there are children actually dying in the cold, wet streets of America. I realize I am only one person and I can not do everything, but eliminating poverty is one of my priorities, and I hope it is yours also.

In conclusion, I feel we all need to speak out whether it be through our actions or our voices. If we neglect these problems and stay silent our winning in the "game" will soon be shuffled in with all the other cards in the deck of dreams. I believe we should all speak out and turn our dreams into reality. Besides, the cards have already been dealt, the game has already begun, and the wages have been set. We are expected to win this one for ourselves and the future generations. My Voice In America's Future is the name of the game! Yes, the rule will be intricate and the challenges great, but by being an active vocal participant I will never ever lose the battle.

TEXAS TECH LADY RAIDERS HONORED

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating my alma mater and the Texas Tech Lady Raiders for their victory in the NCAA division I women's basketball national championship. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that Texas Tech is only the second southwest conference school to win the title in the 12-year history of the NCAA tournament.

The Lady Raiders, under the direction of Head Coach Marsha Sharp, pulled off an impressive 84 to 82 victory over Ohio State to win the NCAA tournament on April 4. It was a great day for all Texans, but it was an even greater day for those of us from west Texas.

The player who left the court with the biggest smile was senior Sheryl Swoopes. Ms. Swoopes was voted most outstanding player of the final four, scoring an NCAA championship game record 47 points. But she, of course, didn't pull off the win by herself.

Eleven of the 12 Lady Raiders are Texans, and nine of them come from west Texas. The Texas Tech Lady Raiders roster includes: Diana Kersey, a junior from Lubbock; Nikki Heath, a sophomore from Sweetwater; Stephanie Scott, a junior from Plano; Krista Kirkland, a senior from Spearman; Noel Johnson, a sophomore from Nazareth; Janice Farris, a junior from Lubbock; Kim Pruitt, a junior from Idalou; Cynthia Clinger, a senior from Freedom, Wyoming; Michelle Thomas, a freshman from San Antonio; Melinda White, a freshman from Borger; Michi Atkins, a freshman from Loraine; and Sheryl Swoopes, a senior from Brownfield.

Mr. Speaker, the Texas Tech Lady Raiders had an incredibly exciting season in 1993, a season that won't soon be forgotten by any Texan. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the NCAA division I women's basketball national champions, the Texas Tech Lady Raiders.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SEPARATION PAY ACT INTRODUCED

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing on behalf of the administration the Central Intelligence Agency Separation Pay Act. This measure is intended to assist the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] in meeting personnel reduction targets while avoiding involuntary separations.

The legislation authorizes the payment of a separation bonus—according to formula but in no event greater than $25,000—to CIA employees within certain personnel categories who retire or resign voluntarily. Bonuses would not be authorized for separations occurring after fiscal year 1997, and the bill would be effective upon enactment.

This proposed bill is virtually identical to the measure enacted last year for the Department of Defense. CIA officials argue that separation pay authority will allow the Agency to encourage personnel with skills surplus to its needs to leave, and allow the hiring of a small number of new employees with critical skills, even as the overall number of employees is reduced.

The Subcommittee on Legislation of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will be conducting a hearing on this measure shortly. Should the need for the legislation be justified by the Agency, I expect the committee to take action on this matter prior to consideration of the fiscal year 1994 intelligence authorization bill.

HONORING THE LEADERS OF TOMORROW

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 20 in the White House Rose Garden, a very special event will occur. It is not the signing of a piece of legislation, nor is it the introduction of a foreign dignitary. It is, however, an event of equal significance: First Lady Hilary Rodham Clinton has invited 100 young women and men from the District of Columbia to join her as they are honored as Tomorrow's Leaders Today by Public Allies, a program that exemplifies President Clinton's call for commitment and participation by the next generation of our Nation's leaders.

Public Allies was established in 1991 by a diverse coalition of young people, advised by community leaders and public officials who all share a common concern for finding and preparing this country's new leaders. Public Allies connects young women and men, ages 18 to 30, with jobs and training in community-based organizations, public interest groups, and innovative government agencies and programs. The organization provides teams of young people with the tools and opportunities to work professionally to solve pressing public problems and inequities.

Each year, Public Allies identifies 100 young people from varying racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds to be honored as Tomorrow's Leaders Today. They are people with diverse visions and unique talents, but they share a common commitment to improving society and pursuing a leadership role in public service and community life.

Public Allies is a paradigm of the kind of innovative program our country needs to give our young people a real stake in their Nation's future. I am pleased to be serving as an honorary host of Tomorrow's Leaders Today, and wish all the honorees every success in the future. We will all reap the benefits of their talents.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY: MY VOICE IN AMERICAS FUTURE

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the award winning essay by one of my constituents, Ms. Elizabeth Stock, of Camp Hill, PA.

Ms. Stock's essay, "My Voice in America's Future," was awarded first place in the State competition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars [VFW] annual Voice of Democracy essay contest in Pennsylvania. Elizabeth was sponsored by VFW Post 7415 and its Ladies Auxiliary in New Cumberland, PA, and her essay placed 13th in the national competition.

As my colleagues know, the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary sponsor the Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Program. The program is in its 46th year and requires high school students to write and record a 3 to 5 minute script on a patriotic theme designated by the sponsor. The theme for the 1993 contest was "My Voice in America's Future." Over 136,000 high school students participate in this annual contest and it is truly an honor for Ms. Stock to be selected the Pennsylvania State winner. It is an even greater accomplishment for her to receive 13th place honors in the national contest.

Elizabeth Stock is a senior at Camp Hill High School in Camp Hill, PA. As a former educator, I am always very pleased and encouraged when I see dedicated and committed students excel in academic endeavors and be rewarded for their hard work and talent.

Elizabeth Stock is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Stock of Camp Hill, PA, and is currently planning a career in physics research. From reading her essay and meeting this outstanding young lady, it is obvious to me she has a bright future ahead of her.

I would urge all of our colleagues to review Elizabeth's essay, which I have inserted for the RECORD. I believe they will find reading this essay enjoyable and uplifting.

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Elizabeth Stock)

In the summer of 1787, 55 men met in Independence Hall to frame a new government—a government based on a revolutionary concept—popular sovereignty. In the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, this was "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

In the beginning, the people were few. Their voices could easily be heard. Their concerns shaped America's laws. Their convictions interpreted them. It was truly government by the people.

There were skeptics who said that this "popular sovereignty" would not last—that it would soon fade into history. They were wrong.

This grand, experimental government has survived and flourished, and proven to the world that democracy does work. Today, our nation is the most prosperous in the world. Our government is stable and effective. We have emerged as a world leader, wielding power and meriting respect. And we have grown.

The question now arises, with all these millions of citizens, can we still have rule by the people? 250 million individual voices, no matter how strong, melt into a meaningless clamor at the national level. To solve this problem, we have a representative form of government. Through this system, my representative in government hears my voice, and is able to vocalize my concerns at a national level.

Sadly, there are those who do not understand this system. They think that what they have to say doesn't make a difference, and tragically, they don't participate in the government. They wrongly believe that the power to govern has been taken out of their hands.

But the voice of a single individual is strong, and so important that it has often changed the course of history. Oliver Cromwell, one of England's most influential leaders, rose to power in 1645 by just one vote. During the American revolution, one vote struck down a bill that would have made the official language of the United States German instead of English. Texas was annexed to the union by one vote, and Andrew Johnson escaped impeachment by a margin of one vote. On November 8, 1923, members of the tiny Nazi party met in a small tavern in Munich and—by one vote—elected Adolf Hitler as its new leader.

One voice has the same power today. At a critical point, one voice can bring about destruction and demise or one voice can build and strengthen a nation, leading to freedom and justice and truth for its citizens. The power lies in one voice—your voice, my voice.

My voice is powerful today. My voice can change America's future. I have a dream for our country. I have fresh ideas and strong ideals, and I have the vision to see them come to pass. I can contribute to the great country into which I was born.

I can and will learn about the issues in question. I will write to my congressmen. I will cast my vote for the men and women whom I believe will best serve our nation, and one day I will represent the people in office myself.

I will make my voice heard in the future of my country, because I believe in rule by the people, I believe in America.

TRIBUTE TO GERTRUDE ALLIONE

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Ms. Gertrude Allione of Springfield, IL, for realizing her lifelong dream of a high school diploma. At the age of 91, she is about to receive her high school equivalent certificate.

The following article from the March 27 Decatur Herald & Review about Ms. Allione's tremendous achievement follows:

91-YEAR-OLD TO REALIZE DIPLOMA DREAM

SPRINGFIELD.—Gertrude Allione says she's been dreaming of a high school education since she was a child. Now, at age 91, she's about to get one.

"I think I've made it this time," Allione said Friday.

Riddled with obstacles, her struggle for a diploma finally is nearing an end as she prepares to take a U.S. Constitution test—the only thing standing in the way of her diploma equivalent. Last week, she passed a mathematics test, the last of her five General Educational Development exams, and she expects to get her certificate in June.

"She's a delight," said Phil Schmidt, chief GED examiner for the Springfield area.

Her struggles began in the third grade, when she was sent to work at St. John's Hospital to help her family make ends meet.

"I wanted to go to school; I liked school," she said.

Working at St. John's began her nursing career, first as an aide and later as a practical nurse. She studied through mail courses offered by Chicago's Wayne School of Nursing and took additional classes at St. John's to earn her licensed practical nursing degree.

"I think I was born a nurse," she said.

Her husband—she married at age 19—discouraged her efforts to further her regular public education. And state law wouldn't let her sit alongside youngsters in regular classes to pick up where she left off in fourth grade.

In 1932, she persuaded sympathetic educators to establish night classes for her in the basement of a Taylorville church.

Allione stuck with her studies as best she could during a period when she was cooking and doing laundry for seven family members. By the time she reached the equivalent of a ninth-grade education, the law allowed her back into the classroom for day-time courses.

In World War II, Allione quit school again to work for an ammunitions factory in Illinois. After that, she divorced her husband and devoted her life to nursing, from which she retired in 1974.

"I've been dreaming about that diploma ever since dad took me out of grade school," she said.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH CARE REFORM NO. 6: "WHERE IS THE INSURANCE?"

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, where has the insurance in health insurance gone? Citizens of this country live their life in fear of becoming ill due to the fact there is no longer insurance or security in their health insurance.

The following letter from Hayward, CA, is only one of many examples of health insurance horrors. It is a shame when our people must pay such a heavy price for life-saving medical procedures, and then find nowhere to turn as they learn their insurance has run out. Again, I ask, where has our insurance gone?

People must be relieved of this enormous pressure; they must be given somewhere to turn. Health care reform will be too late for some, but it will save millions of people from this and similar situations. We must act now; we must restore insurance and security to our citizens.

REPRESENTATIVE STARK: I know that you have been very active in medical and senior problems.

My husband is 58 years old and has been unemployed since December 1992 except for a few part-time jobs.

He received a kidney transplant 5 years ago and requires lab work approximately every 6 weeks at a cost of $500. His anti-rejection drugs are $700 a month.

We are paying $370.50 a month for COBRA insurance. This will stop in August.

I am 66, and on Social Security.

Can you tell me if there is any help we can receive?

TRIBUTE TO DALLAS SELLS, JR.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the exquisite eulogy delivered for the late Dallas Sells, Jr. at the Covenant Baptist Church in Indianapolis.

Dallas Sells was one of the civil saints of our era. He was a high official in the UAW, a labor organization which the record shows is devoted not only to its dues paying members, but also for those who are so downtrodden as to be unable to be dues paying members. Dal Sells, a deeply religious man, spent his life doing the work of the Lord as attested by the eloquence of Rev. Tommy L. Faris, pastor of Covenant Baptist Church.

DALLAS WOOD SELLS, JR.

Born 3 October, 1919 at Anderson, Indiana. Died 20 March, 1993 at Indianapolis, Indiana at the age of 73 years.

He was married to Thelma Pike Sells for 53 years and she survives. Also surviving are sons Dallas R. (Randy) Sells and Larry F. Sells; daughters Sandy Jones and Mary Ann Clippinger; sisters Francis Sells, Virginia Sells, and Doris Jean Donohue; and six grandchildren.

Dallas was a retired director of the United Auto Workers Region 3 and a labour leader for more than 30 years. He attended the General Motors Institute. He was an industrial electrician at Delco-Remy. He was a World War 2 Navy veteran. Dallas served on the boards of nearly 30 community, educational, and governmental organizations. He met three presidents, made visits to the Soviet Union and China as a representative of labour. He received countless awards, honours, and citations.

All of the information in the obituary is astounding. We think, "How could one per-

son have done all of this in one lifetime?" Dallas must have been an amazingly vigourous man. Many of you here today could bear testimony to the integrity, the effectiveness, the resourcefulness, and the persistence of Dallas Sells the union executive, the politician, and the lobbyist. I am sure that Dallas, in his prime, could marshall tremendous forces, both personal and otherwise, for his cause.

Dallas was also enough of a realist to know that he could not always win, but he made sure that he won as often as he could. He had an innate sense for people. He was a good judge of character. He could work with committees and boards and negotiators so well because he could bring people together. With his humour and his quick-wittedness he could defuse tension and direct thought toward new ends. There can be no doubt that Dallas was a man perfectly suited for his work.

What the obituary does not say, what many who did not know Dallas but only knew of Dallas could not have understood, was that the source of Dallas' energy and persistence in his work was that his work was not just a job or a vocation or a career. Dallas' work was his ministry. You see, Dallas was an integrated man. His was an integrated life. Most of us compartmentalize our lives. We break up our self into many selves which we put on and take off like shirt or a jacket. We have the private self that we put on when no one else is around. We have the friends' self, the family self, and, for some, the religious self. In my experience of knowing Dallas Sells for nearly seven years as his pastor and friend I came to see that that did not hold true for him. He did not break up his life into separate boxes. The various aspects of his life flowed together and intermingled. And at the very center of his life, if you were to look, you would have found Dallas' faith in Jesus Christ. That is where it all came down for Dallas. He did not stop believing so that he could do his work. In part, at least, he did his work because he believed. He could question and challenge hypocrisy wherever he found it because he was not hypocritical. He could confront injustice at any level because he was called to love all people without conditions.

While he was accomplishing wonders and miracles in the world of politics and labour, Dallas was also serving on boards and committees and task forces in his church, in the American Baptist Churches, USA, in the National Council of Churches in Christ, and in the World Council of Churches; he was supporting Christian mission work so that people around this city and around the world could be clothed and fed and told the good news of Jesus Christ; and he was teaching Sunday School classes so that future generations could carry on the work of Christ. When he "retired" as a Sunday School teacher at the start of this year, someone asked him how long he had been teaching. He said that he had taught since he was 15 years old!

There have been many times, Thelma, when Dallas' ministry kept him away from home more than either you or your children or even Dallas would have liked, but I know that he loved you all with a deep love. In Dallas we have known true greatness. He was humble, gentle, loving, caring, and compassionate. His greatness was true because it came from the power and the presence of God within.

Dallas' legacy to us is rich. It is a legacy of love in action. It is a legacy of justice, fairness, and compassion rooted in faith in Jesus Christ as Lord. We honour Dallas Sells' memory best when we live our lives in service to Christ.

TRIBUTE TO TUFTS UNIVERSITY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tufts University in Medford, MA, and to commemorate the ninth annual observance of Tuftonia's Day. The annual weekly celebration was inspired by the Tufts football fight song, "Tuftonia's Day," written by Elliot Wright Hayes, class of 1916. This celebration, traditionally of Dr. John DiBiaggio as Tufts' 11th president on April 25. Alumni and students from all over the world will participate.

The university, founded in Medford in 1852 by Charles Tufts, has been graduating the best and brightest students ever since. In fact, in this year of the woman, Tufts University recognizes their first female graduate, Henrietta Noble Brown, class of 1893. We are fortunate to count two Tufts alumni among our esteemed colleagues, Bill Richardson of New Mexico, class of 1970, and Pete DeFazio of Oregon, class of 1969.

As the U.S. Representative from Medford for the past 16 years, I have long been impressed by the academic prowess and intense loyalty that the students and alumni of Tufts show their university. Much like their mascot, Jumbo, Tuft's alumni never forget.

I congratulate Dr. John DiBiaggio upon his official inauguration as Tufts' 11th president and join with him and the 65,000 alumni and 7,900 current students in celebrating Tuftonia's Day. For while Patriot's Day may be best remembered as the day of "the shot heard 'round the world," for Tuft's alumni and students worldwide it is a special day to share memories, reminisce with old friends, and celebrate the contributions Tufts has made to the community—locally, nationally, and indeed, globally.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ARSON PREVENTION ACT OF 1993

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I join with several of our colleagues to introduce the Arson Prevention Act of 1993.

On February 20, 1993, an infant was killed in an arson fire at an apartment in Capitol Heights, Prince Georges County, MD. The fire was caused by a molotov cocktail thrown into the apartment by juveniles intending to silence a key witness to a recent shooting. More than 50 persons were forced to flee from the building as a result of the fire. This tragic incident reflects the deadly nature of arson, and the need for remedies directed at emerging causes of arson such as drug trafficking, domestic violence, and civil unrest.

Arson remains one of the deadliest crimes known to society. It is a leading cause of fire deaths, accounting for approximately 700 deaths annually in the United States. Each year there are more than 500,000 incendiary or suspicious fires, causing estimated property losses in the range of $2 billion. Despite the devastating human and economic costs of arson, efforts to prevent, detect, and successfully prosecute arson offenses have fallen woefully short.

There is a need for standardization of investigative techniques and reporting methodology to facilitate a more accurate representation of the true scope of the arson problem. Because of the disparity of reporting methods, the real magnitude of arson crimes is unknown. Regardless of how the crime is categorized, the National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] estimates that of all the suspicious and incendiary fires that occur, only one-third are confirmed as arson offenses. Of the confirmed arson offenses, 80 to 85 percent do not result in an arrest that solves the crime. Of those that are solved by arrest, about one-half of the suspects arrested are not prosecuted. About one-third of those that are prosecuted are not convicted. The NFPA estimates only about 2 percent of arson fires lead to convictions. Arson is difficult to detect and even more difficult to prove in a courtroom.

Arson investigators and other public officials concerned with this crime need more effective tools. The bill addresses this need by establishing a new competitive grants program, to be administered by the United States Fire Administration, to as many as 10 States to achieve the following: First, improve arson investigator training courses leading to professional certification of arson investigators; second, provide resources for the formation of arson task forces or interagency organizational arrangements involving police and fire departments and other relevant local agencies such as State arson bureaus and the State fire marshal's office; third, develop and disseminate public education and awareness materials related to arson and arson unit management guides; fourth, support research and new programs directed at civil unrest as a cause of arson; fifth, develop new programs to combat juvenile arson; sixth, support research and new programs directed at drug and gang related arson; seventh, provide resources for initiatives to combat domestic violence connected to arson; eighth, improve the capability of rural firefighters to identify arson and preserve evidence; and ninth, expand training programs at State fire academies, for paid fighters, and through regional delivery methods, for volunteer fire fighters, including teleconferencing and satellite delivered programs.

The bill requires that each program goal be encompassed in one or more of the grants awarded.

As a criteria for qualifying for a grant under the legislation, a State must obtain at least 25 percent of the cost of programs funded by the grant, either in-cash or in-kind, from non-Federal sources. To address the problem of a lack of uniform reporting of arson offenses, the bill requires States receiving grants to make efforts to ensure that all local jurisdictions within the State will provide arson data to the National Fire Incident Report System of the U.S. Fire Administration, or the Uniform Crime Reporting [UCR] program of the Federal Bureau

of Investigation. The legislation provides that initial grants to the States are to be for 2 years, subject to renewal for additional periods at the discretion of the Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration.

A separate provision of the bill provides for the development of an advanced course on arson prevention and expansion of arson investigator training programs at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, MD, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, GA, or through regional delivery sites. It is essential that as many arson investigators as possible have access to the state-of-the art investigative techniques that are being developed at the National Fire Academy and Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

The Subcommittee on Science of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a legislative hearing on the measure on April 20, 1993.

TRIBUTE TO ROGER F. SMITH

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Roger F. Smith on the special occasion of his retirement from his position as the superintendent of schools for School District 98 in Berwyn, Ill.

Roger began teaching in 1959 at Dundee Junior High. He then held the positions of assistant principal at Algonquin Junior High and then later principal of Lincoln Junior High in Berwyn. Finally, in 1969, he became superintendent of schools for District 98—the position in which he has commendably served for the past 24 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend Roger for his tremendous contributions to our community and for his commitment to educating our youth. I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting him for his many years of service and wishing him the very best for the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO LOCAL NO. 7 INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize the achievements of Local No. 7 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers on the occasion of their 100th anniversary. Local No. 7 has seen the transformation of western Massachusetts from an agrarian society to the seat of the electrical manufacturing of the United States. Local No. 7 has been there every step of the way. From the electrification of the city of Springfield to the construction of New England's first nuclear power plant, Yankee Rowe. The men and women of Local No. 7 have shared one basic philosophy throughout this glorious history, a philosophy taken from the International Brotherhood's constitution: "Our cause is the cause of human justice, human rights, and human security."

From World War I to the antilabor movements of the 1920's through the great Depression and World War II to an unprecedented post-war economic boom, Local No. 7 has stayed true to the words of its constitution as it has sought to bring better wages, safer workplaces, and the security of long-term employment to its members.

As Local No. 7 enters its second century, we honor its past, yet we are reminded that the past 12 years have not been kind to the labor movement. From the firing of the PATCO air traffic controllers to attempts to remove the 1914 Massachusetts prevailing wage law from the books, Local No. 7 has had to endure an environment that has been hostile to labor unions. Lax enforcement of Federal regulations prevented opening the door of opportunity to hundreds of minority and women craftsmen. The increase of non-union low-wage competition has had labor unions all over America scrambling to retain the gains of past victories that brought justice and security to the workers of the United States.

Fortunately a new day has dawned. President Clinton recognizes the need to rebuild our economy and shift its focus from Wall Street to Main Street. Our economy must progress from downsizing and unemployment to rebuilding and full employment. The time for change is upon us and unions like Local No. 7 can lead the way.

Local No. 7 has seen change before and embraced it. From the automobile industry to the paper mills of the Connecticut River. From building the college campuses of western Massachusetts to building Westover Air Force Base, Local No. 7 has provided skilled laborers dedicated to doing a job well. With a new course of change being charted as I speak here today, I am confident of one thing: that unions like IBEW Local No. 7 can lead the way to a new era of prosperity. An era when the words of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers' constitution are the words of workers all over America. An era when government, industry, and workers alike rise up join forces and unite behind the common cause of justice, human rights, and human security.

I would like to congratulate the officers of Local No. 7 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers: William D. McCarthy, president; Joseph Eisenberg, vice-president; Douglas W. Bodman, business manager; Maureen T. Carney, recording secretary; and Paul H. Fillion, treasurer on their 100th anniversary and wish Local No. 7 good fortune for the next 100 years.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. KUNDUS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Edward J. Kundus, a man whose dedication to the students of my district is exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, every year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary sponsor "The Voice of Democracy" speech writing contest. This competitive contest provides thousands of high school students with the opportunity to voice their opinions regarding their responsibilities to, and reflections of, our great country. In cooperation with State and National Associations of Broadcasters, the winning speeches are then transmitted across America via broadcasting media.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 25 years Mr. Kundus has been a tireless force behind the success of this contest. His work as the country chairman has encouraged the continued participation of high schools and, consequently, the opportunity for aspiring students to learn and grow.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Kundus on his selfless efforts on behalf of my district's students. I am proud to call him a citizen of my district.

GAYS IN THE MILITARY: WE ARE HERE TO STAY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an excellent article by one of my constituents, Capt. Philip Adams [USMCR] and others, which appeared in the April 1993 Naval Institute Proceedings, entitled "We Are Here To Stay."

I hope the day will soon arrive when Captain Adams' coauthors and others, who are currently serving in our Nation's armed services, will be free to list their names on a reasoned article such as this.

The article follows:

GAYS IN THE MILITARY: WE ARE HERE TO STAY

(By Capt. Philip Adams, USMCR, et al.)

A riot at the Stonewall Inn in New York City in 1969 began the modern gay rights movement. We are committed to seeing that movement advanced so that all Americans are granted their full civil rights, which includes allowing gays and lesbians to serve their country in the military—unimpeded by bigotry, hate, violence, and poor leadership. The world is crying out for change. Will the United States—a country founded by persecuted peoples—be among the last of the democratic nations in a new world order to grant all of its citizens their basic civil rights? Do we have enlighted civilian and military leaders who are up to the task?

WHO ARE WE?

We do not seek to make the comparison between racial discrimination and gay rights. We do not necessarily seek to refute all of the claims made by Commander Eugene Gomulka in his December 1992 Proceedings article, "Why No Gays." We simply seek to educate. The term "homosexual" is a clinical term, narrowly defined. For example, it does not include those who are bisexual. The U.S. Navy, however, has chosen to use the term more broadly. As quoted from the Naval Military Personnel Manual (Article 3630400), a homosexual is defined as: "a person, regardless of sex, who engages in, desires to engage in, or intends to engage in

homosexual acts." A homosexual act is further defined as "bodily contact, actively undertaken or passively permitted, between members of the same sex for the purpose of satisfying sexual desires."

Contemporary terms are "gay" for men and "lesbian" for women. We do not choose to be gay or lesbian (or somewhere in between). Most psychologists agree that our orientation is a part of our biological and psychological makeup. Therefore, there is nothing to cure or correct. The logical conclusion, then, is that our orientation is manifest as some sort of behavior on an individual basis. Most gays and lesbians pass as straight and are indistinguishable from the population at large. (Many gay officers are currently serving in the five armed services.) Some of us, however, are very queer—that is, we are distinguishable as gay or lesbian. Does that make us bad or less effective, or does it simply offend a small number of bigoted, narrow-minded, hate-oriented service members who adversely affect the morale of all military personnel?

HOMOPHOBIA

Commander Gomulka boldly claims that homosexual behavior is not "normal conduct." What kind of conduct is he referring to, and who determines what is normal for whom? We like to think of all people as individuals, whether they are gay, lesbian, straight, or in between. He asserts that sexual orientation should be considered a private matter. We believe that it is; the government, however, does not encourage privacy. Current laws, like the ban, make private behavior a public issue. Consider the case of Orlando Gotay, a young naval officer who was "forced to resign" because he was accused of being a homosexual. There was no evidence, no misconduct; there was simply an accusation. The naval service "outed" him in the national press as he desperately sought to preserve his privacy. No, the government has made this a public issue, and it must be addressed.

Commander Gomulka is afraid that gays or lesbians will seek public affirmation of their lifestyle. We are not sure what "lifestyle" means. If he means that we want the public to affirm our out-of-the-closet sexual orientation, then he is correct. We demand that we be treated as equals, and are not ashamed of our sexual orientation because it is not chosen. Could society respect gays or lesbians if we did not seek public affirmation? We do not believe that most gays and lesbians will come out of the closet should the ban be lifted. Not all gays and lesbians come out in the civilian community because of their fears about prejudice and career promotions. We do hope that in time, however, all gays and lesbians can come out of the coffin world of the closet and stand proudly among their peers, with dignity, integrity, and self-respect; that they will no longer be seen as evil, bad, or dirty, but as individuals who serve a special purpose in the success of civilization and modern society.

MANNING THE GUNS

Commander Gomulka refers to the military. The military is not merely an institution; it is people brought together under the law to serve and protect all of the United States. As President Clinton iterates, "We don't have a person to waste." Recruitment and retention will not suffer by lifting the ban; no evidence supports such an argument. If it does, institute the draft or recruit more gays and lesbians, who will be happy to serve. After all, since so many have been discharged, recruiters could target the homosexual community to reach the services' quotas.

TOLERANCE FOR DIVERSITY

If it is true that gays and lesbians comprise 10 percent of the population, is a 10 percent minority willing to risk acceptance by offending their fellow shipmates, Marines, or friends? Hardly! What we believe will happen once the ban is lifted is that, as more young people begin to know gays and lesbians as individuals, our nation will become more cohesive and less fragmented. In the words of Marine Corps General John Lejeune, all recruits will be "far better physically, mentally, and morally than they were when they enlisted."

We agree with the chaplain that "legislators and military leaders have a legitimate role to play in providing positive, acceptable role models, especially for young people whose minds and characters are in formative stages." All of our existing gay military personnel are the perfect start for such role models. Extensive military research and recent flag memos cite gays and lesbians as typically being overachievers and hard workers. Is not this the type of example we want to set for America's youth? Perhaps we will be better able to improve upon the concept of mission accomplishment rather than wasting valuable resources on witch-hunts.

SEX MANIACS?

Commander Gomulka seems to think that gays and lesbians have difficulty controlling their behavior. Does he know who his gay shipmates are? We do. We believe in the personal privacy of all service members, which is a separate issue from sexual misconduct. We hope that Commander Gomulka is not serious in saying that gays and lesbians in the military are analogous to alcoholics working in a liquor store. Is this an implication that a minority of gays and lesbians will begin large-scale molestations of the military population? The syllogism here is incomplete. Why should we see unrestrained behavior in the military when there is no evidence of large-scale unrestrained behavior in the civilian workplace?

It is unfortunate that Commander Gomulka feels free to use dated statistics in his sermon. Professionals who understand statistical research are well aware that data can prove almost any thesis. But, does that make the thesis true, and to what degree of error? His evidence of "wide-spread sexual compulsion among homosexual men" is based on a limited Kinsey Institute report that is contrasted with a University of Chicago survey. Two separate sample populations can yield significant disparities. It is ridiculous to assert that 71% of gay men have had more than 500 partners. No one likes to be accused of something that may contain some shred of truth, but is untrue overall. Our Vietnam veterans did not like being accused of being baby killers, and our gay and lesbian service members do not like to be accused of being sex maniacs. Perhaps military leaders and chaplains should consider attending a local Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (P-FLAG) meeting. Then they could begin to dismantle their homophobia and see sexual minorities as real people rather than as negative stereotypes.

If gays and lesbians are sexually promiscuous, it may be linked to society's refusal to affirm same-sex relationships. It is discriminatory for an unmarried heterosexual couple to be denied the same housing benefits that married couples enjoy. We argue the same for same-sex couples. It is time the military redesigned its housing regulations so that each service member is compensated for his or her individual contribution. Service members who choose to have large families should pay their fair share. Treat everyone equally, regardless of their marital status, and eliminate preferential treatment for only one type of family.

SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

Sexual promiscuity is not the real issue. The real issue is: What is the propensity of gays and lesbians to manifest their behavior as sexual misconduct? To that issue, we address the following questions: How many gay rapes have taken place in the military versus straight rapes? How many violent crimes have been committed by gays and lesbians versus straights?

In light of recent scandals in the Catholic church, should we assume that all priests are child molesters? Based on the coverup by key naval officers involved with Tailhook, should we assume that the naval establishment encourages molestation of women? Hardly! Such logic is faulty. Should gays and lesbians violate sexual misconduct rules, they should be prosecuted to the same degree straights would be prosecuted for related offenses. Unfortunately, most heterosexual misconduct is swept under the rug by career-oriented officers. Treat each person separately and assume that everyone is innocent until proven guilty.

WORKING TOGETHER

Commander Gomulka is quick to point out some startling statistics on gay suicides, as well as gay and lesbian alcoholism rates. We do not dispute these claims; we query, rather, what is the logical conclusion one could draw from this data? Perhaps, that gays and lesbians are naturally self-destructive. Or, that they are repressed by an intolerant society that really has not taken time to understand people who have same-sex orientations. Is Commander Gomulka aware that from 250,000 to 500,000 gay and lesbian youths are rendered homeless each year by *traditional* families that throw them out solely because of their sexual orientation?

We also take offense to Commander Gomulka's less-than-Christian view that, by virtue of being gay or lesbian, one will put an undue burden on the military medicine program. All recruits, regardless of sexual orientation, are screened for exposure to HIV. Those service members who are HIV positive or who have AIDS need medical treatment regardless of the provider source—period! Further, HIV infection rates for gays are declining and are increasing for straights. The gay community has been hardest hit by the AIDS epidemic and is in the best position to help the military reduce AIDS cases through education—not a naive insistence that only gays are infective. The military medical establishment has taken an aggressive role among the leaders in medical research and drug trials for persons with AIDS. As a nation, we need to work together to fight this great plague. Many gays and lesbians have lost friends and lovers to AIDS and are all too aware of the risks of infection and the need to protect ourselves and others from it.

LEADERSHIP FAILURE

The real issue is whether we currently have a military leadership failure. The current "model" Pentagon system for fighting bias is unresponsive and repressive. Oftentimes, those who complained about racial or sexual mistreatment claim their careers were ruined by psychiatric evaluations, criminal investigations, or lowered job ratings, while the offenders went unpunished.

Many women who are sexually harassed report that they are investigated as being lesbians, are denied promotions, and are transferred to remote locations. Military officials insist that their policies are fundamentally sound, but Army Chief of Staff General Gordon R. Sullivan admits the military has not been "completely successful in the execution of the program." If the program is there, why are military leaders so afraid to use it? The military's equal-opportunity system clearly lacks the independence to conduct objective investigations and, typically, military commanders are more concerned with their careers than with the truth.

The last vestige of the existing argument for banning homosexuals from military service is morale and discipline. Who is ultimately responsible for morale and discipline? The commander-in-chief. Who carries out his orders? The chain of command! Every leader in the military establishment has the responsibility to carry out his or her orders in the spirit in which they were issued. We believe that many military leaders are unqualified to lead within or outside a military environment. Once the ban is lifted, leaders—true leaders—in the new world order will continue to include all valuable personnel in their organizational objectives, regardless of sexual orientation. Those who cannot are incapable of leadership in the upcoming millennium.

Leaving the service will not change the makeup of the civilian work force where gays and lesbians also abound. What we need are strong, enlightened men and women who are as capable of leading our nation in peace as they are in times of armed conflict. If there is a moral argument, then all moral issues must be included, not just the homosexual one. While many may disagree with our view, it is important to emphasize the need to separate the values of church leaders from the constitutional guarantees of the state.

CONCLUSION

We believe that by lifting the ban against homosexuals, the naval establishment will receive the following benefits: A savings of time for the Naval Investigative Service that would allow it to spend more time pursuing legitimate criminal cases, significant budget savings in a depressed economy by eliminating costly witch-hunts, higher quality of life for all military personnel in a population that accurately reflects the diversity of the entire U.S. population, and increased personal integrity for all service members who can be who they are—not what others would have them be.

Homosexuals currently serve openly in the armed forces of Canada, Australia, Israel, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland, and France. These countries have assimilated gays and lesbians in their ranks. Do our military leaders have the modern leadership skills necessary to openly accept homosexuals in their ranks and conduct business as usual once the ban is lifted? We are willing to help if our leaders are willing to listen. In the words of Rodney King, a victim of oppression and violence by bigots in uniform, "Can we all just get along?"

CURING OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM THROUGH MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks President Clinton is expected to announce his plan to reform the health care industry through managed competition. Although this approach to health care reform has received the most attention in congressional debate this year, it is not the solution to the problems of our health care system. Phyllis Schlafly discussed managed competition in the February 1993 issue of her newsletter The Phyllis Schlafly Report and concluded that his approach would fail to control health care costs and would lead to a rationing of services. As an alternative, Mrs. Schlafly proposes medical savings accounts as a way of preserving the role of individuals in choosing the health care they receive and enabling the free market to control costs. I submit Mrs. Schlafly's article to my colleagues' attention and urge them to consider her concerns and solutions.

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN HEALTH CARE REFORM?

(By Phyllis Schlafly)

Health care reform stands at the top of our national priorities. Just as Bill Clinton's campaign slogan was "the economy, stupid," the first order of business of his administration is supposed to be "health care reform, stupid."

The Clinton people first floated the slogan of "national health insurance," but that did not catch on since it was readily recognized as nothing but expensive socialized medicine. Then the Democrats moved onto "pay-or-play," a plan to shift all the costs of health care onto business. That idea was abandoned, too, after analysis showed that it would destroy small business and increase unemployment.

The Clinton Administration has come up with a new magic label to sell its health care plan: Managed Competition. They know the "managed" part will appeal to Democrats and they hope the "competition" part will seduce Republicans. But the use of the word "competition" in this context is a fraud. In real competition, consumers are free to choose how they spend their money. In "managed" competition, the customer still pays, but someone else chooses how, where and when the money is spent.

The game is on to confuse the American people with some new jargon which you won't see defined in your dictionary. If you don't know what the new phrases mean the game may be over before you know what the stakes are—and it may be a matter of life or death because it involves your own health care. Here are the new words used in news reports about Managed Competition: "a national basic health care package that will be the standard for tax deductions," "standardized benefits and fees, "managed care," "a national health board," "federally mandated universal insurance," and "global budgeting."

Hidden behind this bureaucratic jargon is the attempt by politically and financially powerful forces to seize control of the $839 billion Americans currently spend on health care. The goal is to transfer control of health care expenditures from patients and their private doctors to government and insurance company "managers" (who, of course, will be handsomely rewarded for their services in supervising, restricting, and monitoring health care). "Global" budgeting means the bureaucrats will restrict how private as well as public health care money is spent in order to stay within the "global" figure.

Under Managed Competition, independent private physicians would be largely replaced by doctors employed by large insurance companies. Most patients will find that they no longer control their health care decisions, but will be virtual bystanders while their fate is determined by the insurance company and its salaried doctors. A "National Health Board" would decide how much America will spend on health care and define a "basic comprehensive health package" that must be offered by employers or by the government to everyone in the country.

The Federal Government would use the income tax code's carrot and stick (i.e. tax deductions) to drive all Americans into big managed care groups. Employers would be allowed to take a tax deduction only for the standard basic plan approved by the National Health Board. The Clinton health care team has already floated the idea of requiring employees to pay taxes on any health insurance coverage that exceeds the basic plan approved by the National Health Board. This would amount to a tax increase for millions of Americans.

Under Managed Competition, large Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) would dominate all health care. Health insurance would be a product purchased principally by employers, who would choose from among several mammoth HMOs with doctors on their payroll. You could not choose your own doctor. He would be selected by the insurance company executives, and the managers of your company's benefits program. Decisions as to health care and treatment would not be made by patients or doctors, but by the politicians who decide what is tax deductible and by the HMO and employer executives who decide how they will ration the funds they are willing to spend.

Newsweek estimated on December 28, 1992 that the Clinton Administration's health "reforms" would cost "$40 to $60 billion a year" in increased taxes. On December 18, 1992 in Little Rock, President-Elect Bill Clinton floated the idea of limiting health care for those who have insurance in order to promote access for the uninsured. "Once you guarantee a threshold of [necessary] access, there ought to be some limit to utilization, I think," Mr. Clinton said. He also stated that he is "inclined" to begin taxing the portion of employer-paid health insurance premiums that exceed a certain amount.

SHOULD "EXPERTS" MAKE OUR HEALTH CHOICES?

To the liberals, "health care reform" means setting up a management system to make health care decisions for ordinary Americans. It is liberal dogma that the average individual is too dumb to make his own health care decisions, and health care is to important to leave up to the doctor and patient because some of us might make wrong decisions. Liberal dogma teaches that "smart people" (like Congressmen, bureaucrats, Ph.D.s, and insurance company experts) should decide the "correct" health care for individuals.

During the Presidential campaign, Bill Clinton made it clear that he supports the national control of private health care that results from Managed Competition. He said

on October 2 that he would "give people significant incentives to be in large managed care groups, and we'll just tell 'em here's how much money we've got and here are the services you have to provide."

We already have the Oregon experience to tell us how a National Health Board might work. Oregon devised a plan to expand Medicaid eligibility by containing costs through rationing of health care. The rationing scheme listed 700+ health care services in the order determined through the political process.

Under Oregon's health care rationing, the services in the top half of priorities included withdrawal from alcohol and other drugs, sterilization procedures, birth control, and abortion. Procedures that ranked lower on Oregon's priorities included operations that might prevent blindness, surgical procedures for cerebral palsy, treatment for miscarriage, surgery for babies born with dislocated hips, and therapy for patients with metastatic cancer who had less than a 10 percent chance of surviving five years.

If you were choosing how to spend your own money, your preferences might be different. You might feel that you should not have to wait in line for heart or hip surgery so that more tax dollars could be devoted to treating alcoholics and drug addicts.

The idea that a National Health Board can determine the appropriate health insurance plan for every family in the country is ludicrous—and will be bitterly controversial. Will the basic health plan cover dental care? Psychiatric treatment? Long-term care for Alzheimer's victims? Drug and alcohol treatment? Treatment of minors without parental consent? Abortion? Abortion rights activists have already staked out their demand that elective abortions be part of the basic package.

Disputes about the necessity for treatment will inevitably arise and cause expensive litigation. Managed Competition could become a bonanza for lawyers, pitting company doctors against physicians selected by plaintiff attorneys. The result would be similar to the worker's compensation system, which many businessmen today describe as "out of control."

Managed Competition makes no more sense than having a National Automobile Board determine a standard car for every family because the "experts" think the engine is too complicated for the ordinary person to understand. If a National Computer Board were set up to choose your computer because you are not "smart" enough to select your own, the price of PCs would be going up, not down.

Managed Competition will both deprive you of your right to choose your doctor and health care plus increase costs on everyone. All our experience with managed social programs shows that they drive costs up, not down.

WHO WILL PROFIT FROM MANAGED COMPETITION?

The large insurance companies have decided that they want to do business with the Clinton Administration, and it's important to realize why. Managed care, such as HMOs, is far different from traditional health insurance. In an attempt to control costs and thereby please employers who are now paying most of the health care bill for their employees, the large insurance companies have established networks of managers, administrators and bureaucrats to limit the utilization of health care by employees. This is called managed care, and it reduces costs by restricting access.

Under this arrangement, employees are channelled to doctors under contract to the insurance company. The doctors must take orders from the managers regarding how long the patient may be in the hospital, what kinds of tests or drugs may be given, and what operations may be performed.

HMOs are not a new idea. A number of employers have already put their health insurance plan into an HMO. Their employees do not have the right to choose their own doctors, but are limited to the doctors under contract to the particular insurance company chosen by the employer. HMOs have been aggressively marketed for the past several years, but still only 15 percent of Americans belong to HMOs. Most people don't like going to a "company doctor," who is under contract and paid by an insurance company selected by the employer, because they believe the old adage that "whoever pays the piper calls the tune." People just don't like it when they find they can't choose their own doctor.

Clinton's scheme of Managed Competition will immensely help HMOs and the largest insurance companies, and also eliminate their smaller competitors. As reported in the American Medical News of December 21, 1992, the largest commercial insurers "have invested heavily in managed care systems and potentially stand to benefit hugely under Managed Competition."

This explains why, once Clinton was elected, the Health Insurance Association of America (HIAA), the trade group of the insurance companies, essentially endorsed Clinton's Managed Competition scheme. The HIAA is dominated by the large insurance companies that deal in managed care. The small health insurance companies, which sponsor traditional insurance, have been left to fend for themselves.

Meanwhile, a major change in accounting regulations has just gone into effect. The new regulations require corporation balance sheets to show as liabilities the health benefits promised to retired employees. This change has caused a terrible problem for Big Business, which has promised billions of dollars in future health benefits to retirees, despite warnings from the medical profession. Big Business is looking for a way out, and it sees the solution as either national health insurance (under which corporations could dump their burden onto the taxpayers) or Managed Competition (which will enable the Fortune 500 companies to give their employees, active and retired, only the cheapest HMO plan available). Those employees not willing to put up with HMO restrictions would have to pay taxes on the higher benefits, which amounts to a tax increase on the middle class.

Some workers would go ahead and pay higher taxes, generating funds for government-sponsored health care for the uninsured; others would not, leaving them stuck with the restrictions and regulations of the cheapest HMO. That's why the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans, a trade group representing much of Big Business, announced a dramatic policy shift December 18, 1992. It now supports a plan to require workers to pay income taxes on health care benefits that exceed the cost of basic (HMO) coverage.

The stage is set for a Super Bowl type of showdown. At state is the health of Americans. On one side are President Clinton, the Democratic leadership in Congress, the largest insurance companies, some Fortune 500 corporations, and Washington bureaucrats. on the other side are patients, workers, and taxpayers. The second group is looking for a political leader with the coverage to challenge the first group.

SO WHAT'S THE SOLUTION

The biggest problem with our present situation is the high cost of health care. But the reason costs are so high and rising higher is no great mystery. Most people are spending someone else's money than their own. This is what we call third-party health insurance, that is, insurance provided by an employer, an insurance company, or government.

Before 1965, increases in health care costs were relatively small because most costs were paid by the patients purchasing the care. The tremendous expansion of third-party health insurance has resulted from the great growth of government-paid health care (Medicare for the elderly and Medicaid for the poor), and employer-paid health care (as employers and employees opted for the tax-free benefit of health care instead of taxable wage increases).

While it might sound good for someone else to pay your medical bills, we are now paying the price for this false generosity: stagnant wages and insurance company bureaucrats telling your physician how to practice medicine.

About 95 percent of the payment to hospitals and 80 percent of payments to physicians are now made with other people's money. The patient who contracts for the health services has no incentive to economize and every incentive to overconsume. If your employer agreed to pay your food bills, supermarkets would accommodate you by stocking more prime rib and less hamburger.

On the average, the cost of an employer-provided family health plan is $4,500 per year. The employer buys a group plan that provides third party (insurance company) payment for each full-time employee's health care with a deductible of, say, $100 to $250.

Now consider how that same $4,500 might be spent in a different way—by changing tax law to permit Medical IRA plans. The employer puts $3,000 into a Medical IRA for each employee, which the employee uses to pay the first $3,000 of his family's health care costs each year. The employer spends $1,500 to buy health insurance that pays all medical expenses above $3,000. The employee has no out-of-pocket expenses (unlike the present system).

Here's the sweet part. Any portion of the $3,000 in the Medical IRA that the employee doesn't spend on health care is his to keep, and the unspent portion of $3,000 per year will remain in his IRA account year after year. Most families have less than $3,000 per year of medical expenses. As long as this IRA money is spent for health care (including eyeglasses and dental care), it remains tax free. If the employee chooses to use it for other purposes (buying a house, paying for a college education, etc.), it would be taxed like ordinary income.

If this concept is so great, why haven't some companies already set up such a plan? Because our tax law will not permit the employee to keep the Medical IRA money that he doesn't spend—he must spend it or lose it. Our present income tax code thus subsidizes large insurance companies and discriminates against savings by individuals.

The Medical IRA plan has three tremendous benefits: (1) it would give each employee a valuable and growing financial asset; (2) since it would be a personal account, it would be portable and stay with him if he loses or changes his job; and (3) it would stop the rise in health care costs be-

cause millions of cost-conscious Americans would spend their health care dollars carefully, ask the price before ordering any treatment, and avoid unnecessary expense.

Individual Medical IRAs are the only plan that can possibly control costs. They will cut costs by putting dollars and choices into the hands of families (not the government or insurance company managers). They will let individuals have a financial self-interest in spending their own money. The general use of Medical IRAs could reduce total health care spending by more than one-fourth, at the same time preserving the right to choose your own doctor.

The second problem with our present situation is the 37 million uninsured who are not old enough for Medicare and not poor enough for Medicaid. Most of the uninsured are part-time or self-employed workers, students, or employees (and their dependents) of small companies without health benefits. Others are dependents of insured workers who do not pay extra for a contributory family policy, or workers between jobs who do not pay for a continuation of health insurance offered under the 1986 federal law called COBRA.

Whereas employees of bigger companies get their health insurance paid for with pre-tax dollars (i.e., the health insurance is deductible to the company that buys the plan and not taxable to the employee who gets the benefit), the self-employed and employees of smaller companies that cannot afford a health plan must buy their health insurance with after-tax dollars. Those who buy health insurance only after first paying their income and Social Security taxes, in effect, must pay twice as much for the same insurance. No wonder 15 percent of Americans are uninsured!

The massive discrimination is fundamentally unjust and must be eliminated and replaced by tax fairness, which would permit everyone—waitresses as well as executives—to buy health insurance with pre-tax dollars.

Individual Medical IRAs combined with tax fairness would benefit all Americans, and would especially help three groups of Americans who are particularly disadvantaged by the present system:

(a) The uninsured. The fairness plan would enable the uninsured to buy their health insurance with pre-tax dollars, and the competition of Medical IRAs would reduce their health care costs. Many of the uninsured would buy health insurance if they could deduct the cost like corporations do.

(b) Future senior citizens. It is now an open secret that Medicare is going broke and is projected to be insolvent within ten years. Congressmen talk about it as a "bureaucratic disaster." The Department of Health and Human Services has already drafted a proposal to raise the age from 65 to 67. Tom Brokaw reported on NBC-TV that some doctors are now refusing to take Medicare patients because of government red tape and price controls. Middle class workers need a method to save for their health care expenses after retirement, since Medicare won't be able to pay in the future the way it does now.

(c) Employed mothers. The present system that ties tax-free health insurance to full-time career employment is grievously unfair to women workers. It is especially hard on the woman who wants to work part time or occasionally, but doesn't dare quit her job because she can't afford to give up her family's health insurance. Most company health plans require full-time employment in order to receive tax-free health insurance. With Individual Medical IRAs and the ability to buy health insurance with pre-tax dollars earned from part-time work, the woman employee would be liberated from "job lock" and have more options in meeting her family responsibilities. There is no more reason for health insurance to be tied to your job than automobile or life insurance.

Of course, no single plan can possibly solve all health care problems, or assure that everyone is healthy or that all sick people are cured. The health care field is encrusted with costly and counterproductive regulations that should be eliminated or modified. But Congress should deal first with the problems that Congress caused: federal tax laws that have led to skyrocketing health care costs and too many uninsured Americans.

So our first task on the road to real health care reform is to change the income tax code to permit Individual Medical IRAs that are personal and portable and to end the discrimination so that all Americans can buy health insurance on the same tax basis. This is the only cost-control plan that can work; it will make health insurance more affordable; and it will not require a big tax increase.

HONORING FORMER ASSEMBLYMAN LOUIS DESALVIO

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Louis F. DeSalvio, a former member of the New York State Assembly and a distinguished community leader on the lower east side of Manhattan. On Saturday, April 17, 1993, Louis DeSalvio will be honored by a grateful community of friends, neighbors, and former constituents for his life of service to our city and our State.

I first met Louis DeSalvio when I began my service in the assembly in 1977. Louis served in that august body from 1941 to 1979. His remarkable career spanned several political lifetimes. As the longest serving member, he held the position of president pro tempore of the assembly and served as its institutional memory.

A familiar figure in Albany, Louis was widely respected for his acumen and know-how. Of the many fruits of his leadership in Albany, one of his most cherished legacies to the community he served is the playground at Mulberry Street in Manhattan's Little Italy. The playground is named for his father—it stands as a monument to the remarkable and enduring commitment to the community that the DeSalvio family has demonstrated over the years.

A lifelong Manhattan resident, Louis DeSalvio lives in the South Bridge Towers complex in my district in lower Manhattan. Still a dedicated and active public servant, he serves as a member of the local community planning board to this day.

Louis DeSalvio is the beloved husband to his wife Elvira, and father of two children, John and Maria. He is a distinguished community leader and a valued neighbor.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, and with great pride that I rise to honor my constituent and former colleague, Louis DeSalvio.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROME NEWS-TRIBUNE

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the Rome News-Tribune in Rome, GA. I rise today to recognize this newspaper on its many years of dedicated service to the people of Rome and Floyd County and the State of Georgia.

The Rome News-Tribune's history dates back to 1843, when it was founded as a weekly newspaper. Only during times of the Civil War, when Union troops occupied the city of Rome, was service interrupted at the newspaper. The Rome News-Tribune went to daily service just after the Civil War. This newspaper is the oldest daily in the State, with the exception of the five major metro areas, and is recognized as the oldest continuous business in the city of Rome.

Over its many years of operation, the Rome News-Tribune has featured such notable journalistic greats as Charles Smith, who under the name of "Bill Arp" became the South's leading humorist following the Civil War, and Henry Grady, later associated with the Atlanta papers and who is credited with creating the term "The New South." Poet Frank L. Stanton, John Temple Graves, T. Buford Goodwin, John R. Hornady, and other distinguished writers also have been associated with the newspaper throughout the years.

The Rome News-Tribune has proven to be a leader among 22,000-circulation Georgia dailies in style and service. The newspaper is always a tough contender in Georgia Press Association and Associated Press contests; honors in reporting, editing, photography, lifestyle features, special projects, and other areas of newspaper production have become tradition at the Rome News-Tribune.

The B.H. Mooney family has been involved in the publication of the Rome News-Tribune since 1928. Today, the newspaper is one of a handful of Georgia dailies still locally owned and operated. Currently, Burgett H. Mooney, Jr., serves as chairman of the board of directors for News Publishing Co., the parent corporation of the paper. His son, Burgett H. Mooney III, who represents the third generation at the helm of the paper, is editor and publisher.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Mooney family and the Rome News-Tribune staff on this milestone event in the history of the newspaper. I am confident that the Rome News-Tribune will continue its long tradition of commitment to excellence in journalism for many more years to come.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHICAGO METALLIC CORP.

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a company located within the Third

Congressional District of Illinois that has stood the test of time and overcome the tough economic climate of today. On April 25, 1993, Chicago Metallic Corp. will be celebrating its 100th anniversary.

Chicago Metallic was founded in 1893 by George Frohlich and upon his death in 1935 the company was sold to Reinhardt G. Jahn. The Jahns are now in their third generation of ownership with six family members involved in the current management of the company. Chicago Metallic is one of the largest sellers of ceiling materials in the world including over $300 million in sales last year. The company employs more than 1,300 people at 10 plants across the United States and overseas, 609 employees alone are located in the Chicago area.

In the past years, the southwest side of Chicago company has designed and supplied ceiling materials for numerous projects including the Sears Tower, O'Hare International Airport, the Georgia Dome in Atlanta, and San Francisco's Transamerica Tower. Currently, Chicago Metallic is supplying materials for the Central Plaza building in Hong Kong, which will be the fifth-tallest building in the world when completed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Jahn Family on this very special occasion. I commend them on their century of hard work and commitment to their community and wish them every success with greater expansion and diversification in the years to come.

1993 J.C. PENNY GOLDEN RULE AWARDS

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the impact of volunteers on every community in this country. Programs designed to enhance the environment, to care for the homeless, to improve our schools, to deliver many of the services we have grown to depend on could not achieve their objectives without the efforts of volunteers.

I would like to pay tribute to all volunteers by recognizing five of them who are being honored this month as winners of the J.C. Penny Golden Rule Awards in Tucson, AZ.

When Bill Fry was diagnosed with AIDS, he "holed up—turned off the world." But after some thought, he volunteered with a vengeance at the Tucson AIDS project in a variety of different areas. He is reliable, energetic, and trustworthy, and willing to do whatever is needed. Bill transports, visits, and supports TAP's clients on a regular basis. During his own hospitalizations, he continues to visit others. When he is released, the first thing he does is call TAP and say, "I'm ready for work. What have you got for me?" Bill is a wonderful example of people helping people.

Walter Karnas is the founder of the Helmet Peak Volunteer Fire Department. When the Helmet Peak Area was told that the Green Valley Fire District could no longer offer fire protection, he obtained $26,000 in donated equipment and training, garnered support from the Pima County government, and sold thousands of raffle tickets. Fire protection in this area owes its existence of Walter Karmas. It has been said that this man "has the energy of two nuclear powerplants, and his leadership qualities are commensurate."

Project Pride Improvement Program—that's the long name for PIP. This organization offers kindergarten through sixth graders information, attitudes, skills, and support that help them to resist alcohol and drug abuse and gang involvement. A group of parents offered their services to help students develop ways to withstand the onslaught of destructive behaviors. In this age of violence and apprehension, PIP volunteers promote hope and faith in the human spirit—to the leaders of tomorrow.

Bianca Cristina Bustamonte, the youth award winner, supports the March of Dimes Youth Leadership Council, Chain Reaction, with peer to peer health education for southern Arizona high schools. She communicates directly by her presentations to area high schools, recruits teens to participate on the Health Conference Committee of Chain Reaction, arranges for speakers, invites attendees, and had primary responsibility for preparing the program. I call that a deep commitment to the community and a real ability to make a difference.

The winner in the education category is the Rio Vista PTO, whose mission is parents and teachers working together to support and strengthen the educational process. To this end, the group had provided hundreds of volunteer hours in support of the total school community by community outreach, family support, academic tutoring and extracurricular support. In addition, the financial support provided by the PTO has enhanced the quality of education by providing access to valuable resources and funding special school programs.

Together, these volunteers exemplify the spirit of volunteerism. I commend the attention of my colleagues to the work that they do, and the value of the work of all volunteers in this country. Without them, many worthwhile projects would simply not be accomplished. I believe that they deserve our support and respect.

TRIBUTE TO JOANNE MALYS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to honor a woman from my district who has served as the national president for the Italian American War Veterans Ladies Auxiliary for the past year. She has been involved with the Italian American War Veterans Auxiliary for over 30 years as a member of the Charles Marino Post No. 3 in Youngstown, OH.

Mr. Speaker, while at the Post No. 3, Joanne Malys served as president, secretary, and trustee. On the Ohio State level, she served as president, 2 terms, secretary, trustee, and several appointed offices. On the national level, she has served the national executive committee as a president, vice president, Americanism chairman, chief of staff, and as deputy inspector.

Mr. Speaker, after graduating from Youngstown State University and Kent State University with degrees in education, Joanne Malys went on to become a high school business education teacher. Joanne Malys has been actively involved with the PTA, band boosters, the Community Development Advisory Board of HUD, and the Polish Arts Club.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize Joanne Malys for her contributions to the Youngstown community and to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH CARE REFORM NO. 4: "KEEP THIS IN MIND"

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, enacting a good health care reform plan will be tough—but we must do it.

I periodically have entered in the RECORD horror stories of how the failure to have a decent national health care plan impacts individuals and families. Rarely have I received a letter as short and to the point as the following from a woman in Maryland.

We must enact national health care to save our citizens from this kind of dilemma. I hope we will keep this example in mind.

The letter follows:

DEAR HONORABLE STARK: The purpose of this letter is to inform you of my personal problems in obtaining health care in this country. I know many others have had similar problems. When you are considering health care legislation, I hope you will keep this in mind.

My husband owned his own business and our family and his employees were covered by Blue Cross/Blue Shield of D.C. I developed complications of diabetes in 1985. After this hospitalization I received notification from Blue Cross/Blue Shield that they would no longer cover any medical conditions or complications resulting from diabetes. In the meantime my husband passed away and I continued to make payments to Blue Cross/Blue Shield of $240 per month for health insurance.

In October and November of 1991, I received treatments from an ophthalmologist. The bill came to $2,100 and Blue Cross/Blue Shield paid only $360. At this point I knew I could no longer afford to pay $240 per month for health insurance plus pay doctor bills that health insurance did not cover. I knew most of my medical problems would be associated with diabetes and I would have to pay the doctor's bills for these myself.

Presently my total income is $540 per month. I no longer have health insurance and I cannot afford to pay for visits to the doctor and medical tests that I need. I am not 65 years of age so I do not qualify for medicare and my income from Social Security is slightly above the cut off of medical assistance. In considering medical care legislation please consider people like myself who cannot afford to pay for a doctor's care, are

not eligible for medical assistance and are not 65 years of age.

FRESH CUT FLOWERS AND FRESH CUT GREENS PROMOTION AND INFORMATION ACT OF 1993

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Congressman TOM LEWIS of Florida, Chairman DE LA GARZA, and others in introducing the Fresh Cut Flowers and Fresh Cut Greens Promotion and Information Act of 1993. The legislation will provide for a nationwide consumer-oriented promotion program to maintain and expand markets for fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens.

The program will be funded through assessments of one-half of 1 percent of gross sales paid by handlers of fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens. A referendum will be conducted within 3 years after the order implementing the legislation goes into effect.

Mr. Speaker, more than 50,000 small businesses in congressional districts throughout the Nation are engaged in providing the American public with flowers for special occasions and for everyday use. It is obvious that flowers enhance the quality of life as people engage in their daily activities. Around the world, flowers are symbols of love, sympathy and joy. They also enhance the aesthetic quality of our environment. And beyond that, flowers have proven to have positive psychological and physiological benefits.

Industry funded activities under the program will consist of promotion to advance the image, desirability, and marketability of cut flowers and cut greens; consumer education to provide information on the care, handling and appropriate use of cut flowers and cut greens; and research as needed to support promotion and information activities.

The U.S. floral industry has a record of significant accomplishments which I would like to mention and make part of the official record. United States and international agriculture is indebted to research first conducted in the floriculture industry. Floriculture was the first to use automatic irrigation and fertilization, now a standard practice for many agricultural commodities. Trickle irrigation, derived from greenhouse watering systems, has revolutionized arid climate agriculture.

Floriculture scientists have also developed methods to conserve energy and water, prevent pesticide pollution and reduce air pollution. In addition to enhancing the quality of life, floriculture can literally improve the quality of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, floriculture is truly part of the global marketplace. The American public receives flowers from growers in the United States and from all over the world. While imports have continued to increase, domestic producers are developing new ways to participate competitively in the marketplace. Under this checkoff program, handlers would be assessed the same for all products, whether domestic or imports.

While the cut flowers industry is only part of the floral industry, it is an important part. Industry sources estimate that the U.S. floral industry is approximately a $12 billion industry at the retail level. Currently more than 45,000 acres of greenhouses, shade houses, and open ground are under floriculture production in the United States.

In order for the floral industry to continue its admirable record of serving U.S. agriculture and providing the American public with products and services important to their daily lives, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this legislation.

QUALITY EDUCATION BEGINS WITH INDIVIDUALS

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to those who have concerned themselves with and have dedicated their careers and long-term goals to educating our young children.

This job is one of the most important because the education of our children represents our future. Potential technological advances and resolved complicated social relationships are dependent on their education.

Early childhood education requires not only teaching academic skills but social skills as well. Therefore, we would not entrust such care to any individuals who were not extremely qualified to take on this task.

The need for such quality education is vital, and many people have dedicated an enormous portion of their lives to improving standards of education and teaching for our children. Such an important job requires higher education, dedication, patience, and understanding. And those educators who have taken the initiative to improve the educational system must be recognized for their leadership roles, as well as for their accomplishments in doing so.

New Jersey has been honored by the outstanding contributions to the educational system by many of its citizens. It is with extreme pleasure and personal pride that I rise now to honor one of the most distinguished New Jerseyans.

Dorothy Engle is a gemstone who has shined brightly for decades in early childhood education and community service. Dot is a woman of remarkable vitality, compassion, and dedication. Her contributions in formal education and community service have always been based on the foundation of love and understanding of young children.

Dot has served eight consecutive 3-year terms on the Board of Education, Sparta Township, NJ. In the Garden State, school board members are elected by the citizenry so this alone testifies to the extreme high regard in which she is held. Her contributions, however, go far beyond school board membership. Dot was an original member in 1946 of the committee to establish statewide standards for the licensing of child care centers. She was instrumental in organizing the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children and has had officerships in far too may organizations to herein mention. But Dot, expert that she is in early childhood education, knows full well that children need much more than formal education. She, therefore, has given continuously of her time and talents to groups such as the Girl Scouts, church groups, and the Sparta Youth Development Commission.

Dot was the first woman to serve as president of the Sparta Area Chamber of Commerce and has also served as president of the Sussex County Zonta Club.

In 1983, Dot was named as the "Outstanding Older American of the Year" by the Sparta Township Council. She received the Jay-Cees Distinguished Service Award in 1982, has been named "Woman of the Year" by the Chamber of Commerce and had an entire week dedicated to her in 1980 by the township.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to honor the contributions of an outstanding New Jerseyan, Mrs. Dot Engle.

EDWARD WELLEJUS HONORED

HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before the 103d Congress to pay tribute to a distinguished American, an exceptional journalist, and a widely respected member of Pennsylvania's 21st Congressional District—Edward Wellejus.

For 50 years, Ed has held true to the journalistic ideal that in Walter Lippmann's words; "A free press is not a privilege but an organic necessity in a great society." From his early high school years on, Ed's writings and work reflected appreciation for his home and its history.

The author of "Erie, Chronicle of a Great Lakes City," and "Erie and Its Newspaper" he is a veteran newspaperman with an exceptional dedication and commitment to excellence. Now the editorial page editor for the Erie Daily Times and Sunday Times-News, Ed originally joined The Times staff as a sports writer in 1943 while still a student at Academy High School where his work on the school paper caught the eye of then sports editor, Howard Parsons.

With the outbreak of World War II, Ed served his country with distinction in the 87th Infantry Division in Europe. During his tour of duty, he was captured and held as a prisoner of war, enduring the hardships of various German prison camps. Upon his return home, Ed enrolled at Meadville's Allegheny College, where he burned the candle at both ends, studying history while also working as the Times' Meadville correspondent.

Upon his graduation in 1949, Ed moved back to Erie where he became a familiar face reporting from city hall as the Times' Man on the Scene for 15 years. In addition, Ed hosted a daily radio news program for 20 years and also served 2 years as moderator for a question-and-answer program with State legislators on local cable television. As a citizen who be-

lieves strongly in contributing to his community, Ed worked on promotion and publicity for Behrend College of Pennsylvania State University for 6 years. He also sat on the boards of the Perry Memorial House, the Erie Humane Society, and, most recently, the community advisory board for WPSE, Penn State Behrend's radio station.

Mr. Speaker, Ed, his family, and his friends can certainly be proud of these accomplishments for they reflect the hard work and dedication of a unique individual. His love for history, his appreciation for books, and his dedication to family and home serves as an example for us all. It is with great pride and honor that we salute and congratulate Edward Wellejus on his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ST. SYMPHOROSA LADY VIKINGS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the sixth grade girls basketball team of St. Symphorosa School. The Lady Vikings are composed of two teams: No. 1 gold and No. 2 blue. Recently, the No. 2 blue team took first place in the Burbank Park District League of Burbank, IL and the No. 1 gold team took second place in the Burbank Park District League.

Both teams successfully played as one team in the Chicago Park District League at Curie High School in Chicago and took second place. It was the first time in the school's history that three trophies were won in one season by the team.

I congratulate all these young ladies, their head coach, John Chico, and assistant coaches, Dan Athern, Ken Kosowski, and Jim Kane, for their hard work this season and wish them all the best for the years to come. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating them for a great season.

The following is a list of the St. Symphorosa Lady Vikings:

No. 1 gold—Gayle Athern, Cathy Burkert, Patti Chico, Jennifer Kosowski, Meghan Dalton, Megan Kennelly, Danielle Rocco, Erica Wojnarowski.

No. 2 blue—Jennifer Smith, Tiffany Kane, Susan Palomino, Erin Marsh, Jennifer Wilken, Tanya Burke, Natalie Cruz, Michelle Rutkowski, Lynda Daly.

TRIBUTE TO THE MILTON LITTMAN MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions that the Milton Littman Memorial Foundation, in Miami, has made to my community, this Nation, and the world. For 15 years the Milton Littman Memorial Foundation has been helping to educate needy young people, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. The Littman Foundation has helped many deserving young people, especially those who have been deprived because of family circumstances or discrimination through no fault of their own, to further their education through cash awards.

Under the leadership of North Miami Beach City Councilman Jules Littman, brother of the late Milton Littman, the foundation has experienced steady growth and broad recognition.

This year I had the honor and privilege of being the speaker at the foundation's 15th anniversary breakfast in my district a few weeks ago, and I was very impressed by the caliber and diversity of the students whom the foundation supports.

The foundation implores the students it assists to give something back to the community and reminds them of their responsibility to make a better city, State, and country.

ANN NICOLE ZAWISTOSKI FINALIST IN WESTINGHOUSE SCIENCE CONTEST

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I pay tribute to Ann Nicole Zawistoski who was a finalist in the 52d annual Westinghouse science talent search contest. Ann was honored last month for her outstanding and creative efforts in scientific research. As a 17-year-old student at Edgewood High School in Ellettsville, IN, she won a $1,000 award for studying ancient tidal cycles as revealed in siltstone buildup in whetstone beds in Orange County, IN. Her purpose was to determine the length of a year as it occurred 300 million years ago.

I commend Ann for her creativity and her success. She is a fine example of American youth and a testimony of what this Nation's young people can achieve given the opportunity and the proper support. Our Nation's greatest resource is its youth. I, therefore, also commend Westinghouse and science service for their private sector initiative in honoring young people such as Ann and for providing them with the impetus to extend themselves in scientific study.

SALUTE TO LEONARD DRAYTON—1992 LOS ANGELES RESERVE POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute one of my constituents who truly embodies the spirit of national service.

Leonard Drayton of North Hills, CA, was selected this month as the Los Angeles Police Department's Reserve Officer of the Year. As a reserve police officer, Leonard Drayton volunteers his time to ensure the safety of our neighborhoods. Officer Drayton averages an amazing 11 shifts per month, while maintaining a career in the private sector.

Officer Drayton's commitment to self-excellence, his leadership qualities, and his ability to motivate his fellow officers, all add up to making him an outstanding police officer.

Officer Drayton has been commended on numerous occasions for his professionalism, attention to duty and unselfish sacrifice.

In 1992, officer Drayton was awarded both the Meritorious Unit Citation Medal and the Police Star.

Officer Drayton is an excellent example of the professional police officer who is not only dedicated to the principals and standards of the Los Angeles Police Department, but also to the community they serve.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the unbridled commitment and dedication of Los Angeles reserve police officer Leonard Drayton, and the thousands of his fellow officers who give so much of themselves.

WCPO-TV AND WCCO HONORED FOR THEIR INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS ON SALVAGE FRAUD

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, while a great deal of attention has been focused on a "60 Minutes" February 21, 1993 segment on a consumer fraud scam associated with salvage fraud, the Society of Professional Journalists has recently honored two local stations for their stories on this very same issue.

I am pleased to inform the House that WCPO–TV in Cincinnati won the Sigma Delta Chi Award for Public Service for its series entitled "Rebuilt Wrecks." The series, "Rebuilt Wrecks" traced totaled cars that had been resold as undamaged. Members of WCPO–TV's investigative team, tracked down histories of rebuilt cars, including previous owners and their stories about the accidents.

The Public Service in Television Journalism Award is given to a television news organization that renders public service to the community it serves through extensive coverage of a controversial issue facing the community.

Mr. Speaker, I viewed this series and found the report absolutely essential in making consumers in the Cincinnati viewing area aware that they may be unknowingly purchasing a previously wrecked vehicle because of the automobile title fraud problem.

I am also pleased to inform the House that the Society of Professional Journalists have honored WCCO in Minneapolis with a Sigma Delta Chi Award for TV investigative reporting for their story "License of Steal."

The investigative team of Steve Eckert, Patrick Weiland, Julie Kramer, Joe Berglove, and Gary Feblowitz uncovered a loophole in Minnesota law that allowed cars which have been wrecked and totaled in other States to be issued clean titles in Minnesota, often without inspection. The TV Investigative Reporting Award is given for investigative reporting by a reporter or reporting team.

I want to commend WCCO for their report. It really is appalling that Minnesota's State law on titling rebuilt wrecks places consumers at such a disadvantage when they purchase a used car. Fortunately, WCCO got on top of the story and provided a valuable public service to their viewers in airing this important report.

Mr. Speaker, it's not just coincidence that the Society for Professional Journalism honored two stations which produced stories on essentially the same topic. Salvage fraud is a hot issue because it is a growing national problem. That's why I have introduced H.R. 1048, the Vehicle Damage Disclosure Act, that would put an end to salvage fraud.

Ordinarily, after a vehicle has been totaled in a wreck, the car's title document is branded "salvage." Salvage fraud occurs because it is easy to wash that salvage designation off the title by simply retitling the vehicle in another State. When the vehicle is later resold, neither the dealer nor the consumer are warned about the prior salvage history.

Many of the people who issued vehicle titles across the United States have been concerned about this problem for years. Their association, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators [AAMVA], established a working group to look into the problem and make recommendations.

The State motor vehicle administrators surveyed all the jurisdictions and recently released their report. The group found that salvage fraud hurts consumers in two ways. First, consumers pay more for rebuilt wrecks than they are worth; second, they face greater safety risks. Salvage fraud also encourages auto theft, and it disadvantages legitimate suppliers of used cars and parts, including auto auctions and dismantlers.

Upon considering the nature and extent of the salvage fraud problem, the State officials' primary recommendation was that Congress pass "Federal legislation to require salvage titles and the carrying forward of title brands." H.R. 1048 is that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend both WCPO–TV in Cincinnati and WCCO in Minneapolis for their very informative news stories on the important issue of title fraud. Their stories have already done a great deal in informing consumers as to the extent of the problem and will greatly assist my efforts in passing H.R. 1048.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DUNWOODY HIGH SCHOOL

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, today, I am very proud to announce that Karen Saunders and her class from Dunwoody High School, in Dunwoody, GA, will be representing Georgia at the national finals of the We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution competition in Washington, DC, on May 1–3, 1993.

I know that State Coordinator Michele Collins and District Coordinator Robynn Greer have contributed a great deal of time and effort to help these outstanding students reach the national finals, and Dunwoody High School teacher Karen Saunders deserves much of the credit for the success of this impressive team.

The distinguished members of the team representing Georgia are: Mehul Bhatt, Kelly Black, Michael Citrin, Evan Cone, Abbie Conner, Troy Coons, Greg Cox, Gray Crawford, Steve Danner, Justin Deasy, Shelle Denkinger, Ross Feingold, Bryce Gartland, Mary Elizabeth Hancock, Matt Harness, Jeff Harvey, Inman Houston, Mike Latham, Brent Loux, Jordan Luftig, Jody Ma, Allison McAndrew, Manashi Mukherjee, Reid Markunas, Sunil Patel, Josh Rosen, Kirk Stonecipher, Mary Beth Telander, Heidi Tuhkanen, Clay Williams, Corinne Wimberley.

The We the People * * * The Citizen and the Constitution program, supported and funded by Congress, provides an excellent opportunity for students to learn about our Constitution, its significance in the history of the United States, and the responsibilities incumbent upon the citizens of our Nation. I am extremely proud of these students representing Georgia and I heartily commend them and their teacher for their hard work. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in wishing them all the best in the upcoming competition as well as in their bright futures.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM B. PEARCH

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a man who has graced me with loyalty and wisdom. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Mr. William B. Pearch.

Mr. Speaker, Bill retired April 1, 1993, after serving 8 years as a staff assistant in my Youngstown office As you may know, my district offices are renown for their tireless efforts on behalf of the people of my community. I am very proud of this reputation. I realize, however, that an important element of this service is missing with Bill's retirement.

Bill's unique and successful career spans nearly 47 years. He has worked as a policeman, safety inspector, and claims investigator. His business, Pearch Construction, produced many beautiful, handcrafted homes and remodeling projects that still adorn the Mahoning Valley. Despite his success, he never turned his back on the community. He was deeply involved in women's softball, generously coaching and sponsoring his own team.

After meeting Bill, I commissioned him as a deputy sheriff. He excelled in his position and I eventually appointed him special investigator. His mastery of detective work is evidenced by the 40 specialized courses in law enforcement he has studied. He left the sheriff's department after I won, and served as a loyal employee of mine ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this special opportunity to thank Bill for the service he has given me and the 17th Congressional District. I wish him all the best.

God Bless you Bill. We will miss you.

TRIBUTE TO MATT PASSERO, LARRY WILSON, AND ANDY DUERLING

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to three men of the Third District of Illinois. On December 22, 1992, Matt Passero, Larry Wilson, and Andy Duerling attempted to save the life of Chester C. Urbanik of Chicago, who suffered a massive heart attack in public.

The heroic actions of these men should not go unnoticed. Too often today we are inclined to stand by while others are in need of our help. But these three men were not afraid to reach out to Mr. Urbanik. The community of Chicago's 23d Ward is fortunate to have such citizens working for it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in commending these men for their unselfish actions. May the rest of the community follow the fine example they have set.

UP TO THE UNITED STATES TO STOP THE SERBIANS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, the world is witness to nothing short of genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovenia. For the benefit of my colleagues, I recommend the following April 19, 1993, New York Times op-ed article by Anthony Lewis. The time for a response by the civilized world is long past.

WAITING FOR CLINTON

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Fifty years after the Nazis, will a European state led by a murderous demagogue be allowed to slaughter and expel another people because of their religion?

The question has faced Europe and the United States since Serbian aggression began in the former Yugoslavia 18 months ago. And no matter how hard European leaders and President Clinton wish, it will not go away.

Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia calculated from the beginning that the Europeans and Americans would wring their hands, say tut-tut and do nothing that really mattered as Serb forces attacked the Bosnian Muslims. So far he has been exactly right.

The latest trophy of his strategy is Srebrenica. After solemnly pledging to cease fire a week ago, Serbian generals let go with massive shelling that killed 53 civilians in the town. Over the weekend, a cease-fire demanded by the U.N. went into effect, on terms that will save life but effective end Muslim control.

The increasingly brazen Serbian aggression is accompanied by denials that would have made Joseph Goebbels blush. Thus the Bosnian Serb leader, Radovan Karadzic, said he had "ordered that not a cigarette butt land in Srebrenica." Serbian television said the 53 supposed victims were really Serbs who had been captured and killed.

Margaret Thatcher, the former British Prime Minister, called on the West to use its air power and let the Bosnian Government buy weapons to fight. "We cannot let things go on like this," she said. "It is evil."

Lady Thatcher's remarks seemed only to increase the defensiveness of both British and American officials. Secretary of State Warren Christopher dismissed her appeal as "rather emotional." As if, when more than 100,000 people have been killed and 1 million expelled because of their religion, emotion is inappropriate.

But why is it America's business? If the Europeans have failed to meet the challenge, why look to us? The answer is that this country is the only superpower. And the world will not move unless and until our President does.

Under the headline "Bosnia Waits for Clinton," Joe Rogaly wrote in The Financial Times, London, last week:

"Only President Clinton can stop the Serbs * * * It is up to the United States to decide whether the artillery used against women and children in Srebrenica and elsewhere should be bombed. If—when—it does, its NATO allies will participate or acquiesce."

The President, evidently embarrassed by the assault on Srebrenica, said he was looking again at all options. But he still seems unwilling to do anything that might actually worry the Serbian aggressors.

The trouble is that the fig leaf Mr. Clinton has used to cover a do-nothing policy has vanished. The fig leaf was the peace plan proposed by Lord Owen and Cyrus Vance. Any military intervention, it was argued, would be fatal to "the peace process."

There is no longer any pretense of a peace process. Even Lord Owen, who for months furiously argued against military intervention, has said that if the Serbs "are hell-bent on taking other towns, then we will have to meet this assault on Muslim towns with military action."

It is understandable that Bill Clinton prefers to avoid meaningful action in Bosnia. He is determined to be a domestic President—to tackle the terrible problems afflicting the United States at home. So he does not want to use his political capital on Bosnia.

But an American President who rallies his people to a good cause abroad does not lose political capital; he gains it. Indeed, if George Bush had used his standing after the Persian Gulf war to fight for a domestic program, he might still be President.

There are many horrors in the world today—but none worse than the unapologetic aggression and murder in Bosnia, and none so central to the established American interest in a peaceful Europe. Joe Rogaly, the Financial Times columnist, wrote that Lady Thatcher had made Britons ask themselves, "Where do I stand?" He answered:

"We must not accept that no military counterforce can be deployed when a gang of warriors, acting in the name of national identity, commits every atrocity, every slaughter, in order to gain Lebensraum on European soil. If we do, we are nothing."

And if we do, we Americans are nothing.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN E. ADAMS

HON. MARJORIE MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1993, when Dr. John E. Adams died, children throughout the world lost a great advocate and I lost a very dear friend.

As the executive director of Holt International Children's Services, Jack Adams was a pioneer in the field of adoption. "I have a simple vision," he once said, "It is that we some day have a world where every child is wanted * * * a world in which each child is adequately and permanently nurtured as a wanted person by his parents, whether they are biological or adoptive."

Without Jack, I never could have adopted my two daughters. Without Jack's faith in me—despite the fact that never before had an unmarried U.S. citizen adopted a foreign child—Lee Heh and Holly could never have entered and enriched my life. Without his compassion, dedication, and love, the thousands of children he helped place throughout the world would not enjoy the lives and families they have today.

Jack was recognized throughout the world for his efforts on behalf of children. He served on the United Nations committee of experts who developed guidelines for international foster care and adoption, he spoke at the Milan World Conference on Adoption and Foster Care in 1971, and he was active in the development of the "International Rights of the Child" which was a part of the United Nations International Year of the Child in 1979.

I wish to offer my condolences to his wife, Jan, his four children, his two grandchildren, and to all the thousands of children and parents whose lives he enriched, whose needs he answered, and whose love he shared. Our world is a better place for Jack's having been here.

WESTVIEW CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. PAUL B. HENRY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute today to Westview Christian Reformed Church located in my congressional district in Grand Rapids, MI.

On June 23, 1993, Westview Christian Reformed Church will be 100 years old. Formerly known as Broadway Christian Reformed Church in the lower westside of the city, it was established as the second English-speaking Christian Reformed Church in North America. Broadway was organized with assistance from the Alpine Avenue Christian Reformed Church, a Dutch-speaking congregation. Broadway was blessed and grew through the period of 1893 to 1963. In 1963, the congregation changed its location, built a new facility, and changed its name to Westview.

The people of Westview Church have given of themselves for many years to their church and to their community. Their contributions have made a significant impact on many people, both within the church membership and those with whom it has come into contact through these many years.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, our community is a better place in which to live because of the presence of Westview Christian Reformed Church. I encourage my House colleagues to join with me in extending our sincere congratulations to the congregation at Westview and we pray God's continued blessings on them in their next century.

THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND POLICY ACT OF 1993

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, 90 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt established the Nation's first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in my home State of Florida. He created it to protect wading birds preyed upon by the fashion industry for their decorative plumes.

What would President Roosevelt say of the abused Refuge System in 1993? Today we permit military practice-bombing of refuges. We allow jet ski noise and wakes to drive nesting birds and wildlife from refuges. In fact, the GAO reported in 1989 that harmful, incompatible activities threaten nearly 60 percent of the Nation's wildlife refuges.

Today's System hardly provides the refuge for imperiled fish and wildlife President Roosevelt envisioned. That is why I have introduced H.R. 833, the National Wildlife Refuge System Management and Policy Act of 1993. My bill would establish precise purposes for the System, improve the compatibility determination process governing secondary uses, establish comprehensive planning requirements, and provide for interagency coordination in maintaining refuge resources.

On the issue of hunting, let me say this. President Roosevelt was not only a famed conservationist, but also a noted hunter. Nevertheless, he saw a utility in setting aside lands to conserve, restore, and manage fish and wildlife. My bill reaffirms the right to compatible recreation such as hunting and fishing where congruent with a refuge's purpose. H.R. 833 does not legislate a Systemwide prohibition on hunting.

Celebrate the 90th anniversary of the National Wildlife Refuge System by cosponsoring H.R. 833.

BAKERSFIELD HIGH SCHOOL CENTENNIAL

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Bakersfield High School's first 100 years of dedicated service to the education of young people in Kern County, CA.

When opened on January 12, 1893, in two rented rooms on the upper floor of the Railroad Avenue School, Bakersfield High School had a faculty of two teachers and a student

body of 30. Today, Bakersfield High School occupies multiple buildings on a 25-acre campus and the student body has reached almost 5,000.

Over the past 100 years, Bakersfield High School has not only grown in terms of students and physical plant, but also in terms of academic and extracurricular pursuits. In 1893, Bakersfield High School provided advanced instruction in literary and scientific subjects. Today, the school offers instruction in a full array of subjects to prepare students for higher education and for their careers.

Bakersfield High School has also had a long history of outstanding sports teams—especially football teams, which won the State championship seven times from 1916–27—and an active student body both at the school and in the community. The student newspaper, The Blue & White, has been published since 1914 and yearly theater plays have been a mainstay since 1902.

Throughout its history, the staff and faculty of Bakersfield High School have remained dedicated to the school's timeless mission statement:

Bakersfield High School is committed to a quality educational program, responsible to the needs of its students within a safe, nurturing environment. The staff, students, parents and community assume responsibility for each student's academic and personal success. Recognizing the worth and dignity of each student, Bakersfield High School prepares all students to achieve their fullest potential. Our goal is to produce students who make informed decisions as they become responsible citizens and productive members of society.

The success of Bakersfield High School in meeting the educational needs of its students can be seen in the success of those who have graduated from Bakersfield High School. Governor of California and Chief Justice Earl Warren; Hall of Famer and sportscaster Frank Gifford; prominent Bakersfield citizen and businessman Jim Burke; Chicago School District Administrator Dr. Ruth Love; and mayor of Bakersfield Bob Price are just a few of the outstanding graduates of Bakersfield High School.

For 100 years, Bakersfield High School has served the young people and the community of Bakersfield, and I am sure it will continue to do so for many, many more years.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CELEBRATES 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague SAM GIBBONS in celebrating the 90th anniversary of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Refuge System is the only network of lands and waters the country has set aside specifically to conserve and manage fish and wildlife.

From the tiny Pelican Island refuge in Florida, established 90 years ago this month to protect brown pelicans and other birds, the Refuge System has grown to include over 480 units and more than 90 million acres. Today's Refuge System provides habitat for over 700 species of birds, 200 mammals, and 300 amphibians and reptiles.

Throughout its history, the National Wildlife Refuge System has been a cornerstone of our Nation's efforts to conserve wildlife. In the early years of this century, dozens of refuges were established to preserve the remaining breeding grounds for egrets, herons, gulls, terns, and other birds whose plumage was fancied by the millinery trade. In later years, refuges were established to protect the wetlands of the prairie States that are so important to our waterfowl and other migratory birds.

Long before there was an Endangered Species Act, there were, of course, endangered species. National wildlife refuges played an important role in conserving many of these species, from the brown pelican to the whooping crane.

Since the passage of the Endangered Species Act, we have dramatically increased the number of critically imperiled species protected by the National Wildlife Refuge System. In my home State of California, we have over 35 national wildlife refuges. Thirteen of these were established explicitly to conserve one or more endangered species.

In southern California, for example, the Bitter Creek, Hopper Mountain, and Blue Ridge refuges were established to protect habitat for the California condor. Sweetwater Marsh and Tijauana Slough refuges were established to conserve the light-footed clapper rail. In Riverside, important habitat for the Coachella Valley fring-toed lizard is protected by the Coachella Valley National Wildlife Refuge.

Unfortunately, as important as the National Wildlife Refuge System is to our Nation's wildlife, it is a system with many problems. The health of many of our refuges has been undermined by harmful economic and recreational uses, inadequate water supplies, poor planning, and lack of direction.

I am proud to have joined my friend and colleague SAM GIBBONS as cosponsor of the National Wildlife Refuge System Management and Policy Act of 1993, a bill that will put the Refuge System on a steady course for the future. This bill is essential if the Refuge System is to live up to its significant potential.

REVERE BEACH STUDY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation that I hope will ultimately lead to the restoration and protection of America's first public beach. Revere Beach, located in the city of Revere, MA, holds the distinction of being the first beach in the Nation that was established for public enjoyment and preservation. It is truly one of New England's great natural assets—a beautiful crescent beach, easily accessible to an urban area, rich in history and with numerous recreational resources. Revere Beach is not only significant as the first ocean property acquired and managed for the public good, but it is also an important example of open space preservation. The bill I am reintroducing today would require the Department of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of including Revere Beach as a part of the National Park System. Last year this same study bill was unanimously passed by both the House and the Senate, but then with a pocket-veto issued by former President George Bush, the bill was terminated. It is my hope that under the new Clinton administration this bill will not only find support within the House and Senate, but from the President as well.

It was in the early 1890's when Mr. Charles Eliot, alarmed at the rapid development and loss of natural beach and ocean panorama at Revere Beach, appealed to the Massachusetts Metropolitan Park Commission to take action and establish a public recreation area at Revere Beach. Eliot commented at the time that such a move was "a difficult and novel question, the beach being the first that I know of to be set aside and governed by a public body for the enjoyment of the common people."

Revere Beach first became a summer resort attraction in the mid-1800's because of its accessibility by rail to the city of Boston. Its popularity gave rise to numerous resort hotels, restaurants, bathhouses, and dance halls. By the early 1900's, lively and colorful amusements lined Revere Beach Boulevard including carrousels, roller coasters, fun houses, and various games of chance. Rather than evolving as an exclusive enclave of the wealthy, it represented the first time a seaside recreation areas was set aside for the enjoyment of a basically working class urban population. It is a slice of American history that deserves to be preserved and appreciated for generations to come.

Revere Beach illustrates a way of life, a stage in the development of the American social and cultural life not preserved elsewhere in the National Park System. It is not connected with famous people or events, but embodies the spirit of an era and the development of the American way of life. This beach was a place for working class Americans to enjoy the pleasures of a seaside resort usually reserved for the wealthy. Its easy accessibility to mass transit make it a location to be enjoyed by all.

As Americans take shorter vacations, closer to home, we need to adjust our recreational resources to reflect these new patterns. The accessibility of Revere Beach makes it a perfect destination for a day or weekend trip. Preservation of the public facilities, the historic structures and the beautiful beach at this old resort would make this unique site available to people without the means of travel to wilderness areas and large parks.

I recall taking daily summer swims at Revere Beach as a boy. Located a short ride on the Blue Line from Boston, Revere Beach was a schoolboy's summer paradise. I have fond memories of the sun and sand, ice cream and hot dogs, and the hundreds of people escaping the city heat and bathing in the cool, clean water. Inclusion of Revere Beach in our system of national parks and recreation areas would avail future generations from around the country the opportunity to enjoy fully this his-

beach and help to return it to the pristine recreational preserve of the common people. I am hopeful that my colleagues will once again show their support for this legislation and I encourage them to cosponsor this measure, one which I believe deserves the enthusiastic support of this body.

TRIBUTE TO CHICAGO POLICE SERGEANT JOHN CONROY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chicago Police Sergeant John J. Conroy on the special occasion of his retirement.

Sergeant Conroy came to the department March 1, 1957, and has worked in numerous positions of responsibility, risk, and protection of the public, particularly on the South Side of Chicago. He represents the highest standard of public service. He truly can be considered a friend of the people of the Chicago community and is to be commended on his retirement after a distinguished law enforcement career of 36 years.

John is retiring in order to spend more time with his family. He and his wife Carol have spent their entire married life together as residents of Chicago's 18th ward.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend Sergeant Conroy for his tremendous contributions to our community. I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting him for his many years of commitment and wishing him the best in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MEADOW

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Charles Meadow, a beautiful new housing community for elderly and disabled citizens in the congressional district I represent. Charles Meadow will be dedicated on June 13, 1993, in Tiffin, OH.

I want to commend Mercy Hospital of Tiffin, the Sisters of Mercy, St. Charles Hospital of Oregon, OH, and everyone else involved in making the Charles Meadow project a reality. Its construction stands as testimony to what a community can do when citizens cooperate and work hard for the common good.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Meadow is in a building formerly used for manufacturing. The building now has within it 28 impressive housing units for the elderly and the disabled, and I am confident that it will be a place of warmth, comfort, and security to all those who will dwell there.

I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in wishing the people of Charles Meadow the best of luck in the years ahead, and in congratulating them for all they have done to bring this great new facility to Seneca County, OH.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. FURILLO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Robert F. Furillo, the 32d postmaster of Youngstown, OH.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Furillo was appointed to the top post this year after serving the U.S. Postal Service for 28 years. He began his distinguished career as a letter carrier and moved along the hierarchy to eventually become the postmaster. He has served in a number of capacities, including manager of commercial accounts, director of customer service and, most recently, director of field operations.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Postal Service handles huge volumes of mail everyday. The elevation of Mr. Furillo to a position in which he oversees a branch of this massive process is a tribute to his hard work and dedication.

I commend you, Mr. Furillo, on your appointment. I join your daughters, Lisa and Gina, in taking great pride in your accomplishment.

MSGR. HENRY J. KLOCKER HONORED

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, please join me in congratulating Monsignor Henry J. Klocker on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his ordination, which he will celebrate on Sunday, April 25, 1993.

Monsignor. Klocker, of Our Lady of Lordes Catholic Church in Cincinnati, OH, has been an integral part of the parish community and the Cincinnati community as a whole. He is originally from Kenwood and attended Purcell High School and local seminaries.

For more than 20 years Monsignor. Klocker served as the director of the Catholic Student Missions Crusade. In this capacity he taught about the needs of the missions and raised money and prayers for their support.

In addition to celebrating the anniversary of his ordination this Sunday, Monsignor. Klocker will also be celebrating his retirement from Our Lady of Lordes parish. At the age of 75 the monsignor has brought the love of Jesus to many individuals in Cincinnati and beyond. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask you to join with me in wishing Msgr. Henry J. Klocker all the best in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI JOHN SHERWOOD

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Rabbi John Sherwood, who is retiring after 22 years with Temple Emet in Woodland Hills. On May 28, Rabbi Sherwood will lead his final Shabbat service at Temple Emet. He will be sorely missed by his congregation, to whom he has been a source of intellectual and spiritual guidance for two decades.

Any visitor to Temple Emet would immediately understand how much Rabbi Sherwood has meant to the congregation. He is the author of the Temple's High Holy Day Prayer Book, as well as numerous other liturgical works. Spiritual leadership comes naturally to Rabbi Sherwood, who before he came to Temple Emet, helped launch Reform Judaism in Western Canada.

But Rabbi Sherwood has contributed more to Temple Emet than the written word. An avid photographer, his fascinating pictures of Judaica from around the world are on exhibit in a gallery he created at Temple Emet.

Rabbi Sherwood is as active outside as inside the temple. He has served the Jewish community as president of the San Francisco Valley Interfaith Council, was chaplain for the Los Angeles Police Department, and has been a member of the Northridge Hospital Foundation Human Use and Research Committee. As his résumé attests, Rabbi Sherwood is a man for all the people. His sense of community extends to everyone.

Los Angeles—and any other large city for that matter—could use more leaders such as Rabbi Sherwood. His devotion to his congregation and beyond is an inspiration to us all. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him a long, healthy, and happy retirement.

THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, SAM GIBBONS, to commemorate an important milestone: the 90th anniversary of the National Wildlife Refuge System. This magnificent System comprises 485 units, including at least one in all 50 States, and is larger than our National Park System. Despite its size and importance, the Refuge System is perhaps the country's best kept conservation secret.

President Theodore Roosevelt—a great conservationist—set aside tiny Pelican Island, in Florida's Indian River, as a preserve for brown pelicans and other birds on March 14, 1903 marking the beginning of the Refuge System. This was a great start.

Now, 90 years later, the National Wildlife Refuge System has grown into a spectacular

accomplishment. The 91 million-acre system protects critical remnants of our dwindling wetlands, forests, prairies, deserts and other habitats. Today, over 170 endangered species spend at least part of their life cycle on these refuges. With a growing list of endangered species conflicts on private and public lands, the refuges are becoming increasingly important for the Nation's wildlife.

While we celebrate the 90th anniversary of the Refuge System, we must also remember that this system is in trouble and we must work to maintain the ecological integrity of the refuges.

Just last year, we finally saw legislation enacted which will provide much needed protection for California's embattled fish and wildlife. Among other provisions, it will ensure that the wildlife refuges in California's Central Valley finally will receive adequate and dependable water supplies, The California refuges provide critical winter habitat for the great waterfowl populations of the Pacific flyway, yet in the past they received only a fraction of the water they needed. With the rapid development of California's open spaces, the wildlife refuges really are the lifeline for these birds. The new law will make sure that the lifeline is a real one.

It is important that we all continue to do what we can to protect the Refuge System and the wildlife dependent upon it. This system will only grow in importance as development pressures constrict wildlife habitat. The Refuge System offers a tangible way we can help pass on the wildlife heritage of this country to our children. I am pleased to join in commemorating the National Wildlife Refuge System.

90TH BIRTHDAY OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CELEBRATED

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my colleague SAM GIBBONS in recognizing an important anniversary. A few weeks ago, when many of us were digging out from Saturday's huge storm, the Nation quietly celebrated the 90th birthday of our National Wildlife Refuge System.

Our Refuge System is unique in the world. No other Nation has set aside such a diverse network of habitat specifically to conserve its biological resources. Today, 90 years after President Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge at Florida's Pelican Island, the Refuge System has grown to encompass over 91 million acres of land and waters. Each of our 50 States contains at least one national wildlife refuge.

In my home State of New Mexico, we have seven national wildlife refuges containing over a third of a million acres. In my district, the Las Vegas refuge provides habitat for over 250 species of birds, including waterfowl, raptors, and shore birds. Resident mammals found at the refuge include pronghorn antelope and mule deer. At the Maxwell refuge, 50,000 ducks annually congregate for the winter. The refuge also provides important habitat for Canada geese, sandhill cranes, bald and golden eagles and numerous other species.

Unfortunately, all is not well with our National Wildlife Refuge System. Unchecked economic, recreational, and other uses have harmed habitat on many refuges. In a study released 2 years ago, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined that a full 63 percent of our Nation's refuges harbored at least one activity that refuge managers reported as harmful.

Other refuges, especially those in the West, are caught in an endless struggle to find adequate water supplies, and contaminants have been documented on nearly 100 refuges.

To address the myriad problems undermining our National Wildlife Refuge System, I have joined my friend SAM GIBBONS as a cosponsor of the National Wildlife Refuge System Management and Policy Act of 1993 [H.R. 833]. The bill would clarify the purpose of the Refuge System, enhance planning of refuges and improve interagency coordination in the administration of the Refuge System.

I encourage other Members to join in commemorating the long history of the National Wildlife Refuge System by cosponsoring this important legislation.

POVERTY DATA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993

HON. THOMAS C. SAWYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, I introduced legislation that will help Congress target billions of dollars annually in Federal program funds to populations most in need.

The Poverty Data Improvement Act of 1993 (H.R. 1645) would require the Census Bureau to produce and publish poverty estimates for States, counties, cities, and school districts every 2 years. Currently, the only source of reliable poverty data below the national level is the decennial census. More than $20 billion in Federal grants is allocated each year to State and local governments based on those poverty estimates.

Clearly, subnational intercensal poverty estimates represent an emerging data need that has profound implications for policy development and program administration. The infrequent production of small area poverty data has undermined the ability of many critical Federal programs to reach their target populations effectively. Perhaps the most notable example is the chapter 1 grant program for elementary and secondary schools, which we will reauthorize during the 103d Congress.

For the current 1992–93 school year, chapter 1 funds were allocated using poverty data from the 1980 census. That data reflects 1979 income, making the statistics 14 years out of date. Imagine developing foreign policy in 1993 based on the way the world looked in 1979. Understandably, we would have little confidence in the soundness of that policy.

The 1990 census income data, which reflects 1989 economic conditions, will be used to allocate chapter 1 funds for the first time in the upcoming 1993–94 school year. At its best, the data will be nearly 5 years old. Furthermore, income data from 1989 fails to capture the effects of the recession that did not hit Eastern States until the spring of 1990. The decennial census poverty estimates may have the illusion of precision, but they are simply not accurate for program purposes.

The availability of more frequent, and therefore more accurate measurements of poverty for small areas will greatly improve the ability of policymakers to assess need and to develop program formulas accordingly. I believe that, as a matter of sound policy, we ought to ensure adequate and direct funding to produce that data on an ongoing basis.

The Census Bureau has already drafted a proposal for research and development of the methodology for producing intercensal poverty estimates. The estimated cost of the program is approximately $450,000 annually. That figure represents only two one-thousandths of a percent of the funds that are allocated each year on the basis of poverty data, through such programs as chapter 1, the Job Training Partnership Act, community development block grants, the rural housing programs.

The Subcommittee on Census, Statistics and Postal Personnel, which I chair, will hold hearings in the coming months to assess the Census Bureau's proposed methodology for producing small area poverty estimates, identify issues that warrant further research, and determine a realistic timetable for publication of those figures. We will seek assistance from the National Academy of Sciences in evaluating the reliability of poverty estimates for different levels of geography. Timely data are an important factor in policy development; it also is important for policymakers to have confidence in the numbers upon which they rely.

Mr. Speaker, we need the capacity to identify demographic and economic forces that are changing more rapidly than our ability to measure them using traditional data collection methods. Accurate, useful, and timely data can serve as a solid foundation on which to build sound and cost-effective programs. H.R. 1645 represents an important start toward achieving that goal. I hope my colleagues will support this worthwhile legislation.

RECOGNITION OF FLORIDA'S BLACK COLLEGES

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions and the legacy of the 12 black 2-year colleges that existed in Florida between 1949 and 1962 to provide post secondary education for black Floridians. I wish to recognize as well the contributions of their founding presidents and their dedicated faculty.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida Mr. Peterson has already identified each of the colleges and their presidents, since three of the colleges were within his district.

From 1949 to 1962 Florida system of black 2-year colleges were a distinct group of institu-

tions that took little and did much for so many for so long. The colleges, their presidents, and dedicated faculty and staff took the budding minds of students and connected them with the blessed benediction of a teacher, because they realized while others did not that they were working with diamonds in the rough.

These institutions and their presidents opened doors to education and doors to opportunity for a generation of black boys and girls for whom opportunities had previously been few and far between. These institutions provided hope where there was no hope, and taught its students to make a way out of no way.

These institutions helped to transform a generation of would be gladiators who perhaps could not design the arenas in which they competed and turned them into college presidents, distinguished educators, scientists, scholars, clerics, and other productive and distinguished citizens. The State of Florida and indeed this Nation is a much better place, because of the contributions made by these 12 colleges, their dedicated presidents, and their distinguished faculty.

C.M. SGT. WALLACE L. HUFFAKER HONORED

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to C.M. Sgt. Wallace L. Huffaker who retires on April 27 after more than 29 years of dedicated service to the U.S. Air Force. For the past year, Chief Huffaker has been serving as the chief, base information management of the 363d Fighter Wing, Shaw AFB.

Originally from Santa Barbara, CA, and later growing up in Kansas City, MO, Chief Huffaker entered the Air Force in 1963. After completing military basic training at Lackland AFB, TX, he was assigned duties in administration at McConnel AFB, KS. In 1965, Chief Huffaker was deployed with the 469th Tactical Fighter Squadron at Korat Air Base, Thailand, to help support the air war over North Vietnam. In 1966, he was assigned to the 4392d Aerospace Support Group at Vandenberg AFB, CA.

Transferred to headquarters 5th Air Force, Fuchu Air Station, Japan, in 1969, Chief Huffaker was assigned in the operations command post and later served as the NCOIC HQ 5AF Command Section. In 1973, he was assigned to Williams AFB, AZ. He went on to technical training school at Keesler AFB, MS. Upon completion in 1975, Chief Huffaker was placed on a remote tour to Osan Air Base, Korea. There he served as the NCOIC of Operations for the USAF Postal Service and inspected postal units throughout Korea.

From there, Chief Huffaker transferred to the 1156th Technical Operations Squadron at Wheeler AFB, HI, he supervised the administrative functions of the squadron and 10 geographically separated units in the Pacific theater. Because of his personal drive for excellence and impeccable integrity, Chief Huffaker was assigned to the position of chief, Administration Management on the Air Force Technical Applications Center [AFTAC] Inspector General team at Patrick AFB, FL in May 1980. There, he planned, scheduled, and conducted worldwide inspections on command units in support of the U.S. Atomic Energy Detection System.

Chief Huffaker was then selected to the position as director of administration for headquarters AFTAC's worldwide network of units. In support of NATO, he was assigned as chief of administration at the 7240th Air Base Squadron, Oslo, Norway in 1988. The following year, Chief Huffaker began serving as executive officer and superintendent to the director of information management, headquarters, U.S. Air Forces Europe [USAFE], Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

Chief Huffaker has attended Community College of the Air Force, earning an associates degree in administration. He also graduated from both the Military Airlift Command Non-Commissioned Officer Academy and the Air Force Senior Non-Commissioned Officer Academy.

Throughout his impressive career, he has been extensively decorated, including the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak cluster, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Outstanding Unit Award with Valor and two oak leaf clusters, the Organizational Excellence Award with two oak leaf cluster, the Vietnam Service Medal, the Vietnam Gallantry Cross, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

The unique insight, outstanding leadership, and distinctive accomplishments of Chief Master Sergeant Huffaker culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect great credit upon himself and the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me, Chief Master Sergeant Huffaker's wife, Kathryn Ann "Tipton," and their son, Brian, in wishing him a happy and productive retirement.

THE VILLAGE GREEN

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge a significant event in the history of The Village Green, a unique residential community in my district located in the city of Los Angeles. On Sunday, May 2nd, there will be a celebration commemorating the listing of The Village Green on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Village Green is a product of the "green belt movement" of the 1930's and 1940's, whose goal it was to provide moderate cost housing for growing urban populations. Planning began in 1935 for the construction in 1941 of what was originally known as Baldwin Hills Village, named for E.G. "Lucky" Baldwin who had purchased the property.

Reginald D. Johnson headed a group of architects whose vision emerged as a planned community of 95 buildings containing 627 units with 16 floor plans. The low density of 10 units per acre utilizes only 24 of the total 68 acres. The remaining 44 acres are devoted to green belts and garden courts.

America's involvement in World War II was well underway when the development was completed in 1942. With housing in short supply, units in the Village rented quickly.

The Baldwin family sold their interest in Baldwin Village in 1972 to new owners who converted the development into condominiums, and renamed it "The Village Green." The Village Green Home Owners Association, through its elected board of directors, assumed management of the completed complex after the sale of the last unit in 1978.

In the 50 years since it was constructed, the complex has received many design awards. In 1946, the Museum of Modern Art in New York named it one of the most significant works of architecture in the Nation. The Village Green has also been recognized for architectural excellence by the American Institute of Architects, and the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Los Angeles which honored the complex as a cultural historic landmark.

However, more important than any architectural prize is the recognition the residents of The Village Green deserve for the quiet way in which they have demonstrated how ethnically diverse communities can succeed. In a society that has become increasingly polarized, they stand as an example more communities should strive to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating The Village Green on its richly deserved place on the National Register of Historic Places, and the many residents who have created such a special community.

EAGLE SCOUTS HONORED

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues two outstanding young individuals from the 3d Congressional District of Illinois who have recently completed a major goal in their Scouting careers. On Sunday, April 18, 1993, Christopher R. Brosilo and Richard Soto, Jr. were honored at an Eagle Scout Court of Honor.

Christopher first joined St. Mary Star of the Sea Cub Scout Pack 4441 in 1983. Two years later, he became a Webelos Scout earning numerous activity badges and in 1986 graduated to Boy Scouting. He supported his troop in several positions including; Webelos den chief, patrol leader, senior patrol leader, and junior assistant scoutmaster. At the same time he earned 22 merit badges, Toting' Chip Badge and the Ad Altare Dei Religious Award. Christopher's Eagle Scout project involved organizing the revitalization of part of a hiking trail at the Little Red Schoolhouse in Palos Heights, IL.

Richard also joined St. Mary Star of the Sea Cub Scout Pack 4441 in 1983. In 1985, he became a Webelos Scout and 1 year later graduated to Boy Scouting. Richard served his

troop at several levels including: den chief, recruiter, patrol leader, chaplain's aid, scribe and junior assistant scoutmaster. In addition, he earned 21 merit badges, Junior Leadership Training Badge, Totin' Chip Badge, and the Ad Altare Dei Religious Award. Richard's Eagle Scout project organized his troop to work with the handicapped residents of Misericordia Home in Chicago.

It is important to note that less than 2 percent of all young men in America attain the rank of Eagle Scout. This high honor can only be earned by those Scouts demonstrating extraordinary leadership abilities. Christopher and Richard have clearly demonstrated such abilities through their dedicated community service and deserve special recognition.

In light of the commendable leadership and courageous activities performed by such fine young men, I ask you, my fellow colleagues, to join me in honoring Christopher and Richard for attaining the highest honor in Scouting—the rank of Eagle. Let us wish them the very best in all of their endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BURTON K. DAVIS

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the recipient of the 1993 Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award presented by the Toms River-Ocean County Chamber of Commerce—Mr. Burton K. Davis.

President of Home Town Diary, Inc., and owner of the Home Town Travel Agency, Mr. Davis is an integral part of the Ocean County community. He is also actively involved in numerous civic organizations. He serves as a board member of the Toms River-Ocean County Chamber of Commerce and Community Medical Center; president of the American Heart Association; and maintains membership in the First United Methodist Church of Toms River; the Scottish Rite of Masonry and the Crescent Shrine Temple of Trenton.

His past activities include the presidency of the Beachwood-Berkeley Rotary as a Paul Harris fellow; volunteer for the United Way; cofounder of the Beachwood Little League; presidency of the Beachwood Fire Company; exempt member of the New Jersey Firemen's Association; service as a Big Brother of America; and recipient of the Toms River Schools Hall of Fame Award.

I am pleased to recognize this most deserving citizen who has contributed so much to the State, county, community, and enriched the lives of so many individuals.

TRIBUTE TO TERRA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Terra Technical College, which, in addition to celebrating its 25th anniversary, is about to open a brand new student activities center.

Terra Technical College is in Fremont, OH, a great city in the congressional district I am proud to represent. Every time I have had the chance to learn about Terra Tech, either as a Congressman or a State senator, I have found it to be an educational institution of the highest caliber. Ever since it was established as the Vanguard Technical Institute in 1968, the administrators, faculty, and students of Terra Tech have shown a unique and admirable commitment to learning, progress, and vision.

It is this vision that allows us to commemorate the grand opening of Terra's new student activities center on May 16, 1993. Its construction stands as testimony to the ability of Terra Tech to achieve important goals and to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the people of Terra Technical College as they celebrate their 25th anniversary and their new facility. Terra Technical College deserves our respect and our applause. As a Congressman, I am very proud of its past and excited about its future.

THIRTY-THREE PERCENT

HON. MARJORIE MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, thirty-three percent.

The percentage of Americans open to the possibility that the Holocaust's extermination of 6 million Jews never happened.

A third of all Americans who do not feel the pain of love ones lost in the concentration camps of Auschwitz and Buchenwald * * * cannot share in the tears shed for children killed for the crime of being Jewish * * * will never understand the universal warning of the survivors that it can happen again.

The powerful story of these survivors is told each year in Philadelphia at the Memorial for the Six Million—a story told both in English and Yiddish as well as in their faces which convey an understanding of the Holocaust's meaning far better than mere words.

This week we commemorate the lives of the 6 million who perished at the hands of the Nazis with the opening of the American Holocaust Museum. But a museum alone will not educate America to the lessons of the Holocaust. Each of us, in our own way, must assume the personal responsibility of educating our community to the horrors of the Holocaust. "Never again" is more than a call to remember, it is a call to educate—a calling to which all of us must respond.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD WATERHOUSE AND LLOYD AHERN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Messrs. Harold Waterhouse and Lloyd Ahern, who have been named "Co-Citizens-of-the-Year" by the Palisadian-Post.

Each year, the Palisadian-Post organizes a distinguished committee of local leaders to select a "Citizen of the Year." This year the committee has decided to honor two individuals who have worked in concert to protect and preserve the magnificent Pacific Palisades neighborhood in the congressional district I have the honor of representing.

Messrs. Waterhouse and Ahern are the founders and leaders of the "Palisades Home Defenders." As a result of the efforts of this group, the city of Los Angeles blocked construction of a large real estate development project that would have permanently marred the most scenic section of Pacific Palisades.

The Palisades Home Defenders made political history by producing a highly professional video to argue their case against allowing high rise structures to scar the Palisades environment. This imaginative and artistically crafted video was shown to the Planning Commission and distributed to each member of the Los Angeles City Council. This effort was accompanied by a highly successful petition drive organized by the Waterhouse and Ahern team.

I congratulate Messrs. Waterhouse and Ahern for committing themselves to the protection of their beloved community, and I wish them continued success in all future endeavors.

BOB TRAXLER: ONE MEMBER WHO REALLY CARED ABOUT HIS CONSTITUENTS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to our former colleague and my own former Congressman, Bob Traxler. I believe that it is particularly appropriate to raise this matter today since we are at about the exact 19th anniversary of Bob's special election as the Congressman for Michigan's Eighth Congressional District. Bob is being feted on May 13 by the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bay County, my home county, for his infectious leadership, a term which describes the essence of Bob Traxler.

Bob was one individual who constantly remind us that there was a time that the phrase public service and the job title public servant were honorable. He challenged each of us to recapture a spirit that has been too often maligned, and I sincerely hope to follow in his mode.

Mr. Speaker, no matter where I go in the Capitol complex, member after member, and

even several staff come up to ask me "How is Bob Traxler doing?" That is the high regard in which he is held within the House of Representatives. In fact, this town can't seem to get enough of him as even the Washington Post last week headlined, in part, one of its stories with "Traxler's Legacy."

Some people leave shoes to fill. Bob Traxler left a folk legend. In his 18½ years in Washington, he never, never, lost sight of serving the people who sent him here. Whether it was something as farsighted as his work on Great Lakes research with the Environmental Protection Agency, or satellite data analysis with the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network, as immediate with his tireless work on behalf of disaster assistance for farmers that to this day serves as a model for disaster programs, or as personal as his involvement in the day to day problems that constituents had in dealing with Federal agencies, Bob Traxler was a Congressman who really did care about his constituents.

Over the years Bob's reputation has changed from one matter to another. When he came to Washington, his designation as "Bingo Bob" followed him from Lansing, where he authored legislation which legalized the conduct of bingo games as a fund raising activity. He had been described here as affable, humorous, approachable, and most importantly as a shrewd, astute politician who knew how to get things for his district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee's "College of Cardinals," Bob chaired the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies for 4 years. He used his position to argue for policies that he believed were in the national interest, even when that meant that he had to work against the administration. He took the time to understand the problems that many of our colleagues faced in their communities, and deserves to be thanked for his willingness to help when bureaucrats would not.

Bob is now immensely enjoying his new role as a member of the board of trustees of Michigan State University, his alma mater, where he is using substantial skills to make MSU an even better institution for the future. As always, Bob Traxler remains an individual serving the public of Michigan while working tirelessly for those causes in which he believes.

Bob Traxler has left the Congress as a member. But his influence and his spirit remain here within many of us. I urge all of my colleagues to join in hearty congratulations as Bob Traxler is honored for his years of service by the Boys and Girls Clubs of Bay County.

TRIBUTE TO DAN ROWLAND AND BARBARA McTIERNAN

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dan Rowland and Barbara McTiernan who will be honored at this year's ROSAS dinner on Sunday, April 18, 1993, in Brooklyn, NY.

Mrs. McTiernan and Mr. Rowland have demonstrated their commitment to and concern for the New York community through years of service. Mrs. McTiernan, who is currently the president of the Park Slope Civic Council and the vice-chair of the Park Slope Ambulance Corps, has always been extremely active in the Prospect Park community.

She has been on the Prospect Park Advisory Committee and the Prospect Park Environmental Center, and is presently the vice president of development for the Prospect Park Alliance, where she served as coordinator of "You Gotta Have Park." In addition to these numerous positions, Mrs. McTiernan is also active in local arts and education.

Mr. Rowland, the former director of development and community affairs at the Methodist Hospital of Brooklyn, has served on the board of directors of the American Red Cross Brooklyn Chapter, the MHB Child Care Center, and the Park Slope Volunteer Ambulance Corps, among others.

In addition, Mr. Rowland is a member of numerous local organizations, including Community Board No. 6, the South Brooklyn Lions Club and the Cobble Hill Association.

I am sure that I speak on behalf of many members of the community, who have experienced the benefits of Mrs. McTiernan's and Mr. Rowland's hard work, when I thank these two remarkable individuals at this special occasion.

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD today an awardwinning speech delivered by one of my constituents, Jeffrey Gubbiotti, of Oakville, CT. Jeffrey wrote this speech for a competition sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. This year more than 147,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for 29 national scholarships totaling $87,500, which was distributed among the top 29 winners. The contest theme this year was "My Voice in America's Future."

Mr. Speaker, I commend Jeffrey's "My Voice in America's Future" to my colleagues:

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Jeffrey Gubbiotti, Connecticut Winner)

Democracy, communication plus participation equals success. Hypothetical case: Joanne Smith, a lawyer, wife, and mother of two, was overheard complaining to her friend while they were both waiting in line at the grocery store about the newly elected mayor of her city. This was not the first time that somebody heard about Joanne's incessant protest about the outcome of the election, as well as many other complaints about different issues and candidates voted upon throughout previous referendums in the city. One day, her hairdresser, while curling Mrs. Smith's hair, questioned her customer about her attendance and decision for the last balloting at the local school. Mrs. Smith replied that she was too busy with her career and running errands for the upcoming party that she and her family would be hosting to go to the polls and vote. Yet, five minutes later, she began a discussion about how horrible a job the new mayor was doing. What's wrong with this picture?

The forefathers of this great nation, from George Washington to Thomas Jefferson, envisioned a strong government for a strong new country when they laid out the plans for America. They created a democracy, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They held that all are equal, and should have equal representation. My voice in America's future must be true to the dreams of these forefathers and execute its share in the government of this nation.

First, America's future. This country has grown in power and importance in the world from July the Fourth, 1776 to today and will continue to grow. America's future is not only within itself, but also in the entire global community. We must act responsibly and responsively, within the borders of the U.S.A. as well as past our borders, towards all other nations in the world. We must dedicate ourselves to liberty, equity, and the preservation of peace for all. My voice is a part of this. It, along with all the other millions of Americans' voices determines, directly and indirectly, this country's future. At times, my voice must be as strong as a thundering monsoon, while at other times, it needs to be as soft as a mother caresses her beautiful baby. As always, actions must be appropriate for their time.

My voice in America's future can be described using the five letters in the key word of the above phrase, "voice." The "V" for vote. From the age of 18 on, every citizen of the United States has a duty and responsibility to cast their vote on a question or candidate that appears on the ballot. We must take advantage of this incredible freedom and privilege that is given to us. The "O" for outstanding. My voice, as well as yours, should be our own, unique opinions and thoughts. We cannot let ourselves be brainwashed by others. For a democracy to work, all must participate for themselves. The "I" stands for initiate. If there is something we find wrong with anything that is subject to change by the government, we each must step up and voice our opinion. If curiosity kills the cat, silence destroys it. We need to get groups together and fight for what we believe is right. The "C" in voice stands for constant. No matter how strongly we feel on an issue one way or the other, we all must all participate all of the time. My voice will be unfaltering. And finally, the "E" for energetic. The old saying goes, "If something's worth doing, it's worth doing right." My friends, I cannot think of anything more worth doing than actively participating in my government and doing my share for America.

My voice in America's future is one of the many vital parts to have our own unique American democracy succeed. My voice must be one note harmonizing with all the others in a chorus of the voices of the millions of Americans singing out so that the whole world can hear, and beyond! Silence is mere consensus and inexcusable carelessness. We all must have some voice, some stake in our country's future, and properly use the great freedoms, liberties, and privileges that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution give to us. Don't be hypocritical and grossly abuse your rights like Joanne Smith. With rights comes responsibility that must be achieved. Empower people. Arise with your countrymen and cry out democracy all over the land.

HOLOCAUST STUDIES CENTER HONORED

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, This week, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the heroic Jewish Warsaw ghetto uprising, I wish to recognize a milestone that has been reached by a center of learning in my district that is dedicated to maintaining public awareness of the important lessons of the Holocaust.

It seems appropriate that the Holocaust Studies Center at the Bronx High School of Science is celebrating its 15th anniversary this week. Just as the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto uprising have come to symbolize the strength of the Jewish people in the face of persecution, the young people who operate the Holocaust Studies Center and similar centers around the world represent the hope for a bright future based on the knowledge they gain from the careful study of history.

It is said that those who ignore history are destined to repeat it. Through its unmatched collection of books, photographs, documents and Holocaust-related materials, the center offers tangible reminders of the past, so that we can ensure that a tragedy of the magnitude of the Holocaust is never allowed to occur again.

Many people deserve credit for the growth and development of the Holocaust Center at Bronx High School of Science, including each of the more than 2,000 students who have participated in its programs. The center's director, Mr. Stuart Elenko, has served as the guiding light since its inception. He received the strong support of former principal Milton Kopelman, and continued backing of current principal Vincent Galasso. There are also many elected officials and local activists who helped secure the grant that began the center's work, and who continue to contribute their time and energy.

Although we celebrate this week, we also know that the work of the Holocaust Center is not complete. I read about an opinion poll taken this week that said one of every five Americans believes that the Holocaust may not have occurred. This is an astounding finding, considering the overwhelming evidence and personal accounts that have been compiled. This poll proves that right-minded people must remain vigilant in their efforts to educate and enlighten their fellow man.

Through the work of the Holocaust Center, we have a model and an inspiration for the work that must continue. On behalf of my constituents, I thank all the people who have made the center a success, and I vow my tireless efforts to help support their good work for many years to come.

ADDRESS OF T. TERRELL SESSUMS TO THE SIXTH FLORIDA/JAPAN EXECUTIVES MEETING

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1993

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Sixth Florida/Japan Executives in Miami, FL, on March 5, 1993, T. Terrell Sessums, chairman of the Florida Chamber of Commerce, was principal speaker. His remarks were so timely and cogent especially with regard to how one State views international commerce and its contribution to the State and country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all our colleagues will be interested in the thoughtful presentation that follows:

ADDRESS TO SIXTH FLORIDA/JAPAN EXECUTIVES MEETING

I am honored to speak to you today and appreciate the opportunity to share some information and several thoughts about Latin America, Japan, and the State of Florida. They concern the nature of the economy which is even now taking shape in this hemisphere, where democratic change and economic liberalization have combined with geography to profoundly improve the lives of millions in North and South America. These changes are accelerating the growth of business between Latin America and the world. My thesis today is that Japan will participate in this economic boom, that Florida will continue to be the crossroads between the continents and the gateway to Latin America, and that Florida and Japan have common interests in this process which make them natural partners.

Latin America and the Caribbean are now a market of approximately 430 million people with a combined Gross Domestic Product of over 1 trillion U.S. dollars. Total external debt for the region has finally begun to fall, and an increasing portion of the total is for commercial credit rather than government debt. And while debt levels are still high, what was a crisis of the 1980s appears to be a manageable problem today. Much of this improvement is a result of increasing privatization of state-owned industries in the region. Growing economies require increasingly sophisticated infrastructure to support their growth. Transportation, power, and telecommunications are improving throughout the region, largely through privatization and huge capital investments. Led by Chile, Mexico, and Argentina, regional governments have encouraged debt for equity swaps, converting their sovereign debt into foreign equity stakes in their infrastructure. In November of 1990, Argentina privatized its national telephone company and sold half to each of two investor groups backed by U.S. banks. In this one transaction, Argentina retired 10% of its foreign debt, gained billions in foreign investments to improve its phone system, and dramatically improved service to business and residential customers around the country. Infrastructure spending is only one aspect of an explosion of consumption in Latin America which has provided growing opportunity during the first years of this decade. The United States is the largest exporter to the region. Florida represents the largest portion of that trade to much of the region.

Florida has become a key player in the hub of Latin American activities. Our state's current population of 13.2 million would put us in the middle range of the nations of this hemisphere, but our 1992 Gross Domestic Product of $240 billion would exceed all but the U.S., Canada and Brazil. Our economy is now larger than Argentina's, larger even than Mexico's. Total international trade for Florida last year totaled about $35 billion, nearly 11% over 1991, which was 10% greater than 1990. Most of this growth is in exports—most of that is with Latin America and the Caribbean. Florida now has a dominant role in world commerce with Latin America and the Caribbean and will retain and expand that role as the region grows. Both U.S. and foreign companies choose Florida as a distribution center to markets in the region, using our unsurpassed capacity to move cargo to the region.

According to the British Florida Chamber of Commerce, the U.K., with 150 British firms employing over 25,000 here, is considered Florida's largest overseas investor. British exports to Florida are now estimated to be over $1 billion annually and 70% of British exports are trans-shipped via Miami International Airport or the port of Miami to Latin America. Others exploit our unparalleled communication and passenger air linkages with the region to establish service or communications centers. The superior trade ties which make Florida attractive to these businesses are the product of geography, demography, and international infrastructure. Let's examine each of these.

If geography is destiny, Florida was fated to be the trading center of the Western Hemisphere. Although you sit at this moment in one of our state's major population centers, you are still far closer to Havana than to our state Capitol or Atlanta. Bogota and Caracas are much closer to us today than San Francisco and Los Angeles, and Mexico City is nearer than New York. For much of Florida, the nearest neighbors and the most important potential markets are in foreign countries rather than our own. Even without the other factors, geography alone would be sufficient to ensure Florida's international focus.

However, much more than geography has internationalized Florida. We're meeting today in the U.S. state with the strongest ethnic ties to the rest of the Western Hemisphere. Over its history, Florida has been part of 4 different nations (and 5 if you include our confederacy of the 1860s). The last 30 years have seen a tremendous increase in the internationalization of Florida, primarily through immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean. These new Floridians have brought with them skills and interests which have shifted our gaze increasingly overseas. Today, the languages of the rest of the hemisphere are better understood here than anywhere else in the U.S. When it's time to trade with our neighbors this gives us an overwhelming advantage.

While location and personal ties lay the foundation for our role as crossroads of the Americas, our international infrastructure has been the means of our trading success. We have developed a network of transportation, communications, finance and international services which allow businesses located here to cover all of Latin America and the Caribbean.

It is simple geography which has dictated the development of our international transportation network. Florida is closer to most of Latin America than any other state, and that basic fact has resulted in the finest air

and sea linkages with the region anywhere in the U.S. Our airports have the most frequent and convenient flights to the region, so much so that travelers often find it routine to travel between Central and South America via Miami. More Latin American and Caribbean airlines come here than to any other state, and if air cargo is moving to or from the region, it probably passes through here already.

Our 14 deep water ports dominate both cargo and cruise traffic within the region. In the Miami Customs District, which covers most ports on the east coast of Florida, 89% of export shipments are to Latin America and the Caribbean. A cruise to the region is likely to originate in South Florida, the No. 1 world center for that industry. Transportation of motor vehicles will likely involve our Port of Jacksonville, import center for both Japanese and European auto manufacturers. Whether it's petroleum at Port Everglades or bulk commodities at the Port of Tampa, (the closest American port to the Panama Canal) Florida's position and port infrastructure place it squarely at the center of North-South trade routes in this hemisphere. Even Mexico, with its long land border with the U.S., now looks to Florida ports to move its goods in and out. the reason for this also points to our prospective gains from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). That long land border is jammed to the point of paralysis with cross-border traffic. U.S.-Mexico trade doubled between 1987–90, and that growth will accelerate after NAFTA is adopted. The overflow of trade has already been forced to the sea lanes and is increasingly crossing the Gulf of Mexico to Florida.

Communications are critical to successful businesses, and here also Florida is the gateway to the hemisphere. Most U.S. calls to the Caribbean pass through switching centers located here by AT&T and other carriers and, for much of the region, Florida is a communications hub. Many businesses in Latin America find it more efficient to locate offices in Florida purely to maintain communication, as long distance from Florida is more reliable than intercity calls in much of Latin America. As governments in the region have moved to improve communications, Florida companies have found a new role as suppliers to the newly privatized phone services. Florida based operations are now building communications infrastructure throughout Latin America, from fiber-optic lines in Chile to cellular networks in Brazil. Every change in the region brings new opportunities to Florida and companies based here.

Successful international operations require other services, of course. Finance, law, accounting, freight forwarding and customs brokerage, even translation. All are necessary in some measure to do business internationally. By now it may not surprise you to learn that Florida is the nation's second leading international banking state, after New York, with banking offices from Europe, Japan, and every part of Latin America. The Export-Import Bank of the United States (Eximbank) has just established an office in Florida to provide greater service to Florida businesses with trade finance needs. Our legal sector offers expertise and linkage with the region unmatched even in New York or Washington. Our international services sector has developed a sophistication to match the increasing volume and complexity of commerce within our region.

I also want to mention the role of our state government, which has recognized the importance of fostering international business in Florida. Our Department of Commerce maintains a strong Division of International Trade to promote international business in Florida. We maintain a network of foreign offices abroad, including one in Tokyo. I think it does say something about state attitudes towards trade that more U.S. states have special offices in Japan than in Washington, D.C.! Florida, I'm glad to say, has an office in both places.

Beyond the government commitments represented by the international operations of our Departments of Citrus, Commerce, Agriculture and Education, Florida has also devoted its efforts to acting strategically in international affairs. The Florida International Affairs Commission (FIAC) is charged with a broad range of international oversight duties, including reviews of proposed state laws for their potential effect on international business. FIAC also works with the U.S. Congress to preserve Florida's strategic interests in the face of proposals such as NAFTA or the recent revisions to the International Banking Act. In this way, the state attempts to protect the interests of international businesses in Florida and to preserve stability in our international business climate. I'm glad to say that the Florida Chamber was an early partner with the state in the development of FIAC.

The latest example of the Chamber's cooperation with state government is the development of Enterprise Florida, which holds the promise to fully integrate economic development in Florida under a joint venture between business and government. I'm pleased to say that this idea was developed under the leadership of the Florida Chamber, and the Chamber will continue to play a strong role in its development. This is a good example of the cooperation between business and government which has become the norm in Florida. In this matter, we may have learned from the Japanese experience. We have found that a cooperative relationship between government and business benefits both.

Florida has not only become the crossroads of North-South trade between the Americas, but also the counterpoint for connecting East-West trade to the North-South business axis. Europeans and Asians have found that Florida acts as a transportation, financial and service hub for doing business in Latin America.

The expansion of business opportunities in consumer electronics, telecommunications, and other high tech areas portends tremendous opportunities for Floridians to facilitate and broker Japanese-Latin American trade. In many instances, we simply need to joint venture existing institutions and organizations that are presently doing bilateral trade with our state and Latin America and Japan.

An example of this business-government cooperation is the Southeast U.S./Japan Association, chaired this year by John C. Bierley of Tampa, which is dedicated to developing relations between Japan and our region of the U.S. Their recent annual meeting was a splendid event held in Orlando and was attended by the governors of the seven southeastern states, including our own Governor, Lawton Chiles, who has given high priority to international business relations. The Japan-America Society of Central Florida has developed a Japanese relationship with Central Florida which is one of the best in the U.S.

Also significant to the Florida/Japan relationship are our educational connections. The Florida-Japan Linkage Institute, co-based nearby at the University of South Florida and St. Petersburg Junior College, supports a number of business and educational programs to develop the relationship between Florida and Japan. Our University of West Florida operates a branch campus at Kobe (Japan) and supports exchanges of Japanese and Florida students. The Dade County school system operates a special bicultural Japanese/English program for the benefit of both Japanese and Florida students.

Finally, perhaps the best indicator of the growing Florida/Japan relationship is the increase in Japanese activity here. The Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) has maintained a promotion officer in Florida for some time now, and the number of Japanese corporations and banks with offices here is increasing quickly. This Florida/Japan executives meeting is the latest step in our growing relationship, and your presence here shows your readiness to go further in the process.

We at the Florida Chamber of Commerce, in partnership with state government and local communities, can help you benefit from the Florida advantages I've described to you today, to ensure your full participation in the economic boom in this hemisphere. As I close, I want to reaffirm my commitment and that of the Chamber and our International Development Committee, chaired by W. Reeder Glass of Miami, to assist you in any way we can to strengthen the business and personal relationship between Florida and Japan.