HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, May 19, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 1993.

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

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

PRAYER

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

We are heartened, O God, that among the difficulties of life there are also the great joys, that among the ashes of conflict there can be the new growth of understanding and cooperation. We know that in life there are the high moments of success and the times of disappointment and defeat. In all these seasons of our being, we are grateful, O loving God, that Your Word is ever with us to give us direction and forgiveness and hope. For these and all Your gifts, O God, we offer our gratitude and thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1378. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the applicability of qualification requirements for certain acquisition workforce positions in the Department of Defense, to make necessary technical corrections in that title and certain other defense-related laws, and to facilitate real property repairs at military installations and minor military construction during fiscal year 1993.

NO TEETH IN GENDER EQUITY REPORT

(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, yesterday the NCAA task force on gender equity issued its preliminary report. It has been 21 years since the passage of title IX of the education amendments, which prohibited sex discrimination in education, including sports, and this is the first time that the NCAA has addressed the issue.

The report may have been a first step, but it was only a tentative one. It was clearly the path of least resistance.

The report endorsed gender equity, which of course, is the law of the land. However, the report contained no enforcement mechanisms to bring this about.

I find it strange that the NCAA would place a school on probation for driving an athlete to class, or providing a small loan, but would have no penalty for a school that violates title IX, a Federal law which mandates the equal treatment of men and women in sports.

The NCAA has hundreds of pages of specific rules governing matters such as recruiting, but when it comes to antigender discrimination, all the task force could agree upon is a fuzzy, broad, and unenforceable definition.

Too many college coaches and athletic directors still don't get it. Equal opportunities for women in sports is a right, and even more importantly, it is the law.

By avoiding the tough decisions, the NCAA has left the job to the courts and Congress. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 921—that's 21 years after title IX—to require schools to report data on their compliance with title IX. It now appears more than ever that Congress must act to ensure gender equity.

WHY THE PRESIDENT WAS HERE

(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, the Nation is restless, and the Democrat caucus is feeling the heat. That is why President Clinton was up here today. To try to convince his own party that we need to pass the largest tax increase in history.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not need tax and spend again. We do not need an energy tax that will spur inflation, slow our economy, and kill jobs.

We do not need a Social Security tax that will hurt senior citizens.

We do not need these other taxes which will just go to more Federal spending.

What we really need is a vote to give responsible Republicans and Democrats the opportunity to strike these onerous and painful taxes.

Give us a vote to strike these taxes, Mr. Speaker. Let us work together to lift the President's planned tax burden off the shoulders of the American people.

AT&T JOBS TO MEXICO

(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, 10 years ago, AT&T built a high-technology electronics plant in New River Valley, WV. They paid $8 an hour.

In 1991, AT&T shut down the West Virginia plant and moved to Mexico.

Think about it. Even though the West Virginia workers were the top workers in the world in their field, AT&T said that alone could not match the economic advantage of relocating their plant to Mexico.

The economic advantage, Mr. Speaker? They pay $1 an hour in Mexico.

Think about it. The jobs go to Mexico. The people in West Virginia with their new so-called high-technology replacement jobs they are waiting for, move to Mexico and the taxpayers will pay welfare, food stamps, and unemployment benefits to workers in West Virginia who are now standing in a soupline.

Beam me up. The Constitution says Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations, not ship the damn jobs overseas.

HOCUS POCUS

(Mr. Thomas of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton says his falling popularity is a result of a lack of focus at the White House. But that is not the half of it. His problem is not a lack of focus at the White House, but an abundance of focus by the American people. People are giving the President's program a long, hard look, and they do not like what they see.

They see that the President's proposal for billions in new investment is just old style Government spending. They see that candidate Clinton's promise to raise taxes on the rich has been transformed into a record-breaking $300 billion increase focused on every American who breathes.

And in the President's proposal to dedicate all these new taxes to a deficit reduction trust fund, they see a desperate White House resorting to a shell game.

The verdict of the people seems to be that they do not like the bad ideas on taxes, the largest tax increase in this Nation. That is not the result of a lack of focus. Actually, the President has 20–20 vision into the pockets of the American people.

What the opinion polls mean is that people want good ideas, substance rather than soft-shoe policy, rather than PR.

IN SUPPORT OF CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM FOR REVITALIZATION OF AMERICA

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor today having looked over the last 25 years, as many of our American cities have deteriorated. In the midst of that deterioration, there does not seem to be much hope for any feeling that there would come the moment when we would be able to see them revived.

I am pleased this morning with the introduction of the Clinton administration's program for the revitalization of urban communities in America. These communities, if conglomerated, would represent for us a Third World community within our very borders.

I think that by getting the banking community and private industry involved in the process of making sure that loans are available, that credit can come into those communities, that investment is available, we make a statement not only to this Nation, but we make a statement to nations abroad that America can indeed be strong.

I believe by building our urban communities through the investment program that has been introduced by the Clinton administration we can indeed make a difference in the lives of other people. If we do not make the investments now, then we spend the money later on building more prisons, on building more social service programs. This is one way to work our way out of that.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to make sure that this program works±.

□ 1210

PAYING THEIR FAIR SHARE

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, candidate Bill Clinton pledged to working Americans that he would not raise their taxes. Candidate Clinton promised that he would only raise taxes upon the rich, whom he argued, must be forced to pay their fair share.

Well, the President's definition of rich is a little rich for me to swallow. President Clinton came to the Hill today to explain that retirees who make just $26,000 should appear on "Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous." They could costar with all Americans who drive cars or use electricity. A special guest appearance could be made by family farmers and workers in industry who will be thrown out of work by the President's Btu tax. Robin Leach will not know what to do.

Mr. Speaker, the President is not taxing the rich. President Clinton is asking middle-class, working Americans to assume a larger burden in order to pay their fair share. Well, middle-class Americans are already paying their fair share.

It is time to eliminate excessive Government spending and protect the interests of working Americans, not the interests of big government. We do not need a tax hike on working Americans. We need spending reductions and we need them now.

MEAN-SPIRITED ACCUSATIONS

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, it amazes me how these people who ran this country for the last 12 years now take to this mike every day to belittle our President. The fact is that they created the problem where people are not working. They created the problem where little babies are not getting their shots. They created the problem where our people are not getting educated. They created the problem of Vietnam veterans sleeping in the streets. They created the problem where senior citizens are suffering.

Now, today, Mr. Speaker, they blame this on the President because he could not solve these problems in 100 days.

Well, we want to tell them that the people voted for change, they will get change, and we say to the President that they have a mean spirit, that it is not going to work, and I say to them, "If you're going to win, take your fight to the American people, and I guarantee you we will get change."

RECONCILIATION

(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, over the course of the next 2 weeks, the American public will hear a lot about something called reconciliation. It forces congressional committees to comply with the fiscal policy passed in a budget resolution.

Unfortunately, in this case, it is also the same painful process which all American taxpayers will go through next April, when they have to reconcile their income statements with their tax statements.

Because, Mr. Speaker, within the 1993 budget resolution, there lies a buffet of hidden taxes. There is a Btu or energy tax, a tax on Social Security benefits, and, of course, your standard income tax hike—or, in other words, there will be a grand total of $300 billion in new taxes over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should not have to reconcile themselves to paying the largest tax bill in our Nation's history. And it is the Democratic leadership who will be forced to apologize for not having allowed separate votes on each and every one of these newfangled, poorly disguised, taxes.

A PRESIDENT WITH THE COURAGE TO MAKE THE TOUGH CHOICES

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years we have had Presidents who have shunned tough choices. They have said: "Don't worry, everything's fine. Let's cut taxes for the rich and increase defense spending. No problem—this will reduce the deficit and spur the economy."

The result of doing it their way? A national debt that ballooned from $1 trillion in 1980 to over $4 trillion today, and millions of Americans standing in unemployment lines. Nice going.

Well, we have got a different President in the White House today, a President with the courage to make tough choices to get the deficit under control and our economy back on track, a President who has proposed a budget plan to repair the damage done by 12 years of trickledown economics, neglect, and indifference.

Because of this new President's work, the House will vote next week on the

largest deficit reduction plan in history. What is more, it is a plan based on real numbers that demands that the wealthy pay their fair share, and that makes tough choices about spending and entitlement cuts. For specifics, try cutting agricultural entitlements by $3 billion, cutting Federal salaries to save over $10 billion, cutting highway demonstration projects and special-purpose HUD grants, cutting $56 billion from Medicare and Medicaid, eliminating unnecessary commissions, and streamlining educational programs. And, if that is not enough of a measure of political courage, how about going after Social Security to the tune of $32 billion. In all, over $250 billion in spending cuts.

President Clinton did not create the problem. He is cleaning up a mess that was left for him—a $4 trillion mess that will not be straightened out without some very heavy lifting. I am glad we finally have a President who is willing to lift his share of the weight. It is our turn—and our responsibility—to do ours.

COALITION FOR REAL REFORM

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had breakfast with a gentleman named Ross Perot.

Along with a number of my freshmen Republican colleagues, we discussed the issues of the day and the need for real reform in this Chamber.

Like many of us on both sides of the aisle, he agrees that now is not the time for more tax-and-spend government that only raises taxes, raises prices, and puts people out of work.

Like many of us on both sides of the aisle, he endorsed a real line-item veto to allow a President to strip the pork out of spending bills.

And like many of us from States with strong open meeting laws, he wholeheartedly endorsed putting an end to closed-door committee meetings where votes are taken to raise taxes while the press and the public wait outside.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that on these issues, Mr. Perot is voicing the overwhelming opinion of the American people—more spending cuts, no more tax and spend, let the sun shine in.

I encourage friends on both sides of the aisle to continue giving voice to these concerns. America is counting on us.

TOUGH DECISIONS HAVE TO BE MADE

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I did not have breakfast with Ross Perot this morning. I kind of wish that I had had breakfast with Ross Perot this morning because it would have been easier than how I spent my morning.

Our President, who was elected President of the United States in November, Mr. Speaker, came to see the Democrat caucus this morning, and he came to talk about what we have in front of us, and what we have in front of us is reconciliation, a long word, a difficult subject, but what it means is we have to raise revenues, we have to have spending cuts, and we have to invest in the future of America. We talked about this, and everyone did not agree about everything. There are those in our caucus who are disappointed that we did not have a stimulus bill because it ended in the Senate, and there are those in our caucus who say maybe there are too many tax increases, and we should have more spending cuts, and we went back, and we went forth.

But the whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that our President, Mr. Clinton, has been elected President. He is willing to come over and talk about these hard decisions that have to be made.

But this country has to go forward, and it is so easy to criticize.

I have been on the Committee on Ways and Means for 10 years. Ronald Reagan, he hated taxes, but he signed 11 tax bills. Bill Clinton is saying, "Let's do investment, let's do spending cuts, let's do revenue increases, and let's rebuild America."

CALLING FOR UPDATE ON INVESTIGATION OF CONSPIRACY TO ASSASSINATE FORMER PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern regarding reports of an Iraqi-sponsored plot to assassinate former President Bush during his recent celebratory visit to Kuwait. The Kuwaiti Government has arrested 17 individuals—11 of them Iraqi—and charged them with conspiracy to assassinate our former President.

Little has been revealed by the Clinton administration regarding this alleged plot since the story broke in the media just over a week ago. In my view the Clinton administration should release the results of its investigation to Congress at the earliest possible time. We should not stand idly by in the face of a possible state-sponsored plot to kill a former U.S. President.

If the ongoing United States investigation proves that Iraq and, specifically, its leader Saddam Hussein, sanctioned an assassination of President Bush, I call on the Clinton administration to seek prompt and definitive retribution. A conspiracy to assassinate a former U.S. President is a grave issue, regardless of whether that plan reaches fruition.

MR. RODGERS' NEIGHBORHOOD—A LAND OF MAKE-BELIEVE

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

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the consideration of the National Competitiveness Act, a number of my Republican colleagues have been falsely claiming that the private sector does not want this bill. They continue to cite the same individual, a Mr. T.J. Rodgers, CEO of Cypress Semiconductor, over and over again as an expert industrialist. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about what has been going on in Mr. Rodgers' neighborhood.

A few years ago, Mr. Rodgers thought he could build a microprocessor that would rival Intel. Mr. Rodgers, soon found out that the semiconductor industry is no land of make-believe. After his Ross Technology subsidiary lost $3 million before taxes in the first quarter of this year, the ever-resourceful Mr. Rodgers decided that the T.J. in his name stood for "Turning Japanese" and sold this subsidiary to rival Fujitsu for $23 million. Mr. Rodgers was quoted in Business Week as saying, "My patriotism does not exclude free-market transactions."

Well, Mr. Speaker, my commitment to capitalism does not include selling out. Anyone in this body who thinks Mr. Rodgers has anything constructive to offer on American competitiveness should go join him in the land of make-believe.

THE TAX BILL IS COMING

(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, the Clinton administration's big spenders are telling Americans they can't run and can't hide from their massive tax bill. Taxpayers are about to get hit with the single largest tax increase ever—families, seniors, workers will all pay more for just about everything. The big spenders label this sacrifice and tell us it is good for America. But read the fine print. This new tax-and-spend program is going to increase the Nation's debt by almost $1 trillion in the next 5 years.

Every man, woman, and child is already $17,000 in debt—today. How many children have piggy banks with $17,000 in them? And if any do would that money not be better spent on a college education than paying off more years of wasteful spending and abuse by Uncle Sam? As the big spending liberals in this House force almost $300 billion in new taxes down our throats,

it is time once again to remind ourselves that, "It's the spending, stupid." Americans won't run and won't hide—they will make themselves heard—and they are already saying: "Cut spending first."

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND

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

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are willing to share the burden of reducing the deficit to ensure a robust economic future for our children and our children's children. However, if this Congress decides to raise taxes to lower the deficit, we would be breaking faith with the people if we did not absolutely guarantee that all new revenue will go directly to deficit reduction. President Clinton supports the deficit reduction trust fund, I support it, and I urge this body to support it.

The deficit reduction trust fund which has been proposed is an airtight enforcement mechanism to guarantee that the deficit will shrink by $500 billion over the next 5 years. Some Members may argue that this will infringe on Congress' ability to make spending decisions in the future, but after 12 years of irresponsibility and skyrocketing deficits, Congress has lost that privilege. We need real deficit reduction, and we need to lock it in now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in laying the groundwork for fiscal responsibility in Congress. The deficit reduction trust fund is an important first step.

THIS PATRIOT PAYS ENOUGH

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, "This Patriot Pays Enough—No More Taxes." This slogan has been popping up on bumper stickers and buttons all over my district. This is not the sentiment of the Washington Beltway special interest groups that cozy up to President Clinton. This is the view of the average American taxpayer, the most special of special interest, the people that foot the bill. This sticker represents a grassroots movement started by my friends, Pat and John Cooksey, and I would dare to predict it will catch on like wildfire across the country.

The tax bill the Democrats have been drafting only contains more taxes and more spending, which will only lead to a bigger Government. This tax bill will impose the largest tax increase in history on the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the patriots in my district have something to say: No more taxes. Leave our wallets alone.

CORRECTING 12 YEARS OF MISMANAGEMENT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues this morning have said they had breakfast with Ross Perot. I wonder if Ross Perot told them what the Wall Street Journal has said his plan is about. Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal. It says that he himself—that is, Ross Perot—has proposed tax increases even larger than what President Clinton has suggested so far, and that he would raise less from the wealthy and more from the lower and middle classes. That is what Ross Perot's program is about, so I wonder if he came clean with the House Republicans this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the current deficit was not created overnight. It took two Republican administrations 12 years to come up with the tax breaks and fiscal policies to create such a huge deficit. Yet there are some people who feel that President Clinton should be able to erase the results of those 12 years overnight.

He cannot do that. No one can do that. At the current rate, set by the last two administrations, the deficit would increase to $682 billion in the next decade. But President Clinton's plan sets the target at less than one-third of that amount. The President has given us a plan to reverse that trend.

We cannot afford to continue on the pathway of the past 12 years. The President's plan is fair and tough. It deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to give his plan a chance. We cannot afford not to do that.

THE GREAT WHALES VICTIMIZED BY JAPAN AND NORWAY

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

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, of all God's creatures, the greatest in size and gentleness that have ever lived are the great whales. For years now, the people of this world have labored to stop their wanton slaughter; all peoples, that is, except, principally, the Japanese, those notorious destroyers of our precious environment. Just last week, the International Whaling Commission reaffirmed their worldwide whaling ban.

However, yesterday, Norway announced that they will kill 296 whales in defiance of the ban. Who ever would have thought that Norway, whose concern for the environment has always been great, would join Japan in the killing of these harmless wonderful creatures. Norway's actions could lead to an unraveling of the International Whaling Commission, which would imperil all the whales of the world.

Shame on you Norway. Shame on you Norway.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PREVENT PRISONERS FROM RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a bill that would close a loophole in the Social Security Act that allows certain prisoners to receive Social Security benefits.

My legislation would expand the current prohibition on sending Social Security benefits to convicted felons to include those who have been judged not guilty by reason of insanity and are currently being treated in a mental hospital.

In 1986, the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services estimated that approximately $1 million in Social Security benefits a year were being illegally distributed to prisoners. I believe this is a perversion of the Social Security system—these funds should go to the law-abiding beneficiaries of Social Security.

The inspiration for this bill was a recent case in New Jersey where a young man brutally attacked his parents and was judged not guilty by reason of insanity. This man was sent to the local mental hospital for incarceration. Unfortunately, he escaped earlier this year and used several thousand dollars that were issued to him by the Social Security Administration to pay for life outside of the State hospital. Luckily, this man was later apprehended. However, under current law this individual could still receive Social Security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security benefits should not go to prisoners. When the public hears of stories like the one above, a loss of confidence in the whole Social Security system results. I urge my colleagues to correct this loophole in the law and pass this legislation.

STOP THE PAY HIKE FOR $100,000 STAFF

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the House Finance Office—on your direction—began notifying Members that the maximum salary for House staff had been increased from $104,878 to $108,234.

That is right. At a time when President Clinton is asking the American people to pay more taxes, and Government civilian and military employees are being told they have a pay freeze, congressional staff who receive six-fig-

ure salaries will be eligible for a pay increase.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average salary for someone working in the private sector is $24,000 per year. Yet by your action, you are saying that five times that amount is not enough for certain congressional employees.

Mr. Speaker, what is demanded of every other employee in Government should be fair for congressional employees as well, especially those making over $100,000 per year. Please rescind this increase immediately, and let the American people know you are not adding yet another double standard to the list.

□ 1230

CUT, MR. PRESIDENT, CUT

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the President has been going around the country blaming former Republican Presidents for the national debt. He should realize that these deficits were rolled up by a Democrat-controlled Congress. The buck may stop at the White House, but it is spent in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we must move on. The lesson of the so-called budget deal of 1990 is that raising taxes does not reduce the deficit. In fact, the opposite is true. If you truly want to stop piling up debt, you have to stop piling up spending. Cut, Mr. President, cut.

TAXES AND TRUST

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

Mr. HUFFINGTON. Mr. Speaker, while campaigning for the White House last year, Governor Clinton solemnly pledged that he would reduce the tax burden faced by working-class Americans.

Now, President Clinton seeks to impose the largest tax increase in American history upon millions of working-class Americans. Despite his protests to the contrary, the President's taxes hit the middle class the hardest. Elderly citizens with an annual income of only $26,000 will face increased taxes. Working-class families will have to pay more to heat their homes, to drive their kids to school, and to cook their meals. Aside from costing the average middle-class family nearly $500 per year, the Btu tax is also expected to result in the loss of over 600,000 jobs because American firms will be at a competitive disadvantage, incurring higher energy costs than their foreign rivals.

Is this what President Clinton means by taxing the rich or asking the wealthy to pay their fair share? By violating his campaign promise for middle class tax relief and instead increasing taxes upon working class Americans, President Clinton will never reduce the Federal deficit, but more importantly, he is increasing his already large trust deficit with the American people.

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vigorous—and most bipartisan—rounds of applause during President Clinton's State of the Union Address came when he restated his campaign promise to "end welfare as we know it." During his campaign, President Clinton repeatedly said that welfare benefits should be time-limited, and that, after 2 years of job training and education, welfare recipients who can work should be required to do so. "We have to end welfare as a way of life," he told us, "and make it a path to independence and dignity."

The President's rhetoric taps into a feeling held by most of us that long-term welfare dependency is a serious and growing social problem. About half of all new recipients are off the rolls within 2 years. This is true—but only because of the high turnover among short-term recipients. At any one time, about 82 percent of all recipients are in the midst of spells that will last 5 years or more. And about 65 percent are caught up in spells of 8 years or more.

The best effort we have to date that addresses welfare reform is 1988's Family Support Act, which sought to move welfare recipients into jobs—first, by making the receipt of benefits contingent on participation in education and employment programs; second, by providing transitional health benefits and child care to those returning to work. Although mandatory education, job training and work programs are at the heart of the act, the obligations it places on receipents are actually quite modest. Strong consideration should be given to strengthening minimal requirements within the Family Support Act.

I look forward to making welfare reform a priority of mine during this Congress, and look forward to learning more about President Clinton's welfare reform package as it unfolds.

SPENDING CUTS INSTEAD OF TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this House next week will have a chance to substitute spending cuts for the energy tax increase. We will have a chance to substitute spending cuts for the tax increase on Social Security recipients. We will have a chance to substitute spending cuts for the tax increase on restaurants that is going to lead to layoffs for restaurants and hotel workers.

I would hope that Democrats who want to stop those tax increases will be willing on a bipartisan basis to work together with the House Republicans so that together, in a bipartisan fashion, we could shape a rule which would allow us to amend the tax bill to have spending cuts instead of tax increases, to protect the American people from the energy tax, to protect the American people from the increased tax on senior citizens, and to protect the American people from taxes on restaurants that are going to lead to increased unemployment.

I would hope that the Democrats who want to cut out those tax increases would work with us on a bipartisan effort to have a rule to make those amendments in order.

PAYROLL IRREGULARITIES AT THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, recently the General Accounting Office was asked to investigate to determine whether or not there had been any problems in the areas of the ethics and conflict of interest as a result of alleged irregularities in the White House payroll. In particular, there was a question of whether or not payroll may have been backdated by as much as 3 months.

However, employees of the Defense Electronic Supply Center, which is a Pentagon agency assigned to process the White House payroll, were ordered by unidentified White House officials not to talk to representatives of the General Accounting Office. In other words, this whole situation is being covered up.

So far the White House has refused to comment on this reported effort to interfere with the probe of the GAO.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the President will order his people today to begin complying with the GAO and give us a chance to understand what has been happening at the White House with regard to payroll irregularities.

NATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 820.

□ 1236

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, with Mr. MONTGOMERY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, May 13, 1993, title III was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board (in this section referred to as the "Advisory Board") to assist the Technology Administration in the performance of its functions.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Advisory Board shall be composed of at least 17 members, appointed by the Under Secretary from among individuals who, because of their experience and accomplishments are exceptionally qualified to provide advice to the Under Secretary on the plans, programs, and policy of the Technology Administration. The Under Secretary shall make an effort to ensure the appointment of socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6) of the Small Business Act, and including women) to the Advisory Board. The Under Secretary shall designate 1 member to chair the Advisory Board. Membership of the Advisory Board shall include representatives of—

(1) United States small businesses;

(2) other United States manufacturers;

(3) research universities and independent research institutes;

(4) State and local government agencies involved in technology extension;

(5) national laboratories;

(6) industrial, worker, and professional organizations;

(7) financial organizations; and

(8) computing and communications equipment and services providers.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the Advisory Board shall include advising the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Director regarding—

(1) the development of policies and options for implementation that the Advisory Board considers essential to technology creation, development, and adoption, including policies that would benefit small businesses;

(2) the development and rapid application of critical and other advanced technologies, including advanced manufacturing technologies;

(3) the development of computer and communications support services for advanced manufacturing; and

(4) the planning, execution, and evaluation of programs under the authority of the Technology Administration.

(d) MEETINGS.—(1) The chairman shall call the first meeting of the Advisory Board not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The Advisory Board shall meet at least once every 6 months, and at the call of the Under Secretary.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members of the Advisory Board, other than full-time employees of the United States, shall be allowed travel expenses in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while engaged in the business of the Advisory Board.

(f) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary shall consult with other agencies, as appropriate.

(g) TERMINATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Advisory Board.

(h) SECRETARIAL DISCRETION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary shall have the discretion to decide whether to establish the Advisory Board or create a more cost-effective way to achieve the goal of closer cooperation with industry. If the Secretary exercises such discretion and establishes an alternative mechanism, the Under Secretary shall make an effort to ensure the participation of socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6) of the Small Business Act, and including women) in the alternative mechanism.

SEC. 402. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) private sector consensus standards are essential to the timely development of competitive products;

(2) Federal Government contribution of resources and more active participation in the voluntary standards process in the United States can increase the quality of United States standards, increase their compatibility with the standards of other countries, and ease access of products manufactured by United States manufacturers to foreign markets; and

(3) the Federal Government, working in cooperation with private sector organizations including trade associations, engineering societies, and technical bodies, can effectively promote United States Government use of United States consensus standards and, where appropriate, the adoption and United States Government use of international standards.

(b) STANDARD PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 104(e) of the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" before "Pursuant to the";

(2) by striking "matching funds" and inserting in lieu thereof "financial contributions deemed appropriate by the Secretary"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) As necessary and appropriate, the Institute shall expand the program established under section 112 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) by extending the existing program to include other countries that request assistance with standards-related activities from official representatives of the United States Government. The Institute may enter into additional contracts with non-Federal organizations representing United States companies, as such term is defined in section 28(d)(9)(B) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(9)(B)) or with United States-based professional societies who participate in the development of standards. Such contracts shall require cost sharing between Federal and non-Federal sources for such purposes. In awarding such contracts, the Institute shall seek to promote and support the dissemination of United States technical standards to additional foreign countries and shall seek, as the Director deems appropriate, to promote the adoption of international standards supported by United States industry, and shall seek to assist private sector professional societies which participate in the development of standards in expediting the development of domestic standards which enable the introduction of technologies, products, or technology-based services which are being delayed due to the lack of available standards. The Institute and such contractors shall, in carrying out the preceding sentence, cooperate with governmental bodies, private organizations including standards setting organizations and industry, and multinational institutions that promote economic development. The organizations receiving such contracts may establish training programs to bring to the United States foreign standards experts for the purpose of receiving in-depth training in the United States standards system.".

(c) REPORT ON STANDARDS.—(1) Section 508(a) of the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(A) by inserting "standards development and international" after "a thorough review of international";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the following new paragraph:

"(1) Current and potential future roles of the Federal Government in the development and promulgation of domestic and global product and process standards.".

(2) The Secretary, in consultation with the Institute and the Department of Commerce Technology Advisory Board established under section 401 of this Act and with, as appropriate, the active participation of the private sector, shall submit to the Congress a report describing the appropriate roles of the Department of Commerce in aid to United States companies in achieving conformity assessment and accreditation and otherwise qualifying their products in foreign markets, through the development and promulgation of domestic and global product and quality standards, and through the implementation of conformity assessment and accreditation procedures based upon such standards, including a discussion of the extent to which each of the policy options provided in the March 1992 Office of Technology Assessment report, entitled "Global Standards", contributes to meeting the goals of—

(A) increasing the international adoption of standards beneficial to United States industries; and

(B) improving the coordination of United States representation to international standards setting bodies.

(3) The report shall also describe emerging product and market areas which can be assisted by shortening the time required for the development of standards and make recommendations on contributions the Department of Commerce can make to improving the timeliness of standards development.

SEC. 403. MALCOLM BALDRIGE AWARD AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 108(c)(3) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(3) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) No award shall be made within any category or subcategory if there are no qualifying enterprises in that category or subcategory.".

(b)(1) Section 108(c)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(3) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(D) Educational institutions.".

(2)(A) Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report containing—

(i) criteria for qualification for a Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award by various classes of educational institutions;

(ii) criteria for the evaluation of applications for such awards under section 108(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(3) of this Act; and

(iii) a plan for funding awards described in clause (i).

(B) In preparing the report required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with the National Science Foundation and other public and private entities with appropriate expertise, and shall provide for public notice and comment.

(C) The Secretary shall not accept applications for awards described in subparagraph (A)(i) until after the report required under subparagraph (A) is submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 404. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Section 202 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a), as redesignated by section 206(b)(5) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting "(including both real and personal property)" after "or other resources" both places it appears; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(A), by inserting "including Federal test and evaluation facilities," after "by a Federal agency,".

SEC. 405. COMPETITIVENESS ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS.

Section 101(e) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(2) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) COMPETITIVENESS ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS.—(1) The Secretary, through the Under Secretary, shall—

"(A) provide for the conduct of research and analyses to advance knowledge of the ways in which the economic competitiveness of United States companies can be enhanced through Federal programs established under the National Competitiveness Act of 1993 or the amendments made by that Act; and

"(B) as appropriate, provide for evaluations of Federal technology programs established or expanded under the National Competitiveness Act of 1993 or the amendments made by that Act in order to judge their effectiveness and make recommendations to improve their contribution to United States competitiveness.

"(2) All executive departments and agencies shall assist the Secretary in carrying out this section as appropriate.

"(3) Nothing in this section shall authorize the release of information to, or the use of information by, the Secretary or Under Secretary in a manner inconsistent with law or any procedure established pursuant thereto.

"(4) The head of any Federal agency may detail such personnel and may provide such services, with or without reimbursement, as the Secretary may request to assist in carrying out the activities required under this section.".

SEC. 406. STUDY OF SEMICONDUCTOR LITHOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGIES.

Within 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Critical Technologies Institute (in this section referred to as the "Institute") established under section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 shall, after consultation with the private sector and appropriate officials from other Federal agencies, submit to Congress a report on advanced lithography technologies for the production of semiconductor devices. The report shall include the Institute's evaluation of the likely technical and economic advantages and disadvantages of each such technology, an analysis of current private and Government research to develop each such technology, and any recommendations the Institute may have regarding future Federal support for research and development in advanced lithography.

SEC. 407. AMERICAN WORKFORCE QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title III of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as added by title II of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 305. AMERICAN WORKFORCE QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may make grants to establish and operate American workforce quality partnership programs in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to pay the Federal share for American workforce quality partnership programs to establish workforce training consortia between industry and institutions of higher education.

"(b) GRANT PERIOD.—Grants awarded under this section may be for a period of 5 years.

"(c) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each grant recipient shall use amounts provided under the grant to develop and operate an American workforce quality partnership program.

"(d) CONTENTS OF PROGRAM.—An American workforce quality partnership program shall establish partnerships among—

"(1) one or more United States manufacturers;

"(2) an organization or organizations representing the nonmanagerial employees of the manufacturers described in paragraph (1); and

"(3) a local community technical college or other appropriate institutions of higher education, a vocational training institution, a Regional Center for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, a Manufacturing Outreach Center, or any similar entity or consortium of such institutions,

to train the employees of the industrial partners through both workplace-based and classroom-based programs of training.

"(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of an American workforce quality partnership program may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the program. The non-Federal share of such costs may be provided in-cash or in-kind, fairly valued. The total contribution of the proposed partnership should reflect a substantial contribution on the part of the industrial partners and appropriate contributions of the education partners, local or State governments, and other appropriate entities.

"(f) APPLICATIONS.—

"(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Any consortium described in subsection (d) may apply for a grant under this section at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"(2) PLAN.—Each application submitted under this subsection shall contain a plan for the development and implementation of an American workforce quality partnership program under this section. Such plan shall—

"(A) show a demonstrated commitment, on the part of the industrial partners, to adopt total quality management strategies or other plausible strategies to renew its competitive edge;

"(B) demonstrate the need for Federal resources because of the long-term nature and risk of such an investment, the inability to finance such ventures because of the high cost of capitalization, intense competition from foreign industries, or such other appropriate reasons as may limit the industrial partners' ability to launch programs where worker training and development is a substantial component;

"(C) demonstrate long-term benefit for all partners and the local economy, through an enhanced competitive position of the industrial partners, substantial benefits for regional employment, and the ability of the education and labor participants to further their capabilities to educate and train other nonpartnership-affiliated individuals wishing to obtain or upgrade technical, technological, industrial management and leadership, or other industrial skills;

"(D) make full, appropriate, and innovative use of industrial and higher education resources and other local resources such as facilities, equipment, personnel exchanges, experts, or consultants;

"(E) provide for the establishment of an advisory board in accordance with subsection (h);

"(F) include an explanation of the industrial partners' plans to adopt new competitive strategies and how the training partnership aids that effort; and

"(G) include assurances that the eligible entity will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all sources for employee training, other than those provided under this section, at or above the average level of such expenditures in the 2 fiscal years preceding submission of an application for assistance under this section.

"(3) APPROVAL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve applications based on their potential to create an effective American workforce quality partnership program in accordance with this section.

"(B) CRITERIA.—In reviewing grant applications, the Secretary shall give significant consideration to the following criteria:

"(i) Saliency of argument for requiring a Federal investment.

"(ii) Commitment of partnership to continue operation after the termination of Federal funding.

"(iii) The likelihood that the training will improve the long-term competitiveness of the industrial partners and contribute significantly to economic growth.

"(iv) The likelihood that the partnership will benefit the education mission of the education partners in ways outside of the scope of the partnership, such as developing the capability to train other nonpartnership-affiliated individuals in similar skills.

"(C) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give priority consideration to industries which are threatened by intense foreign competition important to the long-term national economic or military security of the United States and industries which are critical in enabling other United States industries to maintain a healthy competitive position. In addition, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants in areas of high poverty and unemployment.

"(g) USE OF FUNDS.—

"(1) APPROVED USES.—Federal funds may be used for—

"(A) the direct costs of workplace-based and classroom-based training in advanced technical, technological, and industrial management, skills, and training for the implementation of total quality management and technology management strategies, or other competitiveness strategies, contained in the applicant's plan submitted under subsection (f)(2)(F);

"(B) the purchase or lease of equipment or other materials for the purpose of instruction to aid in training;

"(C) the development of in-house curricula or coursework or other training-related programs, including the training of teachers and other eligible participants to utilize such curricula or coursework; and

"(D) reasonable administrative expenses and other indirect costs of operating the partnership which may not exceed 10 percent of the total cost of the program.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—Federal funds may not be used for nontraining related costs of adopting

new competitive strategies including the replacement of manufacturing equipment, product redesign and manufacturing facility construction costs, or salary compensation of the partners' employees. Grants shall not be made under this section for programs that will impair any existing program, contract, or agreement without the written concurrence of the parties to such program, contract, or agreement.

"(h) ADVISORY BOARD.—

"(1) Each partnership shall establish an advisory board which shall include representation from each of the following categories:

"(A) Multiple organizational levels of the industrial partners, that shall include managerial employees.

"(B) The education partners.

"(C) Organizations representing nonmanagerial employees.

"(2) The advisory board shall—

"(A) advise the partnership on the general direction and policy of the partnership including training, instruction, and other related issues;

"(B) report to the Secretary after the second and fourth year of the program, on the progress and status of the partnership, including its strengths, weaknesses, and new directions, the number of individuals served, types of services provided, and an outline of how the program can be integrated into the existing training infrastructure in place in other Federal agencies and departments; and

"(C) assist in the revision of the plans (submitted with the application under subsection (f)(2)(F)) and include revised plans as necessary in the reports required under subparagraph (B).".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1994.

SEC. 408. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the amendments made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application thereof to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 409. SUNSET.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Before April 1, 1995, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report that evaluates the success of the programs established by this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, in achieving the purposes of this Act.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1995 for carrying out the programs for which funds are authorized by this Act, or the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 410. USE OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS.

(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST FRAUDULENT USE OF "MADE IN AMERICA" LABELS.—(1) A person shall not intentionally affix a label bearing the inscription of "Made in America", or any inscription with that meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States, if that product is not a domestic product.

(2) A person who violates paragraph (1) shall not be eligible for any contract for a procurement carried out with amounts authorized under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, including any subcontract under such a contract pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures in subpart 9.4 of chapter 1 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor procedures thereto.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the head of each agency which conducts procurements shall ensure that such procurements are conducted in compliance with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a through 10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(2) This subsection shall apply only to procurements made for which—

(A) amounts are authorized by this Act, or by any amendment made by this Act, to be made available; and

(B) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) The Secretary, before January 1, 1995, shall report to the Congress on procurements covered under this subsection of products that are not domestic products.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the term "domestic product" means a product—

(1) that is manufactured or produced in the United States; and

(2) at least 50 percent of the cost of the articles, materials, or supplies of which are mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.

SEC. 411. NATIONAL QUALITY PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established, under the supervision of the Director, a National Quality Program (in this section referred to as the "Program"). The purpose of the Program shall be to enhance the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, to disseminate information, and to promote and take part in educational and research activities regarding ways in which United States companies and organizations can improve their quality management practices and productivity.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the Program, the Director is authorized—

(1) to develop industry-led workshops, seminars, and other mechanisms to disseminate broadly to United States companies and organizations the best practices available in total quality management, including the practices and quality improvement strategies successfully employed by those firms that have won the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, as well as best practices in lean production methods, market-driven product improvement, and customer-supplier relations;

(2) to work with industry leaders and others to develop both measures of quality and recommendations concerning what skills employees should have in order to participate effectively in company quality programs; and

(3) to explore, with private industry, other Federal agencies, and State and local government, innovative ways in which 2-year colleges and other educational institutions can teach quality assurance techniques and related background skills to industrial workers in both manufacturing and services.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title IV?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are resuming debate on the question of the competitiveness bill and will presently be dealing with title IV, where it is my understanding that we have a couple of amendments. Those particular Members that had those amendments have not yet arrived on the floor. I would hope that they are going to be here in a couple of minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to raise one point about an amendment that was adopted earlier that dealt with the manufacturing industry that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio. It is my understanding that while the majority has talked fairly consistently about the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers is in support of this piece of legislation, the National Association of Manufacturers has become very concerned about that amendment, and at one point even talked about withdrawing their support of this bill as a result of the adoption of the amendment, which turns out to be, in their analysis, very, very bad economic policy.

It turns out that it is going to literally undermine the ability of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of businesses in this country to participate in the program that is involved here, and may dramatically undermine the whole realm of competitiveness of the bill.

This was, of course, an amendment that was accepted readily on the floor. It had very, very little discussion even. As a matter of fact, I think I am the only person that rose in opposition to it.

□ 1240

But it does turn out that as the manufacturing industry has focused on this particular amendment, that it is going to do a great deal of damage, not only to the bill but, if adopted, could do a great deal of damage economically to the country.

That is my concern about this legislation. We have included a number of items in the bill that have had detrimental impact on the economy as a whole.

We included some social policy items and some economic policy items that could very dramatically undermine our ability to compete in the future.

This whole bill was supposed to be about competitiveness. Yet we turned down amendments aimed at helping the middle class and small business to be more competitive. And we have adopted amendments that will undermine the ability of the manufacturing community to deal effectively with foreign competition.

So there are a number of concerns; several more concerns will be raised in amendments in the course of today. Hopefully, we can finish up this bill today. And as we are moving toward finishing the bill, one of the things we need to focus on is the economic impact of it.

A number of the amendments that will come up today will focus on that, how much are we willing to spend, how much money is going to be put into some of these programs that will be deficit money. And that is the real issue here, how much money are we willing to add to the deficit. How much money are we willing to add to the national debt in order to do some of these things that are regarded as good in the bill.

Since we are dealing with a piece of legislation aimed at competitiveness, those become very real issues, because our debt does drive down our ability to compete.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Are there other amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 119, after line 10, insert the following new subsection:

(c) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any recipient of a grant under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, should purchase only American made equipment and products when expending grant monies.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In allocating grants under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

Page 119, line 11, strike "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that we are talking about a competitiveness act that may lead to some jobs in manufacturing, although I still have my doubts. I do not think we have incentivized the workplace enough to keep jobs in America. But I appreciate the fact that this bill does attempt to address some of those issues.

I have had it included in the Buy American opportunity already. It deals with the extension of grants underneath this bill, and it says where any time there is a grant made under the act, when available, and cost effective, that American-made equipment and products should be the focus of the bill, and there should be a notice to all the people getting these grants that Congress wants to see American purchases, when possible—at least remind them.

I would just like to say that the new job dictionary, the dictionary of new job titles, a classification by the Department of Labor, came out. These are some of the new high-technology jobs that America now offers for its workers: bosom presser, sanitary napkin machine operator, brassiere cup molder cutter, panty hose crotch closer, nut roaster, jelly roller, hardness inspector, gizzard skin remover, corn cob pipe assemblers.

We are just really doing everything we can to create these new high-technology jobs.

The amendment is not fancy. It is consistent, though, and I appreciate the support that I have.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, we believe that the gentleman's amendment improves the bill and are happy to accept it.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, we do not have any objection to the amendment that I know of. I have not seen a copy of the amendment, though, and would, if the gentleman would give me a moment to look at the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, there was a purpose to that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we have no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the minority as well as the majority on the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

Page 120, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 412. FASTENER QUALITY ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—Whenever in this section an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Fastener Quality Act (15 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 (15 U.S.C. 5402) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking "Standard" and inserting in lieu thereof "Standards"; and

(B) in paragraph (14), by striking "which defines or describes" and all that follows through "of any fastener".

(2) INSPECTION AND TESTING.—Section 5(b)(1) (15 U.S.C. 5404(b)(1)) is amended by striking "section 6; unless" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 6, unless".

(3) IMPORTERS AND PRIVATE LABEL DISTRIBUTORS.—Section 7(c)(2) (15 U.S.C. 5406(c)(2)) is amended by inserting "to the same" before "extent".

(c) CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHEMICAL TESTS.—(A) Section 5(a)(1)(B) (15 U.S.C. 5404(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "subsections (b) and (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b), (c), and (d)".

(B) Section 5(a)(2)(A)(i) (15 U.S.C. 5404(a)(2)(A)(i)) is amended by striking "subsections (b) and (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b), (c), and (d)".

(C) Section 5(c)(4) (15 U.S.C. 5404(c)(4)) is amended by inserting "except as provided in subsection (d)," before "state".

(D) Section 5 (15 U.S.C. 5404) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), a manufacturer shall be deemed to have demonstrated, for purposes of subsection (a)(1), that the chemical characteristics of a lot conform to the standards and specifications to which the manufacturer represents such lot has been manufactured if the following requirements are met:

"(1) The coil or heat number of metal from which such lot was fabricated has been inspected and tested with respect to its chemical characteristics by a laboratory accredited in accordance with the procedures and conditions specified by the Secretary under section 6.

"(2) Such laboratory has provided to the manufacturer, either directly or through the metal manufacturer, a written inspection and testing report, which shall be in a form prescribed by the Secretary by regulation, listing the chemical characteristics of such coil or heat number.

"(3) The report described in paragraph (2) indicates that the chemical characteristics of such coil or heat number conform to those required by the standards and specifications to which the manufacturer represents such lot has been manufactured.

"(4) The manufacturer demonstrates that such lot has been fabricated from the coil or heat number of metal to which the report described in paragraphs (2) and (3) relates.

In prescribing the form of report required by subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide for an alternative to the statement required by subsection (c)(4), insofar as such statement pertains to chemical characteristics, for cases in which a manufacturer elects to use the procedure permitted by this subsection.".

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, today, with this amendment, we have the opportunity to strike at the heart of overburdening Government relations and allowing industry to compete.

The Fastener Advisory Committee has just forwarded their study on the probable economic consequences of implementing final regulations without amending the Fastener Quality Act.

The advisory committee has reported that without their recommended changes, Congress could be placing an additional cost of almost $1 billion on the industrial fastener manufacturing industry.

The report states that:

If enacted without the recommendation changes, could have a devastating economic influence upon all facets of our industry, but especially to small businesses that manufacture, distribute specific fasteners that are covered by the Act.

Further, the report explains, "Congress believed the act would cover only 1 percent, or $60 million, of fasteners sold in commerce." Not the 55 percent of the market, as estimated by the fastener industry coalition, that would be affected.

I believe it is important to make clear that the intent of Congress was truly that 1 percent of those fasteners used in critical applications would be covered.

That 1 percent of the marketplace, should not be damaging to the small

business manufacturers trying to complete in the other 99 percent of the market.

My amendment, that is before us now, would allow for, first, allowance for chemistry certification from raw material vendors to be used.

The fastener manufacturer cannot change the chemistry of the raw material. Therefore, all testing of chemistry for finished fastener lots would be redundant, as long as lot traceability to the mill heat of the raw material has been maintained.

It is my understanding that NIST [the National Institute of Standards and Technology], has agreed to work out regulation language that will allow current inventories to be utilized as the NIST accreditation process takes place.

Failing to adopt this particular provision would have an estimated cost to the industry of between $100 million to $286 million.

Further, my amendment redefines the definition of the sale of fasteners with minor nonconformances.

Historically, the industry has allowed for the sale of minor nonconformances. This provision just allows fastener industry to maintain the industry standard.

This provision is intended to ensure that the Fastener Quality Act will not be interpreted to override the provisions of industry and Government standards. These standards provide procedures and safeguards for the sale or other accepted means of disposing of fasteners found to deviate from one or more of the physical specifications set out in such standards.

Failing to adopt this amendment, according to the Fastener Advisory Committee, will have an estimated cost to industry as high as $285 million.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for his willingness to find a compromise on the issues represented by this amendment.

The third recommendation of the Fastener Advisory Committee, and the one that has the largest negative impact on small business and distributers, deals with the issue of mixing like fasteners.

NIST has acknowledged the cost to be $375 million for all distributors to comply, with an estimated ongoing yearly cost to each distributor of $65,000.

Unfortunately, this was not something that we were able to get worked out in our negotiations, and we could not agree that this mixing of fasteners, or what is called commingling, should take place.

I personally have heard from the Fastener Industry Coalition, which represents over 2,500 U.S. fastener distributors and manufacturers and importers with over 60,000 employees in support of this particular commingling provision.

We have heard from the National Fastener Distributors Association. We have heard from the Industrial Fastener Institute. We have heard from the Specialty Tools and Fasteners Distribution Association, and so on and so forth.

□ 1250

I have a whole list of these people that I will put into the RECORD. However, the point is that while I regard that as something that needs to be looked at in the future, that is not a part of this amendment. It was not something that we could work out.

I think it is important to recognize that what Chairman DINGELL and I have been able to work out will be an important step forward that will save perhaps as much as one-half billion dollars a year to U.S. industry, and will enhance the competitiveness, therefore, of U.S. industry.

Therefore, if we want to help business, if we want to help provide jobs, if we want to help American competitiveness, we can do so by supporting this amendment. I feel strongly that the issue is one of improving law that has been passed in a way that the industry feels would be helpful.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include for the RECORD at this point further clarifying, minor, nonconformance language submitted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION FASTENERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT STANDARDS

The Interpretive Problem Now Posed by the Act. Section 5 of the Fastener Quality Act, "Testing and Certification of Fasteners," forbids the sale of fasteners from lots which fail to conform "to the standards and specifications to which the manufacturer represents [they have] been manufactured." This language, coupled with the restrictive wording of the definition of "standards and specifications" in section 3(14) of the Act, could result in the Act's being interpreted to forbid any sale whatsoever of fasteners bearing head-markings associated with a standard which have any known non-conforming characteristics—even with complete disclosure to the buyer and in full compliance with the provisions for disposal of non-conforming items contained in the applicable standard. The National Institute of Standards and Technology believes that such an interpretation is probably required by the current wording of the applicable provisions. For this reason, I propose an amendment to make it clear that the Fastener Quality Act is not intended to nullify the carefully-drawn provisions of accepted industry and government standards governing the proper disposition of non-conforming items. The Fastener Quality Act was designed to stop the fraudulent sale into commerce of counterfeit or substandard fasteners—not the proper disposal of non-conforming fasteners according to the procedural provisions of recognized standards.

This problem was brought to light by a recent report of the Cost Effectiveness Task Group of the Fastener Advisory Committee entitled: "Economic Consequences of Implementing Final Regulations Without Amending the Act Consistent With The Recommended Statutory Changes." The Report, adopted by the full Committee at its March 3-4 meeting, recommended that the Fastener Quality Act be amended "to allow the sale of fasteners having minor nonconformances which will not affect the fit form and function of the fastener in its intended application."

The Advisory Committee Report noted that mechanical fasteners have always been manufactured and sold on the basis of "fit, form and function," with the technical specifications set out in the standard being the guide, but the user/installer being the ultimate judge of whether a particular nonconformance makes a fastener unfit for the intended use. For example, following is an extract from ASME Standard B18.182.2M through B18.18.4M which was quoted in the Advisory Committee Report:

2.9 Disposition of Nonconforming Materials or Parts Records of disposition shall be maintained in accordance with 2.4.

2.9.1 Manufacturer's Options. The manufacturer has the choice of the following options in the disposition of those materials or parts which have been found to contain discrepancies within his plant.

(a) They may be scrapped.

(b) They may be 100% sorted and all nonconforming parts removed.

(c) They may be reworked or reprocessed to correct the nonconforming characteristic(s).

(d) The customer may be informed of the rejectable items and his advice requested on their disposition. If the customer considers that the degree to which the characteristic(s) deviate from specified requirements will have no significant effect on the performance of the parts in their service application, the customer may authorize release of the parts or materials for completion of production or for shipment as applicable.

2.9.2. Customer's Options. The customer shall establish agreement with the manufacturer or one of the following options for the disposition of those materials or parts which have been rejected after receipt from the manufacturer.

(a) They may be scrapped.

(b) They may be 100% sorted and all nonconforming parts removed.

(c) They may be reworked or reprocessed to correct the nonconforming characteristic(s).

(d) If the customer considers that the degree to which the characteristic(s) deviate from specified requirements will have no significant effect on the performance of the parts in their service application, the customer may authorize release of the parts or materials for use and advise the manufacturer.

(e) They all may be returned.

The Advisory Committee report noted that numerous commercial and military documents provide for a cost effective disposition for nonconforming products when a minor nonconformance does not adversely affect the health and safety, performance, interchangeability, reliability, maintainability or effective use or operation of the product.

In my view, the sale of fasteners to fully informed customers under the above condi-

tions accords with the procedural portion of the applicable standard. the Fastener Quality Act was not intended to prohibit such proper, orderly, and fully-informed consensual dispositions as being sales of fasteners from lots "which fail to conform to the standards and specifications to which the manufacturer represents [they have] been manufactured."

The Amendment to Resolve This Problem. The amendment I offer today would resolve this problem by revising the Act's definition or "standards and specifications" to remove its restrictive references to specific physical fastener characteristics or limits which are described by standards. This will remove the implication that the concept of "standards and specifications" includes only the physical characteristics or limits required by fastener standards, and will thus ensure that the concept is interpreted as including the provisions of a standards document that establish procedures for the sale or other disposition of fasteners that deviate from one or more of such physical characteristics or limits.

I wish to make clear that this amendment will not permit the sale of any fastener in United States commerce that "fails to conform to the standards and specifications to which the manufacturer represents it has been manufactured." Rather, the amendment makes clear that the disposition of a technically non-conforming fastener, including by sale, may in certain circumstances be a procedure which conforms to the applicable standard. The sale of nonconforming fasteners will remain strictly prohibited by the Act.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, this represents an agreement by the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and we are happy to adopt the gentleman's amendment. We have no problem with it. We support it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to withdraw my initial objections to the amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania and to urge my colleagues to support the amendment. The technical and conforming changes made by this amendment are consistent with the original Fastener Quality Act.

Mr. WALKER was an original cosponsor of the Fastener Quality Act. He was a supporter of the legislation that was reported to the House by the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science Committee. The amendment he is now offering conforms to the intent of the law we passed in 1990.

I have agreed to withdraw my opposition to the gentleman's amendment because he has taken out provisions that would undermine the law's requirements for commingling and traceability. The provisions of current law are clear. Manufacturers and distributors cannot sell fasteners unless they conspicuously mark the lot number on each container. The reason for this essential requirement was recommended after an extensive and thorough investigation by our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations that documented case after case of substandard and counterfeit fasteners. The reasons to require traceability are simple and compelling: to provide for accountability, to reward those who strive for quality and who play by the rules, and to protect the health and safety of the public and employees. In fact, Mr. WALKER noted the need for traceability when he spoke in favor of the bill during the 101st Congress.

Because the gentleman has deleted the offending portion, I will offer my support for the technical and conforming amendments offered by Mr. WALKER and urge my colleagues to do likewise. Let me repeat: I support the Walker amendment.

In closing, I remind my colleagues that the regulations to implement this law are now more than 2 years past due. It is high time that this law is implemented. And I caution those in industry, including those who want to eliminate traceability in the name of money, that any further delays in implementing this law will be duly noted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV of the bill?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V, as modified, is as follows:

TITLE V—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 501. TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the activities of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Technology Policy, in addition to any other amounts authorized for such purposes, for the Office of the Under Secretary—

(1) $5,425,000 for fiscal year 1994; and

(2) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which $2,000,000 are authorized for competitiveness assessments and evaluations under section 101(e) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 502. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) INTRAMURAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the intramural scientific and technical research and services activities of the Institute, $240,988,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized only for the evaluation of nonenergy-related inventions;

(B) $9,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized only for the technical competence fund; and

(C) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized only for the standards pilot project established under section 104(e) of the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991.

(b) TRANSFERS.—(1) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in subsection (a), so long as—

(A) the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in such subsection;

(B) the aggregate amount authorized under subsection (a) is not changed; and

(C) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives are notified in advance of any such transfer.

(2) The Secretary may propose transfers to or from any line item listed in subsection (a) exceeding 10 percent of the amount authorized for such line item, but such proposed transfer may not be made unless—

(A) a full and complete explanation of any such proposed transfer and the reason therefor are transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(B) 30 days have passed following the transmission of such written explanation.

(c) EXTRAMURAL INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES.—In addition to the amounts authorized under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the extramural industrial technology services activities of the Institute—

(1) for Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, for the National Technology Outreach Program established under section 303 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, and for the National Quality Program established under section 410 of this Act—

(A) for fiscal year 1994, $30,035,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 1995, $150,000,000, of which $50,000,000 are authorized for Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, and of which $97,000,000 are authorized for the National Technology Outreach Program;

(2) for the State Technology Extension Program, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(3) for the Advanced Technology Program—

(A) $197,489,000 for fiscal year 1994, of which $20,000,000 are authorized for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; and

(B) $450,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which $100,000,000 are authorized for carrying out section 322 of this Act, and of which $50,000,000 are authorized for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980.

(d) FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out construction and modernization of Institute facilities, $61,686,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $106,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

(e) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount which may be appropriated to the Secretary pursuant to this title for fiscal year 1995 shall not exceed $950,000,000.

SEC. 503. ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION.

In addition to the amounts authorized under sections 501 and 502, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary—

(1) for the Civilian Technology Loan Program established under subtitle C of title III of this Act, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1995;

(2) for the Civilian Technologies Development Program established under subtitle D of title III of this Act, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1995;

(3) for carrying out the Benchmarking Program established under title IV of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(4) for carrying out the American workforce quality partnership program established under section 305 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

Of the amounts made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, not more than $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is greater,

shall be available for administrative expenses. Of the amounts made available under paragraph (2) for a fiscal year, not more than $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is greater, shall be available for administrative expenses. The Secretary shall ensure that audits are performed by independent auditors on the programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this section or section 502(c). The summary results of such audits shall be submitted to the Congress by the end of each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and not more than $2,000,000, or 2 percent of the aggregate amount made available under such section and subsection, whichever is greater, shall be used in each such fiscal year for performing the audits.

SEC. 504. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

In addition to such other sums as may be authorized by other Acts to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation, there are authorized to be appropriated to that Director—

(1) for carrying out section 212 of this Act, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(2) for carrying out section 213 of this Act, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 505. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this title, appropriations made under the authority provided in this title shall remain available for obligation until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title V of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 121, line 21, strike "$240,988,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$242,988,000".

Page 123, line 11, through page 124, line 19, strike subsection (c).

Page 124, line 20, redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (c).

Page 124, line 24, through page 125, line 2, strike subsection (e).

Page 125, line 5, insert "(a) FISCAL YEAR 1994.—" before "In addition to".

Page 125, line 7, insert "for fiscal year 1994" after "the Secretary".

Page 125, after line 7, insert the following new paragraphs:

(1) for Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, for the National Technology Outreach Program established under section 303 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, and for the National Quality Program established under section 410 of this Act, $30,035,000;

(2) for the State Technology Extension Program, $3,000,000;

(3) for the Advanced Technology Program $193,489,000, of which $20,000,000 are authorized for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980;

Page 125, lines 8, 12, and 16, redesignate paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

Page 125, lines 10 and 11, strike "for fiscal year 1994 and $20,000 for the fiscal year 1995".

Page 125, lines 14 and 15 strike "for fiscal year 1994 and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1995;" and insert in lieu thereof "; and".

Page 125, lines 18 through 24, strike "for fiscal year 1994" and all that follows through "fiscal year 1995".

Page 125, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1995.—In addition to the amounts authorized under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1995, to carry out the other activities of the Technology Administration, including the extramural industrial technology services activities of the Institute and the Advanced Technology Program, $534,000,000, of which—

(1) not more than $150,000,000 shall be for the Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology and the National Technology Outreach Program established under section 303 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980;

(2) not more than $3,000,000 shall be for the National Quality Program established under section 410 of this Act;

(3) not more than $3,000,000 shall be for the State Technology Extension Program;

(4) not more than $50,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980;

(5) not more than $20,000,000 shall be for the Civilian Technology Loan Program established under subtitle C of title III of this Act;

(6) not more than $50,000,000 shall be for the Civilian Technologies Development Program established under subtitle D of title III of this Act;

(7) not more than $10,000,000 shall be for carrying out the Benchmarking Program established under title IV of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; and

(8) not more than $50,000,000 shall be for carrying out the American workforce quality partnership program established under section 305 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980.

Page 126, lines 1, and 2, strike "Of the amounts made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof "(c) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES; AUDITS.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a)(4)".

Page 126, lines 4 and 5, strike "paragraph (2) for a fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (b)(5)".

Page 126, lines 9 and 10, strike "or section 502(c)".

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to make the authorization priorities of H.R. 820 clear and to remove the ambiguity as to the authorization limits which are being set by this bill.

H.R. 820 as reported from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology contains authorizations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce totaling approximately $1.2 billion and a cap of $950 million on authorizations for fiscal year 1995. We were attempting in committee to reconcile two conflicting goals. We wanted to exercise fiscal discipline by holding the total authorization for the Department of Commerce in this bill to the administration's planning total for fiscal year 1995. We also wanted to give the administration flexibility as it develops its fiscal year 1995 budget. In committee we realized that the cap on spending was an unsatisfactory solution to this problem, but it was the best solution available at the time.

My amendment, I believe, achieves what we could not achieve in committee.

First, under my amendment all numbers in the bill now add up. Funds for the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1995 total the $950 million which the Clinton administration states is its planning number for these programs for fiscal year 1995. The amendment permits the administration's technology investment program to go forward, but it just as clearly states that these programs will not be given unlimited resources.

Second, the priorities under my amendment are clear. Specific portions of the $950 million are allocated to the Technology Administration, to the internal programs of NIST, to NIST construction activities, and to the external programs of NIST. This makes it clear that the committee expects growth in the external programs not to be at the expense of internal programs.

Finally, my amendment does not force the administration into making premature decisions as to which of the external programs it chooses to support within the $536 million authorized for these programs in fiscal year 1995. Such decisions would be premature since the fiscal year 1995 budget process is just beginning and since the bill requires study of several of the programs before a final decision is made on whether or not to support them.

Certain authorizations in the committee's reported version are changed into program ceilings for fiscal year 1995 which emphasizes the tradeoffs that must be made within overall budget limits if the administration does choose to request funding in fiscal year 1995 for some or all of the new initiatives contained in the bill.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment which I believe achieves the proper balance between investment and fiscal restraint that we will need as we take on the competitive challenges now facing our Nation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes part of the way but not all of the way, and in a moment I will offer a substitute that, hopefully, will be accepted so we can correct the amendment and get it in the kind of shape that I think that everyone in the House should be able to support it.

The problem with the amendment that we have before us is that it still exceeds that which the administration has requested for the programs. This particular amendment proposes spending $1 billion in 1995. That is actually $88 million more than President Clinton has requested in his own planning

ceilings, and if we stick to those ceilings as a part of it, the amount of money would be more like $912 million. What I will offer in a couple of minutes is a substitute aimed at enacting what President Clinton wants to do.

It seems to me that if we want to support President Clinton's technology policy, then we ought not be playing at the edges with that technology policy. We ought to develop that on the floor which is the President's technology policy, and therefore, this amendment ought to be reflective of both the amounts of money that are anticipated to be spent for 1994 and the planning ceilings for 1995.

I think that this amendment is one that includes some things that President Clinton has not asked for, therefore raises the cost of the program, and in so doing, I think does go beyond that which President Clinton really wants to do.

□ 1300

Let us understand, President Clinton is, right now, out campaigning around the country, telling people that he is trying to save money, that he has adopted spending cuts. The fact is that one of the criticisms of him is that in addition to spending cuts he also proposed spending increases.

What happens in this particular amendment is that we not only take his spending increases and adopt them, we adopt about $88 million more than what the President wants to spend. Ultimately, it seems to me, this amendment ought to get back to the numbers that the President originally proposed, and that is what my substitute, which I will offer in a couple of minutes, will do.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 121, line 8, insert ", including the Benchmarking Program established under title IV of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980" after "Under Secretary".

Page 121, line 10, strike "$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which $2,000,000 are authorized for" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,437,000 for fiscal year 1995, including".

Page 123, line 17, insert "for the State Technology Extension Program," after "Manufacturing Technology,".

Page 123, line 22, strike "$30,035,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$33,035,000".

Page 123, line 23, through page 124, line 2, strike "$150,000,000" and all that follows through "Outreach Program;" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,603,000; and".

Page 124, lines 3 through 5, strike paragraph (2).

Page 124, line 6, strike "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

Page 124, line 6, insert ", including the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980" after "Technology Program".

Page 124, lines 7 through 19, amend subparagraphs (A) and (B) to read as follows:

(A) $199,489,000 for fiscal year 1994; and

(B) $450,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

Page 124, line 23, strike "$106,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$105,337,000".

Page 124, line 24, through page 126, line 7, strike "(e) LIMITATON.—" and all that follows through "administrative expenses." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 503. LIMITATION.

No funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 for the Civilian Technology Loan Program established under subtitle C of title III of this Act, the Civilian Technologies Development Program established under subtitle D of title III of this Act, the American workforce quality partnership program established under section 305 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, or for activities carried out under sections 212, 213, or 322 of this Act.

Page 126, lines 16 through 24, strike section 504.

Page 127, line 1, redesignate section 505 as section 5094.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but we would like to have a copy of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, I thought he had a copy. I am not attempting to hide anything here. I will explain the amendment if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued the reading of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (during the reading). Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] continue to reserve his right to object to the reading of the amendment?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment offered as a substitute, and let me explain in fairly brief detail what it is. This amendment saves $88 million by adopting President Clinton's own planning ceiling for 1995. By sticking to his ceiling we end up, it seems to me, assuring that we do not spend more money than what the President wants to spend in these areas.

The amendment does not authorize funding for six grant and loan programs in the bill that President Clinton has not requested, and Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown says that he does not want. So what we are doing in this amendment is we are taking the absolute administration position. We are saying we have programs here that the Secretary of Commerce says he does not want. We have six grant and loan programs in the bill that President Clinton has not requested. Let us cut those out, bring down the cost by $88 million within the amendment, and we end up with, instead of $1 billion of cost, we end up with $912.4 million in cost.

This is something which is really the Clinton budget amendment. All I have done here is taken precisely that which is reflected in the Clinton budget, and I am offering that on the floor. The President has been concerned, and some of the leadership in Congress has been concerned that we have a lot of gridlock going on in the Congress. Here is a case where a Republican is attempting to give the President precisely what the President has asked for. This should not be a cause for gridlock. This is an attempt to give the President exactly those numbers that he has requested in his budget document. I would ask support of Members to make H.R. 820 a more responsible bill by putting the President's own spending numbers into the legislation.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The funding authorized in H.R. 820 reflects the President's budget request for fiscal year 1994 and conforms to the fiscal year 1995 spending ceiling in the concurrent budget resolution that the House has already passed.

The amendment would prevent the Clinton administration from seeking and the Congress appropriating funds to carry out the President's technology investment initiative. The administration opposes the amendment.

The final budget and spending priorities for fiscal year 1995 will, of course, be set by the Congress next year in the budget and the appropriations process of fiscal year 1995. I fully recognize that funding for these programs will have to compete with other urgent priorities at that time.

Reducing further the authorization for these programs now would prejudice those priorities and preclude the Congress from even considering them. And I urge my colleagues to give President Clinton and the Congress options for making our businesses more competitive.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a moment to clarify a statement that he made?

Mr. VALENTINE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He indicates that the amendment that is before us, that he offered on behalf of the

gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], conforms with the budget documents as passed by the House for 1995. In 1995, function 370 under which these programs fall actually goes down. There is less money in account 370 in 1995 than there is this year.

I am wondering if the gentleman can tell me how this increase in spending conforms with the reduction in spending in budget account 370?

Mr. VALENTINE. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will look at appendix page 66, the total Federal funds for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the gentleman will find the answer to the question, which confirms the statement that I made.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, the problem is I have looked at the document, and what I see is that despite whatever money might flow for NIST, the fact is that the amount of money in the overall account is being reduced in fiscal year 1995. We are adding money here.

The question is where this add-on spending indeed conforms with the budget resolution?

Mr. VALENTINE. I would suggest to the gentleman that the Appropriations Committee will have something to say about that, and I refer the gentleman again to appendix page 66. And I reiterate what I said in my statement.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VALENTINE. I do not yield further.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are looking at and the dollar figures that are in there are ones that have been reviewed by the White House, and I am pleased to report that a letter dated May 19, 1993, from President Clinton has been delivered to the Speaker of the House in which President Clinton fully supports H.R. 820 and the funding levels in that bill. I think that is probably the most recent and best evidence that we have in this Chamber, and I include that letter for the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The goal of H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993, is to ensure that the United States is the foremost advanced manufacturing nation in the world. This is a goal and a commitment I share. H.R. 820's vision of a new public-private partnership to build our nation's technology base, create jobs, and improve America's competitiveness is also my vision. I am proud to be your partner in making this vision a reality.

At the heart of my economic plan is the fundamental premise that the private sector is the engine of economic growth and that through innovative partnerships with private industry the federal government can jumpstart that powerful engine and get it running smoothly again. Increased cooperation between industry and government, particularly in the area of civilian technology development, is essential to that effort.

To compete effectively in a global economy our nation must invest in our technology base and in programs that forge strong links between the private sector and the government to strengthen that technology base. H.R. 820 will create those links, help us to build our technology base, and create jobs and opportunities for all Americans. It will thus implement key elements of my economic plan and my campaign to invest in America's future.

H.R. 820 is a wise investment in our nation's future. I urge the House to pass this legislation without further amendments.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

My larger concern is that we are dealing with a question about investment which transcends some of the investments which are perhaps more debatable, and from some of our perspectives more transparent. The investment that we are talking about in this bill is one that is designed to make American industry competitive in a world economy. We are talking about a computer information age in which Japan and Western European countries are anxious to develop their supercomputer manufacturing capabilities. They are anxious to get into telecommunications in a way that dwarfs their presence in that field today, and it is incumbent upon American industry to retain its leadership in these areas.

It is very easy for us to say this is just additional spending, and I have agonized over this bill quite a bit from that perspective. But I have concluded that at this point in our Nation's economic development that a modest investment in technology, research, development and application in this area is vital to America. We cannot afford to see the tens of thousands of jobs lost in our economy that have been lost in manufacturing of televisions and high-fidelity equipment and other consumer electronic goods.

□ 1310

This has happened over a period of over 20 years, and it is a trend with which all of us are familiar. It is virtually impossible for the normal or the average consumer to find American products or products manufactured in the United States on the shelves of supermarkets and video discount stores. We cannot afford to let the communications and the computer industry slip away from us in the same fashion.

We all know, I am sure, that in the rest of the world, the industrialized world, nations do have a development strategy. We, too, have had a development strategy in this country, and we have chosen, perhaps sometimes by indirection, to emphasize the manufacture and the development and the research with respect to certain segments of our economy, and we have done magnificently in the production of defense equipment. It is time for us to recognize that we need to redirect, refocus our Nation's efforts into the nondefense sector.

I am happy to say that this bill is an attempt to do that. It is not a bill which simply lays money out. It requires matching funds from industry, and I think that hasty or last-minute attempts to make dramatic reductions here and there in the bill with the cry that someplace in an 800-page document there is an ambiguity, that the other side of the aisle would like to exploit for this purpose, is ill-advised.

Since we have a letter from the White House today, I think it is clear that this body should go on record as supporting the funding levels as currently exist in the bill.

We have the appropriations process which is yet to come. There will be ample opportunity at that time to make yet further reductions if this body feels that it is in order as a part of reconciling the deficit that we face with the economy that this country has.

But at this time I urge the body to go forward with the legislation, to reject the amendment unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania or someone else in support of that amendment can produce something from the White House that is equally as current and persuasive as the letter that we have been furnished.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed that we cannot get a dialog going on some of these issues that the majority side will not continue to yield to work out some of these problems, because it is very clear to me that there are some real problems with the funny-money numbers that are being thrown around here.

I do not have the President's budget in front of me from which the gentleman from North Carolina quoted. What I have is a copy of the budget bill that was passed by the House that the gentleman from North Carolina claims that his amendment conforms to. I have got right here a copy of a conference report, and the conference report shows that in fiscal year 1994 we are supposed to spend $16.9 billion; in 1995, it is also $16.9 billion. That figure is $100 million lower than the spending for this year, and yet under the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, we would have spending in this particular program go up by about $400 million. It is about $370 million of increase in this one account despite the fact that the overall spending is being held down or actually dropped.

Now, that is a little confusing, and then the gentleman from Minnesota

comes along and says, "Oh, well, do not worry about it. We have got a letter from the President."

Is this the same President who has been campaigning around the country telling us how he is cutting spending? The gentleman from Minnesota said he has wrestled with this bill, and he has come to the conclusion that this is an investment we have to make. Well, that is fine. All of these investments just add up to more spending, and all this gentleman was attempting to do with his amendment was say, "Let us at least stick to the numbers that the President himself has sent to us." That is all my amendment does.

My amendment says precisely those things that came up in the President's budget we ought to stick to whether or not they conform with the House budget.

I mean, I think it is pretty clear we do not conform with the House budget, so the question is whether or not we are going to stick with the President's numbers. My amendment says let us stick precisely with the President's numbers; let us not fudge around at the edges and put on a whole bunch of additional spending programs that even the President has not requested and that Secretary Brown says he does not want.

There is something awfully odd about the majority who suggest that we want to do what the President wants to do, but then because the President has not requested exactly what we want him to request, we are going to add in some additional spending to give the President more options in the future despite the fact that the Secretary of Commerce says he really does not want it, but do not worry about that, because we now have newer letters from the Secretary of Commerce and now have a letter from the President saying the President wants this program, and he does not want it modified and so on and so forth.

I mean, it is a little hard to know who to believe and when to believe them in the process. But all we are attempting to do, in my amendment, is take the number that the President said that he wants for 1995 and write that into the bill.

When the majority party opposes this amendment, they are opposing the President's own budget number. They are saying, "We ought to spend more than the President wants to spend."

The President is already increasing spending by many times where we are, and the gentleman from Texas will soon offer a freeze amendment to allow us to stay within the spending limits that are presently in law, and we may want to take a look at that.

But this amendment of mine is very modest. It says, "Give the President his due, but let us not go any further." And it seems to me that at the very least we ought to take the big-spending budget of the President and at least not add to that, at least stay within the limits that the President has defined.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding so we could clarify this, because the gentleman from North Carolina would have us believe that this conforms with the budget bill. I have the budget bill in front of me, and there is no conformance at all.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER), there were ayes 8, noes 5.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—394

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

□ 1348

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred ninety-four Members have answered to

their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Chair reminds Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 222, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

AYES—187

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Derrick
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—28

Bilbray
Brewster
Brooks
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Carr
Chapman
Conyers
Faleomavaega (AS)
Ford (TN)
Hefner
Henry
LaRocco
Leach
Manton
McCrery
Packard
Pastor
Porter
Romero-Barceló (PR)
Rowland
Sangmeister
Shaw
Slattery
Underwood (GU)
Washington
Whitten

□ 1352

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Porter for, with Mr. Sangmeister against.

Mr. PARKER and Mr. LEHMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 165 on H.R. 820 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VALENTINE:

Page 121, lines 8 through 14, strike "Under Secretary" and all that follows through "of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Under Secretary, $4,450,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995".

Page 121, line 21, strike "$240,988,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,940,000".

Page 121, line 22, strike "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,940,000".

Page 123, line 21, through page 124, line 2, strike "of this Act" and all that follows through "Outreach Program" and insert in lieu thereof "of this Act, $16,907,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995".

Page 124, line 4, strike "$3,000,000" both places it appears and insert in lieu thereof "$1,280,000".

Page 124, lines 6 through 19, strike "Technology Program" and all that follows through "Act of 1980" and insert in lieu thereof "Technology Program, $67,880,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995".

Page 124, line 23, strike "$106,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$105,000,000".

Page 124, line 24, through page 126, line 7, strike "(e) LIMITATION.—" and all that follows through "administrative expenses." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 503. LIMITATION.

No funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 for the Civilian Technology Loan Program established under subtitle C of title III of this Act, the Civilian Technologies Development Program established under subtitle D of title III of this Act, the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Development Program established under section 304 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, the Benchmarking Program established under title IV of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, competitiveness assessments and evaluations under section 101(e) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as so redesignated by section 206(b)(2) of this Act, the American workforce quality partnership program established under section 305 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, or for activities carried out under sections 212, 213, or 322 of this Act.".

Page 126, lines 16 through 24, strike section 504.

Page 127, line 1, redesignate section 505 as section 504.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. ARMEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply freezes spending for these programs at the current level. Under the Democrat bill, the spending would skyrocket from $388 million this year to $541 million in fiscal year 1994 and $1 billion in fiscal year 1995. My amendment would prevent this profligacy and save the taxpayers $800 million.

Mr. Chairman, it was just a few short weeks ago that the Democrats in this House passed a 5-year budget plan which included the largest tax increase in American history. We were told then, by the Democrat majority, that this hefty contribution on the part of hard working taxpayers was necessary to reduce the Federal budget deficit. And here they propose increasing spending on corporate giveaway programs by 158 percent.

And what does H.R. 820 do? Under this bill, the Federal Government is going to build an enormous network of technology centers so bureaucrats can show business men and women what machines to buy and how to run their businesses. And the same people who gripe about so-called junk bonds are putting Uncle Sam in the venture capital business. If you thought the S&L crisis was bad, wait until bureaucrats start making multimillion-dollar commercial loans. And finally, the Government is going to spend hundreds of millions each year picking winners and losers in the name of promoting technology.

Here is what we are saying to the taxpayers today, the Government that brought you Amtrak, the post office, the USDA, and $600 toilet seats at the Pentagon is going to teach real entrepreneurs how to beat international competition.

The reason this bill is on the floor, of course, is that the majority believes that committees here in Congress and the bureaucrats at the Commerce Department know how to run the economy. As George Will noted in a column 2 weeks ago, the liberals in Washington, DC, believe they know far more about competing in the marketplace than the undiscerning men and women who have risked their life savings to start a real business in the real world.

Well, let us take a look at what the Democrat majority has already done for business this year. It has heaped another mandate on workers and business in the form of mandated leave legislation. It has passed a budget resolution which promises business higher energy and corporate income taxes. The majority has promised the business community and the country another 5 years of huge budget deficits, which will deprive the private sector access to capital.

But we have only just begun. On the way is striker replacement and the rest of the big labor and trial lawyer agenda which will undermine America's competitiveness. The finest illustration of the economic illiteracy of the majority is this: The Democrat Party opposes indexing the capital gains tax—which lowers the cost of capital—yet supports indexing the minimum wage—which increases the cost of labor.

But the Democrats are here to help business today, they say. The party that beleaguers business with higher taxes and regulations at every opportunity now wants to help. The majority wants to promote economic growth and jobs through investment, sounding, ironically, like supply-side conservative Republicans. But as my friend Jude Wanniski says, the majority is operating on the dark side of the supply-side model—investing in government bureaucracies instead of the private sector.

So as Russia, Sweden, Mexico, France, Poland, and on and on—move away from state planning to emulate the American model of free enterprise, the majority—while paying lipservice to the market—seeks to move more and more resources from the productive private sector to the wasteful public sector.

Mr. Chairman, if my Democrat friends are genuinely interested in creating real jobs in the private sector they should consider this: Over the last 4 years, the tax and regulatory burden on small business has increased 34 percent. These small businesses create 75 percent of the new jobs in the economy. If you want to help the entrepreneur, lower his cost of capital, stop tying his hands with unnecessary red and green tape, do not raise his energy costs and corporate taxes, reform America's legal liability laws, amend antiquated antitrust laws. In short, get the government off the backs of small business.

But do not burden all businesses with massive new taxes and regulations and then give away a billion dollars to the politically well-connected. That will not make America more competitive. I would close with a quote from Adam Smith who warned us of politicians who were conceited enough to try to direct an economy. He wrote:

> The statesman who should attempt to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their capitals, would not only load himself a most unnecessary attention, but assume an authority which could safely be trusted to no council and senate whatever, and which would nowhere be so dangerous as in the hands of a man who had folly and presumption enough to fancy himself fit to exercise it.

Support the Armey freeze amendment, heed the advice of Adam Smith, save the taxpayers over $800 million, and limit the damage that will be done by this pernicious public policy.

□ 1400

I will leave you, Mr. Chairman, with one final thought: At the time you consider voting on this amendment and on final passage of this bill, could I please ask you to remember ARMEY's axiom No. 1, the markets are rational; the Government is dumb.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. We oppose the amendment. The amendment proposes funding cuts. We suggest to Members simply to make cuts. It ignores the justification and benefits of programs which are authorized in the bill. It disregards the President's budget priorities and offsetting spending cuts which are made elsewhere. The amendment would deny the President the opportunity to carry out his mandate for progressive change in this country.

The bill will implement key elements of the President's economic plan and his campaign to invest in America's future. The amendment defeats the President's opportunity to carry out his program and to assist industry in becoming more competitive.

Mr. Chairman, we strenuously oppose the gentleman's amendment. I say again, we believe it to be cuts for the sake of cuts, without any regard to the merits of the programs which would be slashed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, maybe it is time that we begin to cut some programs just for the sake of cutting them in order to get the budget in shape. But in this particular case the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] offers us another alternative, and that is to simply freeze at the level that we are now spending.

The gentleman simply says go ahead and do the programs that you want to do, but let us do it within the budget that we presently have in place.

We cannot afford to spend millions of dollars more than what we are now projecting. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] would do more to help American competitiveness with his amendment than any program in this bill will do, because he will save the taxpayers $800 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is an $800 million amendment that essentially freezes spending in place. It does not do any damage, does not cut anything, but just freezes spending.

It seems to me that that is something that we might want to consider. I realize that the President had some ideas for spending, but we just rejected the President's program. Democrats overwhelmingly voted to turn down the President's program. That was the last vote. The Democratic Party decided that the President did not have the right program, and they wanted to exceed his spending. Now we are going to come back with the idea that maybe what we ought to look at is something that really will help business, and that is to freeze spending and save $800 million.

Are there people who believe that this is probably a pretty good idea? Yes, the National Taxpayers Union and the Citizens Against Government Waste both are going to rate this vote as a key vote. The National Taxpayers Union said they are opposed to spending increases included in the bill and support efforts to cut the spending levels.

That is what this does. It will be supported by the National Taxpayers Union. The same thing is true with the Citizens Against Government Waste, who are against the increased spending levels in the bill. They want this spending frozen.

So the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is in fact doing something that both the National Taxpayers Union and the Citizens Against Government Waste endorsed, and that is freezing the amount of money in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support for this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] for his fairness and willingness to try to work out the areas in disagreement. One area in disagreement that we could not work out was that of funding.

Mr. Chairman, for the last year and a half, I have asked witness after witness, what is the lowest funding level that these programs can be operated—and still be effective?

The hearing record is silent. Some witnesses advocated funding levels for various programs—but not one indicated if this was a floor or a ceiling.

From the time this competitiveness bill was introduced in May 1992 the funding level has dropped from $2.2 billion to the current level of $1.5 billion.

I think it can be cut even further without harming the effectiveness of the programs. However, until we examine all options it is better to be fiscally sound and error on spending fewer tax dollars rather than wasting a single tax dollar.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment to cut the fiscal year 1994 and 1995 funding to the fiscal year 1993 level of $389 million for each year. This would result in a saving of over 50 percent.

I urge my colleagues to support this fiscally responsible amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House is considering the National Competitiveness Act of 1993, H.R. 820.

The legislation is directed toward enhancing manufacturing technology "that will contribute significantly to U.S. competitiveness, employment, and sustainable economic growth."

I support this goal. However, I do not believe the Department of Commerce can accomplish this goal. Only industry can improve its own competitiveness, not the Federal bureaucracy.

In fact, the citizens in the 16th Congressional District of Florida are asking for less Government bureaucracy and less Government spending.

I think that in these times of increasing deficit and decreasing funds, we need to determine funding priorities.

Is this legislation of a high enough priority to increase the national deficit by $1.5 billion?

Are the funding levels in H.R. 820, as low as possible or is there a built-in cushion that taxpayers are being asked to fund?

Will this legislation create new jobs in the private sector or will the jobs be in the Federal bureaucracy?

In answering these questions I have reached the conclusion that this legislation before us can be improved and it should be.

I think the American taxpayers demand that we cut out every extra dollar, that we strip all excess bureaucracy from programs, and that we make sure that the legislation will improve private sector competitiveness throughout the United States.

Until the legislation meets these standards, I cannot support it.

As I have said in the past, U.S. competitiveness is not a partisan issue. We should work together to develop legislation that will be supported by all sides.

I want to thank Chairman BROWN, Subcommittee Chairman VALENTINE for their willingness to work on the areas in disagreement.

I also want to thank Mr. WALKER for his interest and devotion to competitiveness solutions that could provide meaningful solutions.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think the No. 1 objective of all of the voters across America is control of our budget deficit. How in the world can we vote greatly increased funding here and keep faith with those voters who sent us here to control deficit spending, to get the debt under control?

We have enough money in this program from last year. It is going well. There is a role for the Federal Government to play, but that role is not to take more money out of the private sector, where we will lose jobs and lose wealth because of it.

The role of the Federal Government needs to play is a role where it creates a better tax environment so that there is more incentive for entrepreneurs to work. This is the wrong kind of a bill and the wrong incentive. Government should not be taking our money and trying to spend it for us. The average voter does not believe that the Government has the wisdom to do this.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the amendment. I think it is important to point out that the issue is not the deficit, but what the deficit does to our economic future.

I would disagree with my colleague who spoke previously. I think the voters are not concerned so much about the deficit number as what the deficit means for our future and the future of the economy. We need to get the deficit under control because of what it does to our current budget, as well as what it does to our economic future.

This bill attempts to do this task. The attempt by this amendment to freeze our spending priorities with those set under the prior administration completely ignores the lesson of the prior election. I think the voters are looking to us to take action with respect to our economy, to restore vigor to American manufacturing, and to make sure that we have good jobs available for our citizens.

I think the amendment would freeze those priorities in amber, but the American people instead have asked us to reexamine our priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I think the speakers on the other side of the aisle are entirely correct with regard to much of the broad substance of their message. We need to attack the deficit. We need to do it by looking critically at programs. We especially need to look at existing programs that simply do not measure up.

We have heard testimony in committee and heard argument on the floor that this bill is exactly the sort of program we need to assure people that our economy will improve, that we will build for one future, and we will turn over to our children the kind of country and economy that they must have to compete in the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, we should not freeze our priorities. We need to reorder those priorities and give the new administration flexibility to carry forward their economic initiatives. Then, I hope we will see similar vigor in cutting spending on a number of other appropriations packages that will be coming through.

Mr. Chairman, let me just remind Members that the budget resolution we passed calls for freezing all discretionary spending for the next 5 years. That is not a freeze over a baseline, that is freeze in absolute dollars.

With the budget resolution, we have done in the big picture what this amendment asks us to do in only one program. But this amendment is an attempt to micromanage this specific program, to tie the hands of the new administration with policies that I believe the voters have rejected. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

□ 1410

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Armey amendment to freeze the spending levels in this bill at the fiscal 1993 levels, which would be a small step, again, in trying to control our fiscal deficit and put some money back into the pockets of the American taxpayers.

We always hear the good arguments about spending more money. Again, in this case, we hear the arguments of Washington feeling that it can best direct business and wants more money in order to do that.

As we know, however, this Nation is facing a record deficit in 1993. Yet here we are, today, ready to authorize an increase for fiscal 1995 spending that is nearly 158 percent of the spending levels for this year.

That is an increase in spending and programs that we do not even know will improve the competitiveness of our private sector and, again, Washington believing that it can best direct success better than the private sector.

In some instances, this bill authorizes money for programs that this administration does not even want.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment in the name of the American taxpayer and to try and keep Government from assuming more control over American business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARMEY) there were—ayes 56, noes 29.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on the Valentine amendment, without intervening business or debate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there—ayes 199, noes 217, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—199

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOT VOTING—21

Bentley
Brewster
Brooks
Bryant
Carr
Chapman
Frank (MA)
Glickman
Hefner
Henry
LaRocco
Leach
Manton
McCurdy
Packard
Sabo
Sangmeister
Washington
Whitten
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 1434

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for, with Mr. Sangmeister against.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN:

Page 121, line 9, strike "$5,425,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,882,500".

Page 121, line 10, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 121, line 11, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 121, line 21, strike "$240,988,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$216,889,200".

Page 121, line 22, strike "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$270,000,000".

Page 122, line 1, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 122, line 2, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 122, line 4, strike "$9,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,100,000".

Page 122, line 5, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 122, line 7, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 122, line 8, strike "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000".

Page 123, line 22, strike "$30,035,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,031,500".

Page 123, line 23, strike "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$135,000,000".

Page 123, line 24, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 124, line 1, strike "$97,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$87,300,000".

Page 124, line 4, strike "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000".

Page 124, line 7, strike "$197,489,0000" and insert in lieu thereof "$177,740,100".

Page 124, line 8, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 124, line 13, strike "$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$405,000,000".

Page 124, line 14, strike "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000,000".

Page 124, line 16, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 124, line 22, strike "$61,686,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$55,517,400".

Page 124, line 23, strike "$106,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$95,400,000".

Page 125, line 2, strike "$950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$855,000,000".

Page 125, line 10, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 125, line 10, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 125, line 14, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 125, line 15, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 125, line 18, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 125, line 19, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 125, line 24, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 126, line 2, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 126, line 5, strike "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500,000".

Page 126, line 12, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 126, line 22, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 126, line 24, strike "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,000,000".

Mr. DUNCAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief since I have already spoken on the bill once before.

My amendment is a very simple one. It is a 10-percent across-the-board cut and it would save the American taxpayers $154.3 million over 2 years.

The last amendment we acted on just a moment ago was a freeze which would have knocked off over $800 million from the bill. This is a much lower cut. In fact, I want to emphasize that my amendment would allow for a 29.6 percent increase over current spending in fiscal year 1994.

If my 10-percent cut amendment is adopted, there will still be huge increases in this bill. This bill totals over the next 2 years, over the 2-year life of the bill a 158-percent increase as it presently stands. My amendment simply cuts 10 percent off of the bill as a whole, and that leaves a very large increase in spending in this bill.

□ 1440

But it would save $154 million. Over 2 years, this amendment allows for a 148-percent increase in spending for these programs.

This amendment is not a cut but, rather, a very, very small reduction in the authorization levels contained in this bill.

My amendment has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers' Union; in addition to that, the Citizens Against Government Waste have sent a letter endorsing the amendment and opposing the bill at its present level.

This amendment gives Members an opportunity to do more than just pay lip service to doing something about the deficit and the national debt. This gives them a chance to do something realistic.

We have been passing bill after bill that has contained huge increases. We have got to do something to bring Federal spending under control, or we are really going to hurt the poor and working people of this country.

This is a simple, straightforward amendment which would allow for a very modest decrease in overall spending on this bill of 10 percent.

I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] insist on his point of order?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, let me say that this is at least the third bite at the apple. It is a question of philosophy. It is a question of whether or not the House wants to provide opportunities for the development of technology for America's so-called middle class.

The amendment would deny the President the opportunity to carry out his mandate, the same thing I said about the preceding amendment.

The bill will implement the elements of the President's economic plan and will help him to fulfill campaign commitments.

I again urge my colleagues to support the committee and oppose this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment represents a very modest cut in the program.

We just talked about an $800 million cut. This is about a $150 million cut.

It seems to me that this is a very, very modest amendment in an attempt to get our budget under control.

I would urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 213, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—208

Allard	Goodlatte	Oxley
Andrews (TX)	Goodling	Pallone
Applegate	Goss	Parker
Archer	Grams	Paxon
Armey	Grandy	Penny
Bachus (AL)	Greenwood	Peterson (MN)
Baesler	Gunderson	Petri
Baker (CA)	Hall (OH)	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Hamilton	Porter
Ballenger	Hancock	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Poshard
Bartlett	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hefley	Quillen
Bateman	Herger	Quinn
Bentley	Hoagland	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hobson	Ravenel
Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Regula
Bliley	Hoke	Richardson
Blute	Horn	Ridge
Boehlert	Houghton	Roberts
Boehner	Huffington	Roemer
Bonilla	Hughes	Rogers
Bunning	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Hutto	Roth
Callahan	Hyde	Roukema
Calvert	Inglis	Rowland
Camp	Inhofe	Royce
Canady	Istook	Santorum
Castle	Jacobs	Sarpalius
Clement	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Coble	Kasich	Schiff
Collins (GA)	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Combest	King	Shaw
Condit	Kingston	Shays
Cooper	Klug	Shuster
Costello	Knollenberg	Skeen
Cox	Kolbe	Slattery
Crane	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Lambert	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
DeLay	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Derrick	Lehman	Snowe
Diaz-Balart	Levy	Solomon
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Dooley	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Stearns
Dornan	Linder	Stenholm
Dreier	Livingston	Stump
Duncan	Machtley	Sundquist
Dunn	Manzullo	Talent
Durbin	McCandless	Tauzin
Edwards (TX)	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Ewing	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	McInnis	Torkildsen
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Upton
Fish	McMillan	Vucanovich
Fowler	Meyers	Walker
Franks (CT)	Mica	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Weldon
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Gallo	Molinari	Young (AK)
Gekas	Montgomery	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Moorhead	Zeliff
Gillmor	Myers	Zimmer
Gilman	Nussle	
Gingrich	Orton	

NOES—213

Abercrombie	Bevill	Bryant
Ackerman	Bilbray	Byrne
Andrews (ME)	Bishop	Cantwell
Andrews (NJ)	Bonior	Cardin
Bacchus (FL)	Borski	Clay
Barcia	Boucher	Clayton
Barlow	Brooks	Clyburn
Barrett (WI)	Browder	Coleman
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Beilenson	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Berman	Brown (OH)	Conyers

Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Blackwell
Brewster
Carr
Chapman
Glickman
Hefner
Henry
Leach
Manton
McCurdy
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Packard
Sabo
Whitten

□ 1501

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the delegates have made a difference in the vote here. Does that result in an automatic revote of the issue?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Four delegates voted no. It was not a decisive vote. Those votes would not have changed the result of the vote.

Mr. WALKER. Wait a minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would advise that if the delegates had not voted, the vote would have been 208 to 209. The result would be the same. The amendment would be rejected. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEARNS. Under the rule that was passed, Mr. Chairman, it has to be closer before we revote, is that it? Because some of these people might have voted a little differently if the vote was just one or two, so I do not think we can speculate. That is why I think we should have another vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair can only base his ruling on the votes cast, and the Delegates' vote was not decisive.

Mr. STEARNS. Decisive is what, a difference of how much?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. But for the votes of the Delegates, the outcome would have been different.

Mr. STEARNS. So if we take the difference of the four, it is a separation of the two votes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Vote 208 to 209.

Mr. STEARNS. One vote, a separation of one vote is not worth another vote? It seems to me that is significant.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The result would not have been different.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, it might have been different if everyone saw there was just one vote, and if their vote was the key vote——

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair cannot speculate on that possibility.

Mr. STEARNS. Will the Chair allow me a further indulgence?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if there is a difference of one vote on the House floor, we have seen many times it go up and down because Members feel a stronger compunction or a stronger conscience on an issue.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair again cannot speculate on that possibility.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, would the Chairman consider a revote on this matter, since there was just a difference of one vote?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The vote cannot be reconsidered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the Chairman for his indulgence.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other amendments to title V?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Has the Chair just ruled that we can get a separate vote on this matter in the whole House?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment was not adopted. The amendment will not be reported to the House. It was not adopted.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I propound a further parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, can we move to rise to the full House and vote on this? Is it appropriate for me to move that we rise?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The motion to rise is in order, but it does not provoke another vote in the House.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, I mean, with the consideration that we vote in the full House on this particular issue, because I think as it stands now there is only one vote that separates us.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would state that would not be resolved in the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Tennessee were to offer exactly the same amendment, but with 9 percent instead of 10, that would be in order at this point, would it not, so that Members knowing how close it is would have an opportunity on a slightly smaller number actually to reconsider, is that not true?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would rule that a different amendment could be offered.

Mr. GINGRICH. And those Members who now know how close it was would have an opportunity to look at voting on this much closer and a slightly smaller amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would state to the minority whip that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would simply ask the Chair to keep that section of the bill open for one additional moment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is this an amendment to title V?

Mr. STEARNS. This is an amendment to move it from the 9 percent. It is the same amendment, minus $100,000.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS: Page 121, line 9, strike "$5,425,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,782,500".

Page 121, line 10, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 121, line 11, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 121, line 21, strike "$240,988,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$216,889,200".

Page 121, line 22, strike "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$270,000,000".

Page 122, line 1, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 122, line 2, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 122, line 4, strike "$9,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,100,000".

Page 122, line 5, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 122, line 7, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 122, line 8, strike "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000".

Page 123, line 22, strike "$30,035,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,031,500".

Page 123, line 23, strike "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$135,000,000".

Page 123, line 24, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 124, line 1, strike "$97,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$87,300,000".

Page 124, line 4, strike "$3,000,000" both places it appears and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000".

Page 124, line 7, strike "$197,489,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$177,740,100".

Page 124, line 8, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 124, line 13, strike "$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$405,000,000".

Page 124, line 14, strike "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000,000".

Page 124, line 16, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 124, line 22, strike "$61,686,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$55,517,400".

Page 124, line 23, strike "$106,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$95,400,000".

Page 125, line 2, strike "$950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$855,000,000".

Page 125, line 10, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 125, line 10, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 125, line 14, strike "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$900,000".

Page 125, line 15, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 125, line 18, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 125, line 19, strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000".

Page 125, line 24, strike "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,000,000".

Page 126, line 2, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 126, line 5, strike "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500,000".

Page 126, line 12, strike "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000".

Page 126, line 22, strike "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000".

Page 126, line 24, strike "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,000,000".

Mr. STEARNS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Carolina insist on his point of order?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we saw on this particular vote a very, very close vote. Once you take the nonvoting delegates out, we are within one vote of passing.

My amendment is essentially the same identical amendment, but we have put a lower percentage in it. In fact, it is not so much a percentage, but a somewhat larger cut than the previous amendment.

So the folks that voted for the Duncan amendment certainly could vote for the Stearns amendment, and I ask on that side of the aisle that they consider this amendment more favorably than the Duncan amendment, because it cuts more money, $100,000 to be exact.

So I do not need the full 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman, other than to ask the House to respectfully consider this amendment and have another vote on this.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], on whose original amendment we voted, for his comments, too, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

I appreciate the support of many Members on the other side of the aisle on my amendment. As I said earlier, my amendment was a simple, straightforward 10-percent cut that would still have left a 148-percent increase in spending on this bill under the 2-year life of this bill.

My amendment as it stood would have allowed a 30-percent increase the first year and an over-100-percent increase the second year, so it still would have left a tremendous increase in spending. It was a very modest amendment, a very straightforward amendment, a 10-percent cut that would have saved the taxpayers of this country $154,300,000.

□ 1510

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] has altered my amendment by knocking $100,000 off the first portion of my amendment, which would still result in a savings of $154,200,000. So, essentially, it is the same amendment as I offered a minute ago with a slight reduction in the cut that was offered. It would be approximately a 9.9-percent cut.

Mr. Chairman, I think if the Members of this body want to do something besides pay lipservice to cutting the deficit and cutting the national debt, this is a tremendous opportunity that should be supported by both sides of the aisle, and I urge support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, and also my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], I just have one question.

If this amendment passes, would it be the first time in the history of the 103d Congress that on the floor of the House of Representatives we actually voted to cut a program or reduce a program in spending?

Mr. Chairman, I was not clear on that matter.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague from Florida that I do not think it is the first time, in all honesty, but I would say it would set a very good precedent.

Mr. MICA. If we voted on this individually though, it will be the first cut?

Mr. STEARNS. I think the gentleman is correct. In the 103d Congress it would be.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, we are debating here, I think, not only the amendment sent forward by the gentleman, which is the fourth bite at the apple, but I suggest to my colleagues that we are now talking about open rules.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my colleagues and especially to the leadership on the Committee on Rules: "For all of the things that I thought in my heart about you because you didn't allow open rules, forgive me. I was wrong."

Mr. Chairman, this is the fifth day that we have been here struggling with this modest attempt to open up some special avenues to middle-class, business America. This is the fifth day on a bill that will cost the taxpayers of the United States over a 2-year period less than it costs to blast off one rocket into space. And to accommodate the gentlemen we have an open rule which is, as I suggested, Mr. Chairman, not an open rule, but a rule in perpetuity. They can come back now and seek to reduce the spending by $100 and ask for a vote. I suggest that it somehow seems to me to belittle the process.

Mr. Chairman, we never heard all of these arguments in subcommittee. We never heard all of these statements by these gentlemen over the year and a half that we conducted the hearings on this legislation. We never heard all of these claims and arguments when we marked up this legislation in the committee.

So do we give them another bite? Do we stay here on into the evening on the fifth day, as I said? Do we suffer them to offer amendments reducing by $100, and if that fails, $50? Where does it end, Mr. Chairman?

I implore the membership to support this committee and vote against this bad amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VALENTINE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we would not do this for $100. We would not do it for $50. All we are saying is that this was only separated by one vote, and we are saying the procedure—we could not get another vote.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman asking a question or making another speech?

Mr. STEARNS. I am just saying that we are just trying to get another vote, something clear, and the gentleman can see from the minority standpoint that there is a possibility we might win this.

So, I respect what the gentleman is saying——

Mr. VALENTINE. If we have another vote, then it is two votes.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, I think we have got an opportunity here to make a point, and we are not just doing this for $100, but something that we think is important.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman asking me a question or is he making a statement? I am trying to answer.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I am just answering the gentleman's statement. That is what I am doing, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] tells us it is just a little bit of money; $100,000 is more than a little bit of money. It represents three or four families' incomes in this country, all of their earnings for all of a year. That is a lot of money; $100,000 in most communities is big money. Only on the floor of Congress is $100,000 not real money.

And so I would say to the gentleman that is a fairly appropriate statement to be made with regard to this bill because the gentleman also indicated that he heard none of these arguments in the committee. Has the gentleman not read his own report? The dissenting views in his own report make most of these arguments. Most of these arguments were made by members of the committee. Most of these amendments were offered in committee. There were amendments to cut; there were amendments to do all of these kinds of things. There is no doubt that the issues raised on this floor were, in fact, issues raised in the committee, too.

So, the gentleman is doing a little bit of revisionism of history to suggest that these issues were not raised in the committee. They were. There is no doubt.

Now the reason why we are here is because the majority party on the opening day of the Congress decided to do something fairly unique, and that was to give people who do not represent real States of the Union the opportunity to vote, and the gentleman has just had an amendment, or had a process that benefited from the fact that four people voted who do not represent States, and so now the minority is saying, "Having had that situation arise, we think it's important to refocus and decide whether or not the House wants to continue in that pattern, and so this vote will not only be all about whether or not you want to cut 10 percent across the board, but also whether or not it is a good practice to have this thing decided essentially by one vote when all of the people representing the States are counted in the last vote."

So, Mr. Chairman, this is an entirely appropriate amendment, and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and hope that the House will vote to cut 10 percent across the board.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. Chairman, I share the passion that the other side of the aisle has for balancing the budget, reducing the deficit, and all of these worthy goals. The question is: We have to decide what are the priorities and expenditures that we are making as a National Government, and that means weighing one program against another.

It is very difficult to sit here with an open rule and decide that this program is less deserving than the next, and the authorization process is not the point at which that weighing actually takes place. It is in the appropriations process, and I would suggest that that is the time, if my colleagues want to, so to speak, nickel and dime on percentages the amount that goes into competitiveness legislation and technology development in this country. Then they can make that point.

I think it is also interesting to note that the legislation, that is before us today, is not some type of new tax and spend concept. This is a concept, this is a bill, that has broad support in industry.

I had the privilege this afternoon of speaking with representatives of the American Electronic Association, and they described to me the benefit that this legislation provides to small- and medium-sized businesses who are trying to upgrade their technology to improve their manufacturing processes and compete in the world economy, and they indicate that this legislation has their full support. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the National Association of Manufacturers has endorsed this legislation, and it has their full support.

□ 1520

Now, I think if we are looking to industry for guidance as to what types of programs are going to be good for our economy, that we have an indication here. Rather than to be debating the nickel and dime efforts of the sorts that we now face, we should get on to the major issue.

I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], or the Members from the other States that have been speaking in support of this amendment, if this amendment passes, does that mean they will support the bill? Or is this a dilatory tactic? I have yet to see any consistent strong support for this type of legislation to make American industry strong in a global economy come from the other side of the aisle. Instead I expect that with any of the amendments that have been proposed, it would still be an unacceptable bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a tragedy of the proceedings that we have had today and the previous days on H.R. 820.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] mentioned previously that the place to start trying to cut these expenditures is in the appropriations process and not to worry about the authorization process.

The fact of the matter is, with all due respect, that much of the things authorized around this place end up being appropriated and it costs the taxpayers money.

Now, I have been informed that this piece of legislation is $200 million over last year and it is going to be $1 billion next year, and this amendment would save $150 million.

Now, most people in this country are very concerned about the deficit and the national debt. We are facing a $4.35 trillion national debt and the interest on that debt is one of the largest items in the budget, and we are facing a $350 billion to $400 billion deficit this year.

So when you have an authorization bill like this one that is increasing spending over the next 2, 3, or 4 years by $700 million, that causes a lot of consternation among American citizens and taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman said that the National Association of Manufacturers is for this bill. We understand that they are having second thoughts about some of the provisions in it.

The National Taxpayers Union, which rates all the votes in the Congress, is adamantly opposed to this and

it will be rated against those Members who vote in favor of it.

So let me just say to my colleagues, if you are really concerned about the people of this country, if you are really concerned about the debt, if you are really concerned about the deficit, then I think that you ought to start, even on authorization bills, voting for amendments that will cut spending, and not continue to raise the spending levels ever upward.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, my comment with respect to the authorization versus the appropriations process, I would like to make sure is not misconstrued. I would like to emphasize to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that I am not saying that we should act irresponsibly in the authorization process. But instead, we have to rank competing pieces of legislation and competing demands on the Federal treasury, and it is very difficult while we are examining one bill to rank its relevance compared to something else.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, this is a $700 million increase in spending authorization. It is too much. The American people do not want more spending. They do not want more taxes. We are talking about raising taxes and fees by $402 billion, and we are not even talking about spending cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this is a $700 million spending increase authorization, and it should be cut. Before we even talk about taxes and President Clinton's spending proposals around this place, we ought to cut spending. Not increase taxes; cut spending. Here is a good place to start.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage in a brief dialogue with the sponsor of the amendment. Is it true that this bill saves the American taxpayers $100,000?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will yield, no, that is not true. It saves $150 million.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the cut before the last, this amendment over the last amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Over the Duncan amendment. This is identical to the Duncan amendment, with that change.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, it saves the American taxpayers $100,000.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, $100,000 more is saved. It is still over $150 million in savings on this amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] aware that if we divided this sum by 240 million Americans, not all of whom are taxpayers, we are saving them one-half of one penny each, .005 cents, over the previous bill that was also defeated.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we are saving $154 million on this amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. As compared to the amendment that was previously defeated, the gentleman is saving the American taxpayer one-half of one penny per person in this country.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must understand the whole focus of this revote is because we lost by one. We think with the delegates voting that we should have an opportunity to have another vote, because some Members missed the vote on our side. They do not realize that we could have won this. So the Chair was very kind to consider this amendment, and we appreciate it.

The real question is, do we want to save $154 million here in the House today. The National Taxpayers Union and the Peter Grace Commission have all endorsed this amendment, and they are going to use it as part of their rating system. So they think it is important.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for clarifying it. I was under the misconception the gentleman was trying to save the taxpayers $100,000. What the gentleman is trying to do is get a different count on the vote.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think we are trying to win the vote for $154 million for the taxpayers. Yes, that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman is trying to get a recount.

Mr. STEARNS. We are trying to save $154 million by winning this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the answer that the gentleman gave before is pretty obvious.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 2 minutes remaining.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctant to rise and speak on this because a part of our problem is we are speaking too much on amendments that are going to delay this to a time when the Members are going to be very unhappy, and I am contributing to it by speaking on it.

Mr. Chairman, I do wish to make some points that have already been made. I sought an open rule on this bill, and I now regret it. I do so because I think the principle of having an open rule is being deliberately flouted here and it is not going to be possible for me to continue to request open rules because I will not get them.

In addition to that, I think the gentleman on this side, in connection with this amendment, it verges on the dilatory. In other words, the gentleman is posing an amendment solely for the purpose of getting a second vote on an amendment that was just defeated. Of course, the gentleman feels very justified in doing this because of the situation with regard to the delegate votes. In other words, the gentleman has brought up another issue here, his objection to the rule that allows delegates to vote.

Mr. Chairman, we have had in addition amendments here that have brought up every other kind of extraneous specter to this bill. We have had suggestions that this bill verges on state planning, for example. That while those state planning countries, such as Russia and Poland, are moving back to free enterprise, we are moving back in the direction of state planning.

□ 1530

We have had suggestions here that this is picking winners and losers, arguments that we have gone over many times before. These are code words. These are words intended to imply that there is something un-American about this bill. And there are Members here who feel that it is un-American, despite the fact that the legislation here comes from recommendations made by every council in critical technologies, on competitiveness, appointed by the previous administration. And we are merely expanding upon programs which were laid by the Republican administration before.

I would venture to predict that if Bush had been reelected, he would have been recommending a bill very similar to this. But because it is a Democratic bill, it is the representation of a philosophy expressed by the Democratic President, when he was running, there are those of my colleagues on that side who will object to it under any circumstances.

I venture to predict that every one of those of my colleagues who have offered amendments, if those amendments had succeeded, they would still have voted against the bill. And I am beginning to resent their use of these tactics on this floor.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Is it not true that basically when your party loses a vote in the Committee of the Whole, we vote again in the full House? That has happened many times. Is that not true?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, our party on this side uses the

rules of the House, and they are enforced uniformly. If we want to have a second vote in the House, we ask for it under the rules. The gentleman can do the same thing, or he can put it in his motion to recommit. The rules do not prohibit him from doing that.

I say to the gentleman, you are engaging in dilatory tactics.

I would point out that when President Reagan was elected, he came in with a program which called for doubling the expenditures of the Defense Department. This was considered to be a matter of national defense, and we went along with that doubling, also with the tax reduction, which created a $3 trillion deficit in addition to what we already had.

We have today another type of security threat. It is an economic security threat.

This President proposes to meet that security threat by a very modest program, supported by industry, supported by every branch of the high technology industry in this country, which is aimed at making us economically competitive again.

You are nit-picking it to death. You are giving it the death of a thousand cuts.

I could think of more colorful adjectives, but I will not. But I think this is a prostitution of the rules of this House and the processes that we set up to protect the minority.

I urge you to think about that very carefully.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

We appreciate the open rule. We do not think that this is abusing it in any way, and I have great respect for my colleague.

This is talking about a vote, again, in the Committee of the Whole, which we could not get in the full House. And I asked the chairman if we could get it.

He said we could not. The gentleman knows, his party, again and again, when they lose in the Committee of the Whole, they go to the full House and they have this vote again. So we are just asking for a chance, when there is only a separation of one vote, is it possible that we could get our Republican colleagues, who missed it, to come down and maybe we could, for the American taxpayers, save $154 million.

That is the issue. There is nothing else. Shall we save $154 million. It is not a question of the gentleman believing in industrial policy. The Republican Party, I believe, does not believe in solving the problem through a Government industrial process which decides winners. We can save money here.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, first of all, apparently misunderstands the rules.

The rules did not allow him and would not allow me, as a member of the majority party, if I were unhappy with the vote in the Committee of the Whole, to ask that the Committee rise and then have another vote. The rules do not permit that for either party.

We could, however, when we complete the work in the Committee of the Whole, offer a motion to recommit. The Republicans have control of that, which they chose not to do that.

That is a problem that the gentleman should not raise because the rules apply to both of us equally in that regard.

His other point, that this is really highly significant because it proposes to save $154 million, his amendment does not save anything.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I just say to my colleagues, the National Taxpayers and the Citizens Against Government Waste do not agree. They think it saves the taxpayers money. So instead of us discussing it, I think we should just move to a vote.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this is with regard to the gentleman's point about saving this amount of money. The reason that I said that this verges on the dilatory, first of all, it does not save any money. But if the gentleman is unhappy at any time with an amendment, for example, that loses and cuts 10 percent and he wants to come back with 9 percent and then 8 percent and then 7 percent, which is what this verges on doing, he is just being dilatory.

I hope that he will not get himself into that position.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the issue to this Member is threefold: first, to cut spending; second, to eliminate the Delegate vote by bringing it to the whole House, which is unfair, they should not be voting in the first place on a bill like this; third, what is the priority? It is not nit picking to cut $700 million to save the taxpayers.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take all of my time. I think on my side there will not be any more talks on this particular amendment.

I would just say to the gentleman from California, chairman of the committee, a couple of observations.

First, I believe with the exception of this amendment, virtually every amendment has been a serious amendment that many, I think many of which have been raised in the committee. They were brought to the floor by serious Members.

I think almost half the amendments, in fact, have been brought by Democrats. And I believe nine have been accepted by the committee, if I remember correctly.

Second, I believe it has taken this long to deal with the bill because the leadership of the House pulled this bill in several days, when otherwise it might have been concluded. That was a function of the scheduling of the leadership, not of the committee or our side.

Third, I agree with the gentleman. This particular procedure is not something I would normally recommend. And I do not.

Certainly, on our side, we were grateful to the gentleman's leadership in being the first chairman to ask for an open rule. We thought it was the right thing to do for the House. We do not intend to abuse it, and I would not want the gentleman to leave the floor today without knowing that we appreciate the way he approached this bill and that we hope it is part of the future.

I would say to the gentleman, I do believe psychologically, when the Delegates get to cast votes that do not count and a Member walks on the floor of the House and we see a 4 or 5 extra vote margin instead of seeing a vote that is 197 to 196, we see a vote that is 202 to 196, there is a propensity for Members to not realize that their single vote could change the outcome.

And I think the only point we were trying to make by coming back with this essentially same amendment was to say to the Members of the House and the country that there is something inherently wrong with Delegates, who by law cannot have their vote count, and that was the, remember, the one binding decision of the judge was, he said, since they do not count, they can go ahead and let them vote.

But the fact is, psychologically, on a vote, they give the side they are on an appearance of being five votes stronger than it actually is.

So when we got down to the last minute and a half of this vote, I came back to the floor, because I suddenly realized by deducting four or five votes it was a much closer vote than I thought it was. And as the whip, I keep a pretty good count.

So I would beg the Chairman's understanding, but for those of us who do not have the five votes that are not real but that are real on the board, even though they are not real in counting, that we are trying to make the point to the House that there is something fundamentally wrong about looking up here at the board and seeing votes that

do not count be counted so that when a Member is making a decision it looks like the margin is wider than, in fact, it actually is.

When we get down to a one-vote margin, which might have changed had Members been a little more careful because they might have been the difference. And I would say that $150 million in authorization here and $150 million there is, in fact, a nontrivial decision for the House and is one which, in the past, we might well have wrestled over, depending on what the issue is.

□ 1540

I do appreciate the gentleman's statesmanship in asking for an open rule, and I would say, with the exception of this single amendment, I would hope that the gentleman would agree that that was a serious effort to offer serious amendments.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a high respect for the gentleman from Georgia, as I do for the other colleagues there on the other side. I go out of my way to be accommodating to the Members in every case that I can. However, we all have limits. I am beginning to reach a limit here. I want the Members to understand that.

I try not to let this interfere with the cool, dispassionate way in which I usually deal with things, but it is getting to that point. If it were not for the honor of being the vehicle by which the gentleman is contesting the rules allowing Delegates to vote, I would wish it was on somebody else's bill rather than ours, but the gentleman has that right under the rules and I am not going to object to the procedures that he is using.

I am trying to point out, however, that there is a larger purpose involved here, and we verge on threatening the comity and the purpose of achieving legislative results when we go too far.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my dear friend that he does bear this with honor. I think we will finish this bill this afternoon. We appreciate his approach. Maybe at some point we could let Delegates vote at the end, instead of changing the appearance of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEARNS) there were—ayes 42, noes 48.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—203

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—9

Blackwell
Brewster
Hefner
Henry
Leach
Manton
McCurdy
Packard
Synar

□ 1603

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for, with Mr. Synar against.

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

Messrs. MCMILLAN, HOAGLAND, and LAUGHLIN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

Page 127, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 507. COORDINATION WITH BUDGET PROCESS.

Amounts authorized under this Act may be appropriated only to the extent consistent with the levels established in a congression-

ally adopted concurrent resolution on the budget for the appropriate fiscal year.

Redesignate table of contents accordingly.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on H.R. 820 and all amendments thereto conclude by 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, do I understand that we are going to permit two Members, who were skipped by in title III, to go back, by unanimous consent, and pick up those amendments as well, as a part of the time limitation? Is that correct? That would be titles III and IV.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], those amendments which we have copies of and which were amendments to title III?

Mr. WALKER. Title III and title IV.

Mr. VALENTINE. If the gentleman will yield further, those two, yes. If the gentleman will agree to my unanimous-consent request, then we will agree that those amendments may be offered by those gentlemen.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman also agree to support this amendment, and we could save another 15 minutes maybe?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like very much to accommodate the gentleman, but that is not included in the agreement.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the National Competitiveness Act of 1993 to require appropriated funding for programs in this bill to be in compliance with the conference report of the concurrent resolution of the budget, as adopted by this Chamber.

As a member of both the Budget Committee and the Science, Space and Technology Committee, I find it disturbing that funding levels approved in the budget resolution are not binding throughout the budget process. Simply titled, "Coordination with Budget Process," my amendment would require amounts appropriated for programs under H.R. 820 to be consistent with amounts established under the budget resolution.

This amendment does not require reductions to H.R. 820; it requires appropriators to live within the function 370 allocation provided under the budget resolution.

H.R. 820 programs are funded under function 370, the Commerce and Housing Credit category. Discretionary budget authority for all commerce and housing credit programs is $3.3 billion under the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. This is a reduction of $100 million from the fiscal year 1993 discretionary total of $3.4 billion for this function.

At the same time function 370 is reduced, H.R. 820 increases spending from $388 million in fiscal year 1993 to $540 million in fiscal year 1994. It also provides for funding of over $1 billion in fiscal year 1995.

The percentage of function 370 resources used for H.R. 820 programs would increase from 11 to 30 percent in just 2 years.

While the President has requested and the committee has provided increases for programs under H.R. 820, let's agree not to exceed budget resolution funding levels.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with the budget resolution, and I believe the amounts authorized under H.R. 820 are in excess of what we can afford, I ask that this Chamber agree to limit appropriations for programs under H.R. 820 to the extent provided for under the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the budget resolution, it claimed to be for deficit reduction.

This is a vote on whether Congress is willing to live within the budget resolution by making it part of this law.

Let's agree we will spend no more than the funding levels provided under the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this House pass the coordination with budget process amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have just finished serving my sentence on the Committee on the Budget for 6 years, and it was my experience on that committee that we rarely, if ever, in the budget resolution provided specific amounts for specific line items. The budget resolution was confined to functions, as the gentleman has acknowledged, and I am concerned that his amendment suggests otherwise and suggests that the budget resolution is somehow going to have to specify how much money will be for this program.

Would the gentleman answer that?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes, sir. The budget resolution appropriates money for the 370 function area. Eleven percent of the 370 function area goes within the parameters of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology in this particular amendment. All this amendment says is that we will live within the bounds of that 370 function. It does not specify, and the Committee on the Budget does not specify, how much goes to each separate committee. I think that is a change we need to consider in the budget process, because the propensity to overspend now, as we all know, is significant.

The fact is that all we are saying to the appropriators is that they live within the boundaries of what was passed by this Congress in the budget resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not quarrel with the gentleman's suggestion. It is worthy of debate and merit. I just wonder if this is the right place to be raising the issue. I think the gentleman is calling for a change in the budget resolution so there would be more specificity in allocation.

□ 1610

As it stands now, the Appropriations Committee that I serve on—and every other appropriations committee—is bound by the budget resolution in terms of how much we can spend in each function. That is already in the law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, on both sides of the aisle, there is a yellow sheet of paper. The amendment is very simple. It simply states that the amounts authorized under this act may not exceed what is authorized in the budget resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is raising a very legitimate question. I think it deserves to be answered.

I do think what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is proposing to do probably does fit here. It appears, our interpretation of this is that what the gentleman would do is give an additional point of order on the appropriation bill that exceeded the 370 account. As it is right now, if the gentleman's amendment were not adopted, a point of order might not exist should the subcommittee go over the 370 account based upon spending in this bill.

What the gentleman is doing is establishing a secondary point of order that would exist based upon this legislation on any appropriated amount that would go over the budget resolution, and as far as we know, that is entirely within the bounds—it does not require a change in the budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 1½ additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Again let me remind my colleagues that we are

facing the situation where the recommendations of the President have been less for the 370 function area. So, for 1994, the actual budget as approved through the budget resolution process is $100 million less in 1994 than it was in 1993. This particular budget actually increases its share of the total 370 function authorization by $150 million. So, we are faced with a situation where this competitiveness bill is using a larger share of the 370 function budget, and this simply puts it into absolute law that what this body wants to do is hold the line at least within the parameters of the budget resolution.

When we passed that resolution, we all agreed we wanted some spending cuts. This simply would put it in law that we are going to at least, at the very least, live within the guidance of that budget resolution.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would have the Budget Committee, on which I serve, set spending levels for specific programs, something it does not do now. I understand his desire to control spending and agree with the principle that Congress should stay within budget. But his amendment is misdirected.

The Budget Committee budgets by function. At best the committee makes only assumptions about where reductions may be made or new spending allocated. The amendment unnecessarily broadens the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee, and does so at the expense of the authorizing and appropriating committees.

Mr. Chairman, I support stronger budget enforcement and will gladly work with the gentleman on effective spending restraints. But this House should agree that good order dictates that the issue of committee jurisdictions should be taken up in measures on the organization of Congress and not in an amendment to a bill dealing with our Nation's industrial development. For that reason, if no other, I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to do so, as well.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I was hoping to engage the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], if I may.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the budget resolution sets out broad categories, function 370 for example, which we are discussing, as well as function 250, which is involved in this bill as well, but that the individual programs are left up to the expertise of the authorizing committees. What this amendment would do would be to require the Budget Committee, it appears, to develop substantive expertise with respect to all these programs rather than letting the committees retain that expertise and make those individual program breakdowns.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROWDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is absolutely right. There are a lot of us who think that we have that expertise, but I do not think we have that possibility under the current constraints. I believe what this would require us on the Budget Committee to do, since we have already passed the budget resolution, it would require us to come back and restate that.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Reclaiming my time, that point is exactly what I was wondering about, how this amendment might work for fiscal 1994. The Budget Committee and the House have both concluded consideration of the budget resolution without dealing with the individual programs.

Mr. BROWDER. If the gentleman would yield further, the gentleman is right. The budget resolution does not specify how much funding these programs under this bill would get. It sets funding levels for broad budget functions, but does not deal with this particular set of activities. I do not know how we would come back, after having just passed the budget resolution, and redo this.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Reclaiming my time for one final question: It appears, under current law and procedures, a point of order lies should the appropriation for any of these programs exceed the ceilings set in the budget resolution.

I heard the gentleman on the other side of the aisle say that all this would do would be to give an extra point of order. But a point of order already lies. What the amendment essentially would do in that case would be duplicative.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I leave the gentleman from Arizona to answer his own question.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. A point of order already exists; I am not exactly sure what this amendment would do. A point of order already exists, and I fail to see how the legislation would help.

The point I would like to make is that this bill does fit within the ceilings set in function codes set by the Budget Committee. This bill attempts to reorder priorities within those functions set by the budget resolution. This bill takes the expertise of the authorizing committees to set priorities for the various programs. We should not expect the Budget Committee, particularly with the speed that it must deal with the budget each spring, to develop the expertise to go program by program setting individual program funding levels.

I think the amendment is offered in a good attempt toward a laudable goal, but the better idea is for us to keep within the broad budget caps and then have the individual programs fit within that overall cap. I think that is the intent of this bill, and I think the amendment truly does not serve that purpose.

Mr. BROWDER. If the gentleman would yield for one final comment: This bill is already consistent with the budget resolution, and this amendment is inconsistent with the budget process and would selectively alter that budget process.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been an awful lot of overinterpretation of the amendment. The amendment does none of the things the gentleman just talked about, requiring the Budget Committee to go into specificity. There is nothing in the amendment that even presupposes that.

All the amendment does is fixes another point of order that could be raised on the floor in budget item 370 if it were exceeded. As it is right now, the Budget Act is routinely waived on the floor. So, the point of order to which the gentleman just referred are usually routinely waived on appropriation bills. So that is something which is not usually operative.

What this does is sets up another point of order that could be used should function 370 be exceeded. That is all it does. It does not say to the Budget Committee, "You have to get into specifics." it simply sets up one more point of order that could be waived with regard to function 370.

Why is that important in the bill? I simply have to disagree strongly with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] said, that this is inconsistent with the present Budget Act. If you take a look at what is being done in the Budget Act, what you find is that the Budget Act is dropping significantly in function 370. At the same time, this bill is taking a share of function 370 devoted to those programs from 11 percent to 30 percent in just 2 years.

Now, if in fact you are doing that, I do not see how the appropriators can possibly do their job.

I mean, you have given the appropriators almost an impossible task by suggesting to them that in the commerce and housing account they can in fact accommodate a massive increase in this one program in 2 years and at the same time fulfill all the needs we have in commerce and housing over the next couple of years.

□ 1620

That is inconsistent with the budget resolution. The budgeteers decided that this is an account that should actually

drop. This is a place where we are bringing down the spending, yet this bill proposes an increase from 11 to 30 percent. That is entirely inconsistent.

So what occurs to us is that appropriators caught in this bind may well have to exceed the budget numbers in function 370.

All the gentleman from Michigan is suggesting is should that happen, the House should have an additional point of order available to it. That is the only effect of this amendment is to ensure that there is one more point of order that lies against spending that may exceed the caps agreed to in the budget function.

I would suggest it is an entirely reasonable amendment and should be supported.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to recognize that all this particular amendment serves to do is to require that the bill, H.R. 820, will stay within the amount that was set up within function 370. Function 370 has been allocated $3.3 billion for fiscal year 1994. It is a reduction of $100 million from fiscal year 1993 which had a total discretionary amount in function 370 of $3.4 billion.

The purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is to require that we do not go over the total amount that has been allocated in function 370.

The whole point of this is does the budget resolution have meaning or not? If it has meaning, then we ought to stay within function 370. We ought to stay at the $3.4 billion. We will hassle it out in the Appropriations Committee with respect to whether it goes to the Housing Credit Programs, the Commerce Programs, the Science, Space, and Technology H.R. 820 bill, but are we going to stay within that budget resolution or not? We voted for it. We passed it in this House. That is really what it boils down to.

If we are not going to do that, if we are going to waive the budget resolution when we come to appropriating the funds in this, then it really points up the sham of the whole budget resolution process.

I would suggest that if we are not willing to pass this simple amendment that would create a point of order later, then we really do not take seriously the budget process at all, and that is why I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, with great reluctance, I rise to oppose the amendment. I recognize, as others have, that the effort of the gentleman is again to provide fiscal restraint, but let me try to give you a perspective on this.

This amendment on this bill, unless it is applied to every bill, will in effect be a nonentity. This has to be done in such a way it applies to all authorizing legislation.

Second, I honestly do not think that this amendment can function. You already can raise a point of order on an appropriations bill if it exceeds the budget process, if it exceeds the budget resolution, or if it exceeds the allocation process within the authorizing committee.

In order to have an effective point of order against an authorization bill, it would require, as several of the previous members of the Budget Committee have indicated, that the Budget Committee put into their resolution a level of specificity below the present system of functions, like function 370. They would have to specify within section 370 the details that would coincide with the legislation, and that in effect means the Budget Committee not only would be constraining the Appropriations Committee process, which it does now, but it would be constraining the authorizing process and would in effect become an authorizing committee.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio. Perhaps he can clarify what he intends to do with this amendment.

Mr. HOKE. What I think I hear the Honorable Chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, saying is that this amendment might not do any good, but it does not do any harm. If we consider that it might bring us a little closer to fiscal responsibility by directing that we do not appropriate in function 370 to a greater extent than was authorized in the budget resolution, then it very well might do some good, and I hope we can move in that direction.

I am concerned, as I am sure the chairman is, that we have been somewhat fiscally irresponsible as we proceeded to increase spending and increase our deficit and debt in this country.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I note the presence of one of the distinguished subcommittee chairmen on appropriations. I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], if he does not mind. I think he probably minds.

The question that I would pose to any member of the Appropriations Committee is, Can you appropriate today in your appropriations bill an amount which exceeds the amount contained in the budget resolution?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If it exceeds the 602 allocation that we report to the House, then it is subject to a point of order on the floor.

Mr. BROWN of California. If it exceeds the 602 allocation?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman's answer that you cannot exceed the amount in the budget resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No. From the big pot in the budget resolution, we get an allocation under 602. Then we cannot only exceed the budget resolution, we also cannot exceed that our 602.

Mr. BROWN of California. So you have two checks within the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of California. The Appropriations Committee cannot appropriate more than is in the budget, nor can you appropriate more than is in your 602 allocation?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am also on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Chairman SMITH is absolutely right, but as the chairman knows, and this House knows, we waive the budget resolution and points of order against what the chairman brings up all the time in this House, so that we can spend over what the budget allows.

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes. This gentleman is also aware of that, but let me point out that there is nothing in this language that would preclude this from being waived just as well.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The one concern we have here is that when we start talking about violating the 602(b) allocation, the chairman of the subcommittee is absolutely right.

The problem is that 602(b)'s can be entirely different from the 602(a)'s, which merely reflect what the budget resolution says. The Appropriations Committee on its own can reallocate.

The gentleman's amendment would go to that question. In other words, if there were a change over the budget allocation——

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania so that he may continue.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The point I am making is that it would enforce the budget resolution

from some dramatic changes over the budget resolution that might take place within the Appropriations Committee. That would be the real function of this point of order versus the 602(b) point of order.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania can conceive of a useful purpose for this amendment, as the author undoubtedly conceives it. Of course, their argument is, well, it is not harmful, so why do we not pass it.

Let me say that normally I can buy an argument like that, but this amendment really leaves me confused, because I do not think I would understand the relative position of our committee as an authorizing committee or the Appropriations Committee or the Budget Committee. I do not want to add to the confusion around this establishment. There is too much already.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 228, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—192

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meehan
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Becerra
Bentley
Brewster
English (OK)
Faleomavaega (AS)
Gingrich
Hefner
Henry
Houghton
Leach
Manton
Packard
Rush
Sisisky
Synar
Waxman
Wilson

□ 1650

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for; with Mrs. Synar against.

Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. KREIDLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BAESLER, JOHNSON of South Dakota, and HOAGLAND changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 169 on H.R. 820 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer 2 amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DELAY:

Page 109, line 14, through page 117, line 10, strike section 407.

Page 117, lines 11 and 18, redesignate sections 408 and 409 as sections 407 and 408, respectively.

Page 118, line 4, redesignate section 401 as section 409.

Page 119, line 18, redesignate section 411 as section 410.

Page 3, strike the item in the table of contents relating to section 407.

Pages 3 and 4, in the table of contents, strike "408" and insert in lieu thereof "407"; strike "409" and insert in lieu thereof "408"; strike "410" and insert in lieu thereof "409"; and strike "411" and insert in lieu thereof "410".

Page 125, line 15, insert "and" after "fiscal year 1995;".

Page 125, lines 19 and 20, strike "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 125, lines 21 through 24, strike paragraph (4).

Mr. DELAY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc and that we reopen title IV so I may offer my amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, title IV will be reopened for the offering of these amendments.

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 820 authorizes $50 million in fiscal year 1995 to fund a new grant program at the Department of Commerce for American work force quality partnerships—these would be partnerships between industry and higher education institutions to train and educate employees. My amendment would strike this program.

Before I begin, let me remind my colleagues that I am a businessman. It is no revelation to me that in a fast-paced, high-technology marketplace, employee training and education are critical to the success of any business. Not only does employee training and education improve the efficiency of the work force, and therefore, increase profits, it boosts employee moral.

That having been said, let me further remind my colleagues that noble intentions, while necessary, are seldom sufficient on their own to make a good law or to fashion programs that spend taxpayer dollars effectively. Private sector employers clearly recognize worker training as critical to their ability to compete. The private sector spends between $30 to $44 billion each year on worker training and education programs. A survey by the National Association of Manufacturers showed that virtually every business surveyed was doing something to improve the quality of its work force.

The program we are debating today would not make worker training more prevalent; it would simply provide a subsidy to a few of the businesses already engaged in it—a subsidy, I might add, that comes on top of the tax incentives we already provide.

Nevertheless, to the extent that some believe there may be a certain role for Government to play in worker retraining, there are several avenues other than creating yet another tax dollar spending program.

The General Accounting Office reports that there are already 125 Federal job training programs spread out through 14 Federal departments and agencies. These programs spent $16.3 billion on various forms of worker reeducation in 1991. These figures do not include State and local government programs. The GAO reports:

> This myriad of programs creates the potential for overlapping services and confusion on the part of local service providers and individuals seeking assistance. Although multiple programs are an acknowledged problem, many barriers exist to effective program coordination or the integration of program services, such as varying target group definitions, differing administrative rules, and competition between programs.

Surely, we don't need to create yet another new training program—through the Department of Commerce this time—that would be duplicative of existing training programs under the: Job Training Partnership Act, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, the Adult Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, the Even Start Program, and the Job Opportunity and Basic Skills Program.

More assistance is provided through the Department of Labor through the National Advisory Commission on Work-Based Learning and the Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, not to mention subsidies through the tax system in the form of credits for employer training of workers.

Even in this time of budgetary crisis, the authors of this proposal would rather buy a brand new program, rather than going back into the closet and fixing one of the 125 programs we bought in the past.

Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, testified in front of the Science Committee that while he agreed that the Department of Commerce has a substantial stake in the quality of the work force, he would like to study the situation further. He asked the committee to reserve judgment on this program pending further administration review.

Acting general counsel at the Department of Commerce, Carol Darr, followed up the Secretary's comments by rejecting outright the proposed training program. In a letter to the Science Committee she writes and I quote:

> Although the Administration supports the goals of section [407], we do not believe that establishing a new grant program for American workforce partnerships in FY 94 is appropriate, given fiscal constraints and the need to prioritize investments.

While the committee didn't fund the program in 1994, the fiscal situation for 1995 is no different; it should not be funded in 1995 either.

One of the biggest flaws of this program is the power it gives to Federal bureaucrats to determine which businesses have developed the best workforce quality partnership programs. My experience with bureaucracy is that they are not up to this task and shouldn't be in the business of picking winners and losers, and that's exactly what this grant program allows them to do.

Further, there is no question in my mind that this grant program will end up as so many Federal programs that dole out Federal dollars—opportunities for those who know the ropes to harness the pork. I fail to see how such a program will enhance the competitiveness of our Nation's businesses.

Mr. Chairman, this new Federal grant program adds needlessly to our burgeoning deficit and will not enhance the competitiveness of our Nation's businesses. Moreover, we already have 125 programs in place with a budget of $16.3 billion to which we can turn to accomplish any goal that we think too important to ignore. We don't need another program. If there's retraining to do it's on those Members of Congress who just can't say no to spending money when they like an idea.

I urge my colleagues to heed the recommendation of Secretary Brown and remove this program from the bill, voting "yes" on this amendment.

□ 1700

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the battle of the letters, and concerning what Secretary Brown and what some general counsel or somebody else who purports to speak for the administration might say about the legislation, let me say to the gentleman on the other side, and to especially my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], that I hold in my hand a letter dated today from the President of the United States wherein he states that H.R. 820, that is the bill we are talking about, the bill which the gentleman seeks to amend, he says;

> It is a wise investment in our Nation's future. I urge the House to pass the legislation without further amendments.

We have copies of these letters. We will be happy to make them available to the gentleman. They supersede anything that the gentleman might have read from in debate.

Mr. Chairman, this is yet another amendment which pretends that there is no problem or crisis, which pretends that America needs to do nothing else with respect to worker training. The amendment would strike provisions of the bill which establish a cost-sharing worker training program.

The Competitiveness Policy Council, in a recent report to the President and to the Congress entitled "A Competitiveness Strategy for America," stated, and I quote;

> Investment in American workers is central to restoring the Nation's competitive position.

The report, Mr. Chairman, goes on to say that—

> 20 percent of our adults are functionally illiterate, compared with only 1 percent in Japan. Four in ten business executives say that they cannot modernize their businesses, their equipment, because their workers do not have the appropriate skills. Only one in five firms believes that high school graduates can write adequately, while more than two-thirds consider their reading and arithmetic skills substandard.

The ability of some Japanese firms to introduce flexible manufacturing systems twice as fast as American firms may stem from their having four times as many workers trained on numerically controlled machines. All of our foreign competitors spend four to five times as much as the United States on worker training.

The rapid rise of Pacific rim exports is contributing to increased joblessness and lower wages in the United States. The bottom line is simple. If we want a higher standard of living, we will have to earn it by improving the education and training of our work force.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we have attempted to do, and this is what oth-

ers would attempt to tear down. I respect my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY]. We came here at the same time. He is filled with many good ideas, but this is not one of them. The Department of Commerce is uniquely qualified among Federal agencies to discharge the responsibilities which are placed upon them by this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to not at this late date eviscerate our handiwork, and to vote against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment, and I plead with the Members on both sides of the aisle to understand exactly what we are doing. I happen to sit on the Committee on Education and Labor, and I agree with everything the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] just spoke about in terms of the importance of educating and training the American workers. We are in a high-technology lifelong society where we are going to need to train and retrain every American employee many times simply to keep their jobs, to say nothing of getting a new job.

The reality is, Mr. Chairman, that is the role of all of our programs presently existing primarily in the Department of Labor for training and retraining, some of them in the Department of Education when they deal with basic education, adult education, or higher education.

The fact is, according to the General Accounting Office, between these two departments we have over 125 different programs today involved in training and retraining the American worker. The fact is that we in the Committee on Education and Labor are looking at roughly, on an annual basis, something like $16 billion a year spent on training programs. We do not need, and as a matter of fact, it is a harm, to create a new program not in conjunction, not in consortium, not in connection with those already existing in the Department of Labor, but to create a program over in the Department of Commerce. That does not make any sense.

We are looking at, under the Clinton budget over the next 4 years, something like a $28 billion increase in function 500, which is education and training. Those are the programs, that is the area. If we have got problems, if we are not targeting the right people, then come to us.

Secretary of Labor Reich intends later this year to submit to the Congress a comprehensive one-stop shopping program for every American worker for assessment and training. Let us fix any problems we have there. Let us not make the Department of Commerce the education and training place. Let us not make the Department of Agriculture the next education and training department. Let us not make the Department of Defense the third education and training department.

At least the Pentagon, in all of their defense conversion dollars, contracted with the Department of Labor so that this would be done in conjunction with all of our other programs in terms of qualifying, in terms of consistency, in terms of deliverance. This does none of that. This program out of the blue says:

> We think that is an interesting area to be involved in, and so we in the Department of Commerce want to be involved as well.

I plead with the Members, whether they are Republican or Democrat, this amendment begs for consistency and efficiency in the implementation of our manpower, our employment policy programs in this country. I plead with the Members, support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY]. It makes sense. It is the right thing to do. We solve these problems elsewhere in programs today.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. His eloquence is so much to the point. I just want to point out to the gentleman that I hold in my hand the letter from the President that does not say anything about being against my amendment, but it does say they support the bill without further amendments. So Members who are going to be voting on this amendment may be voting for a plan that the gentleman has described as unnecessary, and then let the Senate take care of it, because that is where they will take it out, or let the conference take it out over there, and be stuck with a vote that does not properly reflect their ideal or the Members' ideal of efficiency and good common sense.

I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to begin my remarks by saluting the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] for his efforts, his conscientious efforts to be concerned about the budget deficit, and have joined him in some of his efforts. People on this side, in a bipartisan manner, have also joined with the other side in efforts to be responsible in the funding levels of this bill. I just voted for a cut in the funding level of this bill at both the 10 percent level and the 9.9 percent level.

I am very concerned about the budget deficit. However, I think this program is both unique, it is needed, and it is important. The American Society for Training and Development has said that the American work force quality partnership's initiative is the only major Federal effort to support training for currently employed workers. I think we should in this country be concerned not just about dislocated workers and unemployed workers and workers that lost their jobs 5 years ago and 10 years ago or 2 months ago, but working in pro-active ways to work on new industrial techniques, on management techniques, on total quality management techniques, especially targeted to our small and medium-size businesses, which will help prevent the loss of that job, and which will, second, help us compete with other countries that are developing new areas to develop productivity, and third, to reach out with our small and medium size businesses that are having such difficulties getting access to this information because they do not have the budgets like a Motorola does to deploy total quality management techniques to develop this kind of a training program.

□ 1710

So I think this is a needed program. I think this is in the interest of the workers and of the management in this country.

Also I want to mention a couple of important statistics that further argue for the importance of defeating this amendment. Of the workers who will be employed in the year 2010, 70 percent are in their job today. We will be developing new quality improvement techniques, we will be developing new manufacturing processes, and we want to keep these people working in the defense sector, in the high-technology sector, and these people are going to have to upgrade their skills. In manufacturing alone more than 15 million jobs will require different skills than they require today, currently. We should keep up on the evolving techniques here.

Finally, more than 90 percent of manufacturers in the United States are small or medium-size and face significant financial and logistical obstacles to training. This helps them with those training techniques.

My last point would be that Motorola, using total quality management, has saved over the last 5 years $2 billion.

When we can forge matching grant programs such as this one that help solve problems and help get this information from bigger businesses to smaller businesses, to save money and to save jobs, I think that is a prudent investment in our work force and our own management in our small and medium-sized businesses.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that America is falling behind in the area of industrial competitiveness, and as we continued to lose manufacturing jobs to other parts of the world throughout the 1980's, the prior administration stood by and did nothing.

This party has now come forward with H.R. 820, which will give American industry the tools and incentives to regain its competitive edge, to develop new technologies and new products through research and development, and to build state-of-the-art plants and facilities, and create new high-paying jobs of the future.

Having failed to respond to the challenge in the past 12 years, my friends on the other side of the aisle now criticize this bill in their seemingly endless series of frivolous amendments. They say we should leave hands off. Well that party left hands off the savings and loan industry in the 1980's, and it cost the American taxpayer $200 billion.

They say we should follow their trickle-down economic theories by lowering the taxes for the wealthiest Americans. Well we did that in the 1980's, and business giants like Michael Milken and the CEO's of our largest companies made fortunes, but none of it trickled down. The average American is worse off and millions lost their jobs.

They say we should not give financial assistance to small or medium-sized businesses because it is a poor risk and the banks will not make these loans. But the banks would not loan money to help Chrysler, so the American Government did. And it not only turned out to be a great investment for the American taxpayer, but it put Chrysler back on the road to competitiveness and financial health, and it created good, high-paying jobs.

H.R. 820 will do the same for many other American companies and create jobs for American workers. But it is not enough to create jobs. We have to have workers who are trained and continue to be trained so that we have the best and the most skilled work force in the world. And to strike the training provisions of the bill, as this amendment does, is to gut the bill.

This is simply part of a pattern of frustrating and impeding this much-needed legislation. Having imposed failed policies and caused the worst recession since the 1930's, we are now faced with obstructive tactics to impede efforts to help this Nation's economy.

I say let us get back to work again. Let us make American industry competitive again. Let us give our workers the tools, and let us make "Made in the USA" once again a standard for quality throughout the world.

I urge the rejection of this amendment and the quick passage of H.R. 820.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this amendment until I heard the last speech, and it always strikes me as passing strange that the blame-America-first crowd always comes out, and so on, with the idea that the United States is the one that is failing here. The fact is that this country does pretty well in competing in the world. It is the world's largest exporting nation, and so on. We can improve, but that kind of rhetoric we just heard, suggesting that America is somehow in the doldrums, and we have no ability to fight, just strikes me as kind of outrageous.

But let us understand that the gentleman just referred to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas as another frivolous amendment. Well this frivolous amendment was adopted in the committee. It was adopted 10 to 9, until the majority hauled out their proxy votes to defeat it. But when we had the members there debating the bill, it in fact won, so it is not a frivolous amendment. It goes to the point.

Why does it go to the point? Because the Department of Commerce, when they really were speaking for themselves, before they got under political pressure and were really reviewing the subject matter, said flatly that they did not want this amendment. I quote again from the acting general counsel at the Department of Commerce who says, speaking for the Commerce Department:

> We do not believe that establishing a new grant program for American work force partnerships in FY '94 is appropriate, given fiscal constraints and the need to prioritize investments.

The Commerce Department said very clearly this is not a frivolous amendment. This goes to the heart of it, and the administration is in such disarray, and there are so many letters floating around the Hill that no one knows what any of them mean. The Clinton administration cannot get their act together even to tell us what their opinion is on some of these various amendments and some of the various bills. But we do know that when the Department itself reviewed it and came up here with their technical letter, the technical letter suggested that this is not a good idea.

Of course, we used this letter in committee, and they were very embarrassed in committee when on a real vote of the members actually sitting in the room this amendment won, largely based upon this language. But the gentleman's amendment is not frivolous. It is an extremely important amendment in that it is, I think, one that goes to the heart of the issue. And I would hope that the Members would approve the amendment.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make one point in response to the point of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], about the duplication of training programs, and also to respond to the eloquent statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

I am extraordinarily sensitive to the point the gentleman raises, and I think he is as committed to true quality training programs for our work force as is any Member in this body, certainly as is any Member on either side of the aisle, and I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], if he is still here, or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], will be very active in sorting through all of these duplicative programs that exist, because I believe that it is a well-taken point. And certainly the Committee on Education and Labor ought to take that up, and encourage them to do it.

I support this program though and oppose the amendment because this is a unique program of the kind that I hope we will explore. As I visit businesses in my district, and particularly manufacturing businesses, what they have said to me is, of all of the training programs that are out there, they would like a training program that involves them directly, and that they are personally, the businesses are personally involved in designing the training program for their own workers.

So this program, first of all, I think, is located in the right department of our Government, in the Department of Commerce, which is where this critical issue of training current workers ought to be lodged. And second, it is a program that involves the Government through its support, but directly to business, and the community college system of our country, which I think is where the most effective job training is going on.

□ 1720

So to me this responds very specifically to the request from the manufacturing businesses that I have talked to for a target program that addresses their needs specifically.

I urge the defeat of the amendment, but I encourage the gentleman and his colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], to go after the duplication and the wasteful programs that exist in the other areas of the Government.

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

Mr. FINGERHUT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and it is so well taken.

The gentleman from Ohio is new to this body, and I just have to explain to him something that I know he is aware of. This comes up all the time. We have all of these duplicative programs. We could go in and take this $16 billion and rework it, but if we keep adding new ones on and just keep adding new ones on, each one of them gains its own constituency, and it makes it even more difficult to go in and actually do

something more efficiently and really reach down to those companies that both of us want to reach.

Mr. FINGERHUT. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Were this not the No. 1 concern, frankly, of manufacturing businesses throughout the country, their training of their workers, I would agree that we should wait until after we have cast away duplicative programs.

Just yesterday there was an initiative announced by the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, a bipartisan initiative, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS], of your side, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], on our side, cochairing the initiative on manufacturing, the chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers was there, and in his remarks he identified that this was the No. 1 issue.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 234, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—188

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

NOES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Bentley
Brewster
de la Garza
English (OK)
Gingrich
Hefner
Henry
Leach
Manton
Nadler
Packard
Pelosi
Rangel
Swift
Synar

□ 1742

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for, with Mr. Synar against.

Mrs. LLOYD changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to subtitle C of title IV, section 336, and I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 62, line 11, insert "Nothing in this section shall be considered to extend eligibility to individuals on the basis of sexual orientation." after "including women).".

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing controversial about this in my opinion. I understand the majority side will accept it.

It is merely to make sure that we do not get court decisions impacting upon anything involved in this bill that will be similar to decisions we are starting to get, bizarre decisions on section 8(a) and other sections for assistance under the Small Business Administration.

So I would ask all Members to please vote "yes" on a voice vote. I have no intention of asking for a recorded vote.

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary. It has absolutely no bearing on the issues of competitiveness we are considering today. This amendment diverts this body from our efforts to improve competitiveness, to assist small business and the middle class. It is specifically this type of amendment which give open rules a bad name.

Mr. Chairman, let me review where we are. The committee included in this bill a standard, boiler-plate provision, contained in many, many bills passed by the House and long enacted into Federal law which, simply requires the Secretary to the extent possible to set aside 10 percent of the loan guarantees under this bill to businesses owned by socially and economically disadvan-

taged individuals and women, as defined by the Small Business Act.

Congress has adopted this policy, time and time again, as a modest effort to remediate the decades of well-documented discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities that have prevented them from full participation in the U.S. economic mainstream.

Mr. Chairman, present law is very clear that these types of set-asides are aimed at individuals who have been disadvantaged because of race, ethnic origin, gender, and physical handicap—not sexual preference.

Mr. Chairman, there are no court cases construing the Small Business Act to include homosexuals as a socially and economically disadvantaged minority. The Small Business Administration is aware of no instances in which homosexuals have attempted to claim such status under their act. The SBA regulations are clear that discrimination is based on race, ethnic origin, gender, or physical handicap—not on sexual preference.

Mr. Chairman, at best; this amendment is a solution in search of a problem.

If the gentleman from California truly feels we are facing a problem, the appropriate place to address this issue is in the Small Business Act, where changes in the law would control numerous statutes which refer to this definition.

However, the aims of this bill are too important to be diverted by irrelevant issues. So that we can continue our efforts to improve the economy of this country and to improve the competitiveness of American business, we will accept the amendment on this side despite its irrelevance and lack of necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

□ 1750

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 127, after line 4, insert the following new title:

TITLE VI.—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the programs authorized by this Act are not sufficient to address the root cause of the competitiveness problems facing United States commerce and manufacturing. Further, it is the sense of the Congress that there exist fundamental competitiveness disadvantages imposed by Government on United States industry, and that the Congress should consider such additional provisions as are necessary to promote the competitiveness of American businesses.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was accepted by the committee when we met in the committee, and then, because of fears of certain kinds of germaneness problems, it was taken out of the bill on the way to the floor. It has since been redrafted in a way to ensure that it meets the germaneness test, and it does not in any way interfere with the jurisdiction of any other committee.

All this amendment says is that this bill does not solve all the competitiveness problems, and other problems involving regulation, litigation, and taxation are also at the heart of America's competitiveness problems wherever they exist. All this language would do is suggest that we need to act in some other areas in order to ensure American competitiveness in the future, and I would ask the adoption of the amendment.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, it was something that the committee felt was reasonable to do. We have since redrafted it to get around any sensibilities that may be in the House, and I would be hopeful that the committee could accept the amendment and that we can get the final passage of the bill.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, as we approach 6 o'clock, I want to say that I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I readily acknowledge, as we have frequently in the past said, that many other factors affect U.S. competitiveness. We have said this to the gentleman over, and over, and over again, but he knows the reason that we cannot address these other problems is because we do not have jurisdiction.

This bill does, admittedly, not address these issues, but it does address some of the issues and some of the problems.

Mr. Chairman, we think this amendment is unnecessary and would do damage and violence to the bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VALENTINE. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], who, I might say, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, is the one largely responsible for the fact that we have been here for the past 5 days. This is in a real sense the George Brown bill, and I am happy to yield to my teacher, mentor, and chairman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE]—I think.

What I think he means is that this rule will be designated as the George Brown rule. Whether the bill is is another question.

I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. As he knows, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the thrust of his assertion contained in this amendment, that the problems of competitiveness are large and complex. They extend to many things, the jurisdictions of many committees. They even extend to the possibility that the Government tries to do too much for business and is counterproductive.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there are flaws in this bill, and I think it will be misconstrued.

Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has not been at all reluctant to express his overall opposition to this bill. I do not think I am mischaracterizing this. He intends to vote against it. He finds that it is overly intrusive, that it moves us in the direction of State control of industries, that it has many other flaws which make it totally unacceptable. Despite that, Mr. Chairman, he has had a number of his own amendments accepted on the bill, and he is still going to vote against it.

Now I adopted the philosophy, and I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] expressed it a moment ago, that we cannot solve all of the problems in each of our little activities here in the Congress. I revert back to a line that I learned in Sunday school which is: "Try to brighten the corner where you are," and our effort in our little committee is to brighten the corner of our country where we can do some good; in this case, improve industrial competitiveness.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does not feel that we are going to do any good. He wants to point out that this bill is not doing any good. He wants to lay on the other committees of the Congress a guilt trip because they are not doing any good. All of these committees are being controlled by the Democrats, of course, so he wants to use this vehicle, which he is going to oppose, even though it includes his handiwork, and he wants to use it to condemn the other committees in the Congress.

Now I do not mind doing that once in a while. I occasionally point out that they are not doing their work as well as I would like to have them do it. I hope they will forgive me when I say this because they have just as much right to condemn me and members of the committee that I chair for not doing everything we could do. We make mistakes.

I suggest to my colleagues that it is not in the interests of comity, of productivity, of efficiency, for the Members of Congress individually to load on bills that they have a voice in language which merely exacerbates the problems that we have with other committees. That is the basic objection to this amendment. This is the reason the Committee on Rules chose to take it out of the bill as it was originally presented, and I might say that I encouraged the committee to adopt it in the

interests of comity with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I want to cooperate with him as fully as possible. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I feel a little betrayed when he uses the opportunities that he has to in effect do everything he can to delay, destroy, damage, or otherwise adversely impact the legislation that we are acting on because it does not meet his particular standards of ideological purity.

Now that is not a criticism. We all should have standards of ideological purity and seek to achieve them. But it can be taken to extremes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment takes the process to extremes, and I reluctantly oppose my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VI

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide any direct Federal financial benefit to any person who is not (1) a citizen or national of the United States; (2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or (3) an alien granted legal status as a parolee, asylee, or refugee.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], and I would like to reserve my point of order and ask the gentleman to explain his amendment, if I could do that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is permissible. We have only 3 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] for 1½ minutes to explain his amendment. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] will then be allowed a minute and a half to oppose or agree to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It just simply states that, if we are going to expend this kind of money or these tax dollars, that we ought to expend them on people who are citizens of the United States of America.

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] seek recognition for 1½ minutes to debate the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS]?

Mr. VALENTINE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which, if I understand it, gets us over into immigration policy of the United States. Had we had an opportunity to become familiar with this proposed change in our legislation before 1 minute before the end of the debate, we might have been able to reach some accommodation. But in view of the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, we oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] has 30 seconds remaining to ask his question and get a response.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman not understand the intent of the bill with the amendment?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, no. Frankly, I see that I read here, but I do not understand its implication or impact on the legislation, and we oppose it.

□ 1800

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my question was, Does the gentleman not understand the intent of the amendment?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, we understand the amendment. We oppose it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman opposes it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 156, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—263

Ackerman	Goodling	Murphy
Allard	Gordon	Myers
Andrews (TX)	Goss	Neal (NC)
Applegate	Grams	Nussle
Archer	Green	Orton
Armey	Greenwood	Oxley
Bachus (AL)	Gunderson	Pallone
Baker (CA)	Hall (OH)	Parker
Baker (LA)	Hall (TX)	Paxon
Ballenger	Hancock	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hansen	Penny
Barrett (NE)	Hastert	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Hefley	Petri
Bartlett	Herger	Pickle
Barton	Hobson	Pombo
Bateman	Hoekstra	Pomeroy
Bereuter	Hoke	Porter
Bevill	Holden	Portman
Bilbray	Horn	Poshard
Bilirakis	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Bishop	Hoyer	Quillen
Bliley	Huffington	Quinn
Blute	Hughes	Rahall
Boehlert	Hunter	Ramstad
Boehner	Hutchinson	Ravenel
Bonilla	Hutto	Regula
Borski	Hyde	Ridge
Brooks	Inglis	Roberts
Browder	Inhofe	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Rogers
Bunning	Istook	Rohrabacher
Burton	Jacobs	Rose
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Roth
Byrne	Johnson (GA)	Roukema
Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Rowland
Calvert	Kaptur	Royce
Camp	Kasich	Sangmeister
Canady	Kim	Santorum
Carr	King	Sarpalius
Castle	Kingston	Saxton
Chapman	Klein	Schaefer
Clement	Klug	Schroeder
Clinger	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kolbe	Sharp
Collins (GA)	Kreidler	Shaw
Combest	Kyl	Shays
Condit	Lambert	Shuster
Cooper	Lancaster	Sisisky
Costello	LaRocco	Skeen
Cox	Laughlin	Skelton
Cramer	Lazio	Slattery
Crane	Lehman	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Levy	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Darden	Lewis (FL)	Smith (TX)
Deal	Lightfoot	Snowe
DeFazio	Linder	Solomon
DeLay	Lipinski	Spence
Derrick	Livingston	Spratt
Dickey	Lloyd	Stearns
Dooley	Long	Stenholm
Doolittle	Machtley	Strickland
Dornan	Maloney	Stump
Dreier	Manton	Sundquist
Duncan	Manzullo	Talent
Dunn	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Tauzin
Durbin	Mazzoli	Taylor (MS)
Edwards (TX)	McCandless	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Everett	McCrery	Thomas (WY)
Ewing	McDade	Thornton
Fawell	McHugh	Thurman
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Torkildsen
Fish	McKeon	Torricelli
Fowler	McMillan	Traficant
Franks (CT)	Meehan	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Menendez	Volkmer
Gallegly	Meyers	Vucanovich
Gallo	Mica	Walker
Gejdenson	Michel	Walsh
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Weldon
Geren	Minge	Williams
Gilchrest	Molinari	Wilson
Gillmor	Mollohan	Wolf
Gilman	Montgomery	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Glickman	Morella	Zeliff
Goodlatte		Zimmer

NOES—156

Abercrombie	Andrews (NJ)	Baesler
Andrews (ME)	Bacchus (FL)	Barlow

Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blackwell
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Danner
de Lugo (VI)
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Grandy
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Mann
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shepherd
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—18

Bentley
Brewster
de la Garza
English (OK)
Gibbons
Hefner
Henry
Leach
McCurdy
Nadler
Packard
Reynolds
Sabo
Schiff
Synar
Waxman
Whitten
Wise

□ 1829

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for, with Mr. Synar against.

Messrs. OBEY, McDERMOTT, HILLIARD, and PAYNE of New Jersey, and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CRAMER, BROWDER, LANCASTER, SPRATT, and GORDON, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. DURBIN, POMEROY, BROWN of Ohio, INSLEE, JOHNSON of Georgia, ROWLAND, KLEIN, BISHOP, and SPENCE, Mrs. LLOYD, Messrs. ACKERMAN, HOLDEN, RAHALL, LAROCCO, ROEMER, KREIDLER, BORSKI, and PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. LONG, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. LAMBERT, Messrs. BROOKS, DERRICK, and STRICKLAND, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to give my wholehearted endorsement to the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

This legislation will make an important contribution to the effort to nurture the businesses that are going to provide good-paying jobs in the next century. And it is an exciting reversal of form and economic policy.

It reverses years of neglect of American business by American Government. The Clinton administration has made a conscious decision to work with the business community—to try to overcome the traditional wariness that has existed between the Federal Government and corporate sector.

Bill Clinton and AL GORE and the supporters of H.R. 820 are taking an approach that is stark in its simplicity: We can't compete in a global market if Government and business don't cooperate.

What's the idea behind H.R. 820. To expand and revive our economic base by helping budding high-technology businesses, by improving our science and research infrastructure, by developing the attitude and the means to support lifetime learning, and by promoting a fiscal climate that encourages investment and reduces its cost.

We have to use our scientific and technical expertise—where we're second to none—to reinforce and enhance America's position as a source of technology for the rest of the world. Bill Clinton wants to apply the mighty resources of the Government's technological machine in that effort.

Where are the potential obstacles to making this novel idea work. The most serious, again, is the innate skepticism about anything that smacks of industrial policy. We have to overcome 12 years of having people in charge of the Government who didn't really think Government could, or should, do anything along these lines. But it's foolish, I think, to shun a modest collaboration between Government and business out of a desire to keep an ideology intact.

The details of H.R. 820 have been discussed in great detail over the past few days, so I will not add to the volume of that discourse.

I do, however, want to mention briefly one aspect of these new programs that I'm extremely concerned about. How do we pay for them?

As a former member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and a current member of the appropriations subcommittee that's going to have to find the financing, I want to reiterate my support for this measure. But the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary has been given the task of paying in fiscal year 1994 for $488 million in outlays and $987 million in budget authority for these, and other investments proposed by the administration. If we are to finance these programs at the level they deserve, we will have to cut spending on other existing programs.

I stand ready to work to reorder priorities so we can move forward in this critical area.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993. For too long, we have let the free market exercise its will, and will some of our country's best jobs and industries to overseas competitors. Now is the time for Congress and the executive branch to band together, and join in a partnership with our country's manufacturers and universities to provide good jobs for the future.

The actions we take today are not without precedence. The Japanese have been doing this for years. In fact, the Japanese manufacturing miracle is no miracle at all. Japanese manufacturing is the powerful international player it is today, in part, because of the tremendous investment the Japanese Government has made in manufacturing outreach. Government entities in Japan invest about $500 million each year in their manufacturing sector, compared to about $79 million by the United States.

Japanese universities, government agencies, and industry all work together to create jobs and opportunity for their citizens. We should expect the same from our country whose economy is twice the size of the Japanese economy. This bill is one more example of a concrete step we can take now to help provide good quality jobs for the future.

H.R. 820 will help identify those technologies which are most important for the future of our economy. This bill will require Government to cooperate with the private sector by: Helping remove impediments to technological development; improving manufacturing infrastructure; easing access to capital; improving training and education of workers; and promoting international standards favorable to American goods.

Between 1972 and 1987, my home State of Maryland lost approximately 40,000 manufacturing jobs which have had a significant impact on our economy. After all, manufacturing jobs provide the high pay which helps create the wealth necessary to drive consumption in our country.

Today we can act for a stronger American economy and for better paying jobs in the future. Support H.R. 820.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, as modified.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LANCASTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 164, he reported the bill back to the House with

an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Collins of Georgia amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VI

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide any direct Federal financial benefit to any person who is not (1) a citizen or national of the United States; (2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or (3) an alien granted legal status as a parolee, asylee, or refugee.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays, 127, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—288

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brooks
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—127

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Bacchus (FL)
Barlow
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blackwell
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Furse
Gonzalez
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kopetski
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velázquez
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Bentley
Brewster
de la Garza
English (OK)
Gibbons
Hefner
Henry
Hinchey
Hunter
Johnson (SD)
Leach
Nadler
Packard
Sabo
Schiff
Synar
Whitten

□ 1849

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Packard for; with Mr. Synar against.

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, McHALE, KENNEDY, COLEMAN, and DEUTSCH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, as modified.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, as modified, was agreed to.

□ 1850

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALKER. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 820, to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 167, answered "present" 7, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—243

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—167

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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Becerra
Brown (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Slaughter
Unsoeld
Velázquez
Waters

NOT VOTING—15

Applegate
Bentley
Brewster
de la Garza
English (OK)
Gekas
Gibbons
Hefner
Henry
Johnson (SD)
Leach
Nadler
Packard
Smith (NJ)
Synar

□ 1908

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Synar for; with Mr. Packard against.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "present."

Mr. PASTOR and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "present" to "nay."

Messrs. ORTIZ, TEJEDA, and McKINNEY changed their vote from "present" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 173, due to an apparent malfunction, my "nay" vote against H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act, was not properly recorded. I would request that this statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the rollcall vote to properly note my vote against this legislation.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS SPONSOR OF H.R. 1914

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] be removed as a sponsor of my bill, H.R. 1914.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 820, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

WEEK FOR THE NATIONAL OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) designating June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as the "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly shall not object, I thank the Chair for bringing this legislation to the floor. It comes today with 225 cosponsors.

This is the third year that the Congress has recognized the first week of June in commemoration of the celebration of the end of World War II.

Now, of course, this particular week involves, first, June 4, 1942, when the Battle of Midway occurred, which was a turning point in the war in the Pacific Ocean, and also embraces June 6, 1944, which so many of us will remember as the D-Day Invasion of Europe.

□ 1910

Mr. Speaker, this idea first started in Indianapolis by the World War II National Commemorative Association chaired by Albert Watson, who was

really the idea man behind this. It is a good idea. Throughout the country people will be celebrating now through 1995, the 50th anniversary.

There are 9 million living Americans who served in the Armed Forces during this period of time in World War II, and many, many people, some of whom are still in Congress here, not only served in uniform, but also contributed to the success and the completion of World War II.

So, it is most appropriate, I think, that our Nation does recognize and commemorate this first week of June as a time to reflect, and to remember and to thank the veterans, many who have sacrificed, that we might live in freedom today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker as a World War II veteran, I am honored to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 80, to designate June 1 through June 7, 1993, as a week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II. I commend our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for introducing this important measure. It is crucial that, as a nation, we honor the courageous men and women who served during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, while there are those of us who have experienced the horrors of World War II firsthand, there are many Americans who are uninformed of the tremendous upheavals, the tragedies, the abominable atrocities, and the political factors that led to World War II. And, thee are those who would like to forget.

However, as the wave of democracy sweeps through the once oppressed countries, we must not forget. We must remember the combat, the destruction, the horrors of the Holocaust, and the devastating inhumanity of ruthless totalitarianism. Only by recalling the horrors of the past, we can ensure that future generations will never allow such monstrosities to happen again. I believe that our Nation must remain dedicated to supporting freedom, liberty, and democracy, for it is these ideals upon which our great Nation was founded.

The lessons of World War II are invaluable, and we must learn from them. By educating younger generations and by promoting equality and human rights we will ensure that this form of devastation does not occur again. Racism has an odd way of disguising its wicked purpose, however, an enlightened nation can combat its evil roots.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to support this measure. Many proud, dedicated soldiers fought, and sacrificed during World War II. In support of our freedoms and our democracy, I feel privileged to support this measure which designates, the week of June 1 through June 7, 1993, as the week of the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II. This tribute is a fitting manner in which our Nation may honor our true heroes—the courageous fighters and survivors of World War II, while remembering the painful lessons of the past.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 80

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States of America made tremendous sacrifices during World War II to save the world from tyranny and aggression;

Whereas the winds of freedom and democracy sweeping the globe today spring from the principles for which over four hundred thousand Americans gave their lives in World War II;

Whereas World War II and the events that led up to that war must be understood in order that we may better understand our own times, and more fully appreciate the reasons why eternal vigilance against any form of tyranny is so important;

Whereas the World War II era, as reflected in its family life, industry, and entertainment, was a unique period in American history, and epitomized our Nation's philosophy of hard work, courage, and tenacity in the face of adversity;

Whereas, between 1991 and 1995, over nine million American veterans of World War II will be holding reunions and conferences and otherwise commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of various events relating to World War II; and

Whereas June 4, 1993, marks the Battle of Midway, and June 6, 1993, marks the anniversary of D-Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That June 1, 1993, through June 7, 1993, is designated as a "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SAWYER:

Page 2, line 3, strike "June 1" and insert "May 30".

Page 2, line 4, strike "Week" and insert "Time".

Page 2, line 7, strike "the time" and insert "that period".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendments were agreed to.

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

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution designating May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a 'Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II'.".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. 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 passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, May 17, 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 the Office of the Postmaster 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.

VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER AND REINSTATEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the 5-minute special order on May 20, 1993, for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] to a 60-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON MAY 20, 1993

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to transpose the name of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] in the Special Order Calendar with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] on May 20, 1993, and I do this with the concurrence of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

There was no objection.

NEGOTIATIONS IN OTTAWA COULD DOOM NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I take the well tonight to talk about an issue that has concerned me greatly over the past couple of days. I have very proudly been a strong proponent of the establishment of a North American Free-Trade Agreement. I happen to believe that, as the U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor has said, there will be a net gain of 400,000 new jobs in the United States if we can diminish the barrier and create an opportunity for us to export more U.S. manufactured goods and services to Mexico. It is clear, from having looked at the changes which have taken place throughout the world, the establishment of EC 92, the reduction of trade barriers in the Pacific Rim and other parts of the world, that the wave is clearly toward the lowering of barriers. It is very beneficial to the U.S. consumer. Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that I, as a Member of Congress, do not have the right to say to the American consumers that they cannot buy the best quality product at the lowest possible price without my imposing a penalty on them.

Well, the thing that I am disturbed about, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that developments which have just begun to take place in negotiations of the so-called side agreements in Ottawa, Canada, are jeopardizing the support that I provided throughout the entire debate of NAFTA and that I know a number of the rest of us who are in favor of the reduction of trade barriers have supported.

Why? Well, these so-called side agreements are moving dramatically in the direction of protectionist barriers rather than improving the trade picture and reducing barriers and creating more opportunities for consumers and workers alike.

Now what we have seen here is we have seen specific proposals which have been very, very disturbing to me, and I would like to outline a couple of them as they have been reported so far.

The Clinton administration proposes to create largely independent labor and environmental commissions with the authority to investigate the enforcement of all national and State environmental and labor laws. Well, clearly this is not a part of the goal that we have of reducing trade barriers. This is encroachment in an area which extends far beyond the scope of NAFTA. Trade sanctions, which will involve revoking NAFTA benefits, could be imposed by two of the three nations when one country is judged to be not enforcing a particular domestic labor or environmental law.

□ 1920

Again, two nations could gang up against another country because they have determined that local laws are not being established, again, going far beyond the scope of simply dealing with trade aspects.

Clearly in an outright surrender to the special interests, the administration's proposal does not require a link between the law which is not enforced and trade or the economy. The enforcement of any labor or environmental law will be fair game in this process. Even if there is no trade nor economic gain from not enforcing a particular law, the NAFTA-related dispute panels and NAFTA trade sanctions could be used to compel enforcement.

Again, what we are witnessing is a move not in the direction of free trade, but in the opposite direction, barriers which are going to jeopardize free trade.

Tragically, we have seen the Clinton administration, which has paid tremendous lip service. The President's speech at American University and the words that have come from my friend, also from Los Angeles, Mr. Kantor, the U.S. Trade Representative, have been very good. But when we look at this proposal, it is very distressing for those of us who have been fighting on behalf of freedom and free trade for the past several years.

We are moving, I believe, in a positive direction by trying to implement NAFTA. It is going to allow us to compete. It is going to allow us to create jobs in the United States of America. But, Madam Speaker, if we move toward these side agreements which are being discussed at this moment in Ottawa, Canada, it will clearly jeopardize the support of those of us in the Congress who have been traditional proponents of free trade, and I believe create the potential to doom the implementation of this very important North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Madam Speaker, I say to those who are at the negotiating table, do not jeopardize the support which so many of us desperately want to provide in behalf of what I believe is clearly the most important economic policy that the United States of America and this hemisphere will face in years.

BRINGING THE SUNSHINE TO THE DELIBERATION OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my disappointment and dismay over a recent action by a committee of this House. Last week in its deliberations on the tax bill the Committee on Ways and means voted to close its doors to the press and to the people. This action on that important bill was described as customary, business as usual, and I regret that it is, for it was also just plain wrong.

Madam Speaker, I have the very highest regard for my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and especially for the committee's chairman. I understand their point of view, but I do not share it. This is the people's House, and the people's House should not be closed to the scrutiny of the people or the press.

I am from Florida. In Florida we conduct government in the sunshine. In fact, in Florida we invented government in the sunshine, and in Florida we know that governing in the sunshine works, and we should govern in the sunshine in Washington, too.

Madam Speaker, this is why my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and I have introduced H.R. 143, an open meetings bill to bring sunshine to the deliberations of our Congress.

This bill would mandate that all congressional meetings and hearings be open to the public and the press except for the following reasons: National security; if disclosure of matters to be considered would place an undue burden on the privacy rights of the private citizens; or if disclosure of matters to be considered would jeopardize an ongoing criminal investigation or confidential source of any criminal investigation.

A majority of the full committee of jurisdiction would have to vote to close the meeting or hearing rather than just a majority of those present, as is now the case, and it would have to be a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker, the public's right to know what we do here is fundamental. It overrides all those reasons that are customarily given for closing a meeting.

This is not a partisan issue. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] is a Republican and I am a Democrat. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who share our point of view. Republicans and Democrats alike over the years have voted to close the doors of committees of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I would submit that the people are weary of partisanship, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting government in the sunshine. It is argued by those who support closing the doors that to do so is more efficient, that it makes the trains run on time. They would suggest that those of us who are privileged to represent the people do not have the guts to look a lobbyist in the eye and say no. Well, I do, and I would submit that my colleagues do, too.

It may be more efficient to close the doors, though I doubt it, but it is certainly not more democratic. I say open the doors and let the sun shine in.

FEDERAL REGULATION RUN AMOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to run a lap for the regulatory relay team. Led by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the regulatory relay team has been coming to the floor of the House each week to discuss a different Federal regulation which is harmful to business and the economy.

Federal regulation of businesses costs hundreds of billions of dollars every year. When a business spends money to comply with Federal mandates, it is diverting money which could be spent on new plants or equipment and creating jobs or paying salaries.

Not all Federal regulation is bad. In fact, many Federal regulations are needed to protect the health and safety of workers or society at large. However, sometimes Federal agencies are overzealous and inflexible in their implementation of regulations. Many times they do not take into account the cost of regulations to businesses or look for ways to minimize the cost of compliance with regulations.

I want to give my colleagues an example of a well-intentioned regulation run amok. The Department of Labor has promulgated a regulation, called Hazardous Occupation Order 12, or H.O. 12, which prohibits anyone under 18 from operating machines used to manufacture paper. Included in the regulation is the operation of paper balers in grocery stores. Now this is a regulation which is necessary. After all, paper balers can be dangerous machines if operated improperly.

The regulation seeks to protect teenagers from baler accidents. However, it goes so far as to prohibit 16- or 17-year-olds from simply tossing a piece of paper, such as a piece of cardboard or even a candy wrapper, into a baling machine which is not even operating. The Department of Labor claims that this is "assisting in the operation" of the baler. This is similar to saying that when someone places a box inside a car when the engine is turned off, he is assisting in driving the car. Of course, this is ridiculous. Faced with this regulatory dilemma over paper balers, many grocers have stopped hiring 16- and 17-year-old employees.

Grocery industry representatives requested that the Labor Department review the regulation to see if it is justified and consider possible alternatives to the rule. The Department has refused to do this.

Enforcement of the regulation has been extremely aggressive. Grocers report that the Department acts as investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury and is using the regulation to intimidate businesses by imposing hefty fines. Some report that the regulators are failing to take into consideration company policies against teenagers using balers and is basing fines on unsubstantiated statements by former employees. In addition, instead of working to prevent future injuries, the Department is going back in time looking for violations which may have occurred up to 2 years in the past.

A grocer in my own district in central Illinois tells me that the Labor Department used this regulation to question former employees about past use of balers and fined him $8,000 for a few alleged violations. To grocers, it seems that the Labor Department is more interested in collecting fines and harassing businesses than in protecting the health and welfare of teenage workers.

As I mentioned earlier, this inflexible regulation has caused grocers to avoid hiring teenagers. The President is currently seeking $320 million from Congress to create summer jobs, but this onerous regulation is killing jobs for teenagers. The administration could help create jobs for teenagers simply by improving this unreasonable regulation and enforcing it in a fair and rational manner. And the H.O. 12 regulation can be altered in a way which will not threaten the health or welfare of anyone.

This regulation is a good example of the regulatory overkill our Federal bureaucrats frequently use. It is about time the Federal Government got off the backs of businesses and let them do what they do best—create jobs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 1992.

Hon. LYNN MARTIN,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LYNN: To follow up on our recent meeting, I want to reiterate that the Department's vigorous enforcement of regulations prohibiting 16 and 17 year olds from placing paper into balers continues to concern me greatly.

I am enclosing a small sampling of documents that illustrate what I am talking about: the excessive, over zealous pursuit of "violations" in retail grocery stores. The experiences of Piggly Wiggly of Memphis and Sewell-Allen Big Star highlight my feeling that your investigators go back too far, rely too heavily on statements of ex-employees, and amass too many citations as to be punitive rather than to encourage corrective action by a store owner.

The experience of Mr. Scott Means seems to be typical for those owners choosing to exercise their right to appeal. The Department by law is investigator, prosecutor, judge and jury, but when the Department also encourages that a fine be paid or yet another citation will be issued is simply intimidation.

I would like you to read this material personally. I am sure you will be as annoyed as I am that the others show a pattern of an employee's statement being taken at face value, of not taking into consideration company policy against teenagers "operating" balers, basing fines on the unsubstantiated statement of former employees, and not-so-subtle intimidation. These are not isolated cases. It looks like a bureaucracy out of control.

Lynn, stepping back from the specifics of any one situation, I think there is an important larger picture. Here is a zealous, big-brother bureaucracy unreasonably hunting and punishing employers—many of them small businesses—to the point of discouraging them from hiring teenagers. I understand that more and more companies do not hire anyone under 18 as a mater of policy because of the regulatory nightmare DOL has created. Please see the enclosed letter from First National Supermarkets and the policy statement of Fleming Companies.

Here we are as a society with a major problem of teenage unemployment—willing to pay for very intensive and expensive job creating programs for inner city youths—yet, at the same time, systematically discouraging employers from hiring these youths. It's incredible, really. What is of particular concern to me is that this is happening during the watch of this administration! I believe it is symptomatic of why the level of support for our party is not as high as it ought to be from within the job-creating sector of our society. I think we are playing into the hands of those who want a bigger, more costly and heavy handed government.

Let me be so bold as to suggest four steps. One, the Department should reduce the zeal of what is now its overly aggressive, revenue-generating enforcement actions regarding the "operation" of balers by teenagers. Two, it should stop looking for violations that may have occurred before November 20, 1991, when the recent clarifying regulations pertaining to Hazardous Operations Order Number 12 were issued. Three, an open and impartial examination of the Hazardous Occupations Order Number 12 should take place. Four, you should work to rescind the 1990 budget agreement provisions that the Department generate revenues through its enforcement powers in order to help reduce the deficit. In regard to item four, I am prepared to be the House sponsor.

I believe this is a very serious matter that is much larger than the baler issue, and I look forward to working with you on a solution.

Sincerely,

DON SUNDQUIST, M.C.

FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, October 9, 1992.

Hon. LYNN MARTIN,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MARTIN: The Food Marketing Institute (FMI) urges you to direct the Department of Labor (DOL) staff to undertake an expedited review of Hazardous Occupation Order 12 (H.O. 12) relating to the operation of paper balers in grocery stores. We further request that DOL discontinue its on-going harassment of our nation's food retailers through its unreasonable interpretation and enforcement of H.O. 12.

FMI is a nonprofit association conducting programs in research, education, industry relations and public affairs on behalf of its 1,500 members—food retailers and wholesalers and their customers in the United States and around the world. FMI's domestic member companies operate approximately 19,000 retail food stores with a combined annual sales volume of $190 billion—more than half of all grocery stores sales in the United States. FMI's retail membership is composed of large multi-store chains, small regional firms and independent supermarkets.

As you know, DOL's unfair methods of enforcing H.O. 12 have been the subject of much well-deserved criticism from individual companies, FMI, the National Grocers Association, other industry groups and congres-

sional leaders (see for example, the attached letter from Representative Don Sundquist). As a direct result of these enforcement methods, many grocers across the country have stopped hiring 16 and 17-year-olds. This significant reduction in teenage employment opportunities flies in the face of your avowed goal of "assisting youth in making the connection between school and the world of employment."

We reiterate our opposition to this relentless, unfair "guilty until proven innocent" enforcement approach. However, the underlying problem is with the department's irrational conclusion that by tossing a piece of paper (cardboard, candy wrapper, etc.) into a non-operating baling machine, a 16 or 17-year-old employee is "assisting in the operation" of that machine in violation of H.O. 12. There is no sound basis for this position. It is equivalent to stating that by placing something in a car a person is assisting in driving the car.

Most disturbingly, despite FMI's (and others) repeated entreaties DOL has failed to articulate its rationale for this position. No evidence has been presented, even gathered, by DOL that this activity of placing paper in a baler is hazardous; that this interpretation reduces injuries; or that other safety requirements might not be equally effective in preventing injuries.

In April of 1989 FMI raised these issues in a letter to the Administrator of the Employment Standards Administration for consideration by DOL's Child Labor Advisory Council (copy attached). Among other things, we said:

"We urge the Subcommittee to analyze thoroughly the baling process to pinpoint what, if any, hazards exist in the operation of balers, and to provide its insight on whether the operation of baling machines is "particularly hazardous" within the meaning of the law. As part of this review the Subcommittee should establish a complete and thorough record on the number and kind of injuries that have occurred involving balers. Accident rates involving scrap paper destined for remanufacture, covered by the rule, should be compared to those for balers used for waste disposal. The information should also reflect the number of injuries sustained by adults and, to the maximum extent possible, the injury rate should be placed in the context of the number of sixteen and seventeen year olds actually exposed to baling operations.

"During this review we urge that the Subcommittee also examine possible alternatives which would allow use of baling machines by 16 and 17 year olds who load and/or operate balers may be appropriate; the mechanical safety features and requirements on balers should be reviewed to see if safeguards can be enhanced to prevent the kinds of accidents that have been documented; and, each step in the baling operation should be isolated so that 16 and 17 year olds might be able to avoid hazardous operations, and perform only those functions in the operation of balers that are safe."

No such review was ever undertaken, no data developed, and no attempt was made to understand how modern balers work. No response was ever even provided to our letter.

In October of 1990, DOL proposed to revise H.O. 12 to "clarify" that the order covered all baling machines, no matter where located or for what purpose the paper was being baled. The notice of proposed rulemaking included no discussion of the dangers of baling machines nor a factual predicate for the proposed change in the rule (which is what it was—not a clarification).

FMI submitted a statement in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking and the request for comment (copy attached). Once again, we asked the Department to analyze the baler to see if this regulation was justified and to review possible alternatives to the proposed rule—e.g. training requirements, or new mechanical safety features.

Incredibly, DOL responded in this fashion:

"These commenters stated that the Department had not done an investigation of the actual operation of paper balers in retail establishments, the safety mechanisms and training methods in use, and the number and kind of injuries. However, because these clarifying revisions merely ensure that the regulation conforms to its intent, prohibiting the operation of paper products machines, regardless of the ultimate disposition of the product, an investigation is unnecessary."

In other words, DOL felt no obligation to justify its conclusion because the proposed revision was aimed "merely" at ensuring the regulation conformed to the intent of the regulation. To put it more simply "we know we are right so we don't have to explain why we are right."

DOL's only other effort to justify its position was that "all the H.O.'s traditionally have been construed broadly, to include any assistance in the operation of prohibited machinery, so as to reduce the likelihood that a young person may engage in a dangerous activity."

FMI and its members fully understand that the intent of the hazardous occupation orders is to protect children from injury. We also understand that the department traditionally interprets these orders broadly to protect children.

But in this case, with this order, DOL's position is wrong. It is unjustified. It is arbitrary and capricious, with no data, or analysis or even argument provided to justify it. And it is causing huge problems for the grocery industry. Problems that have repeatedly been brought to the Department's attention and that have been ignored.

Frankly, we are perplexed by DOL's total unwillingness to address the issues we have raised. Why is this order beyond review? Is the department simply unable to reconsider a regulation because it is labeled as promoting child safety?

We urge that a formal review of H.O. 12 be undertaken immediately. Such a review is long overdue. Interested parties should have the opportunity to provide all relevant data and information. Only then will DOL be able to meet its obligation to regulate in a fair and reasonable manner. We are confident that this review will show that there is no sound basis for DOL's current position.

We are all concerned about the safety of children and teenagers in the workplace. But that's only the beginning of the analysis. We should also all be concerned about teenage unemployment, harassment of employers and bureaucratic inertia. By working together we can ensure worker safety without the negative consequences of the current rule. That should be our common goal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GEORGE GREEN,
Vice President,
Assistant General Counsel.

[Labor Information Service, June 1992, Vol. 62]

CHILD LABOR LAW—PAPER BAILERS ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY

(By William J. Rodgers, Collier, Shannon, Rill & Scott and George R. Green, Food Marketing Institute)

INTRODUCTION

Many readers know from first-hand experience that the Department of Labor (DOL) continues to place enforcement of the child labor laws at the top of its priority list. Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin has carried forward the "Operation Child Watch" program begun two years ago by then Secretary Elizabeth Dole.

Just last week the United States Department of Labor announced the results of an April/March two-week "blitz" by Wage and Hour investigators on smaller towns targeting businesses such as food retailers and restaurants. They investigated 4,700 businesses, found 5,000 minors working in violation of Federal laws, and assessed $3.2 million in civil penalties. Many grocers who believed themselves to be in full compliance with the law have found themselves among those cited. Therefore, it is important for all FMI members to review their child labor compliance programs generally and especially to make sure all stores employees are aware of the prohibitions concerning paper baling machines.

GENERAL LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) applies to retail enterprises with gross sales of $500,000 or more, so supermarket operators are covered. In addition to governing the federal minimum wage (currently $4.25 per hour, your State may have a higher minimum wage) and overtime (premium pay equal to one and a half times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours in a workweek), the FLSA establishes restrictions on the use of child labor.

The May 1990 and December 1988 issues of this bulletin review the many aspects of the child labor laws with which food distributors must be familiar.

Most states also have child labor laws and they should be reviewed as well, as the state law applies if it as stricter than the federal law.

In a nutshell, under the FLSA: 14 and 15 year olds can work in non-hazardous occupations for not more than 40 hours in a week, or 8 hours in a day, when school is not in session and not more than 3 hours in a day or 18 hours in any week when school is in session; 14 and 15 year olds can work only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., except from June 1 through Labor Day they can work to 9:00 p.m.

In addition to the above, no employer shall use any "oppressive child labor" in commerce or the production of goods for commerce or "in any enterprise engaged in commerce."

"Oppressive child labor" includes employment of any person under 16 years of age except for certain specific jobs in retail stores as enumerated in the may 1990 issue of this bulletin. Also included is the employment of any person under age 18 in any occupation found by the Secretary of labor to be particularly hazardous.

There are several specific Hazardous Occupation Orders issued by the Secretary that affect grocers. Among them:

Order 10—provides that any work in meat processing, including the operation of an automatic slicing machine, like those found in store deli departments, is a hazardous op-

eration and off limits to those under 18. This includes the cleaning of meat slicers as well.

Order 11—provides that working with, cleaning or repairing power driven bakery machines is a hazardous operation. Example: dough mixers, dough sheeters, molding machines, bread slicing and wrapping machines, cake cutting band saws and more.

Order 12—provides that working with, cleaning or repairing any paper products machines is a hazardous operation. Example: sheeting machines, guillotine paper cutters or shears, arm type staplers—scrap-paper balers—and all power driven machines used to prepare paper for disposal.

PAPER BALERS

The operation of a paper-baler and assisting in the operation of a baler is considered by DOL to be a hazardous occupation covered by Order 12.

Last November 20, the Wage and Hour Division of DOL issued a final rule clarifying that the operation of paper balers by minors under 18 years of age is prohibited in all circumstances. DOL also reiterated its position that the placing of material into the baler is a violation of hazardous Occupation Order (HO 12). The Labor Department is aggressively enforcing this prohibition and we urge all members to review their policies and especially to communicate to all employees that minors may not place any material into paper balers. DOL will issue citations to retailers for violations based solely upon statements from minor employees or former employees that they have on a single occasion placed a piece of cardboard in a baler, even when the baler has signage prohibiting use by anyone under the age of 18. FMI has objected strongly to this interpretation and enforcement policy, but until DOL can be convinced to take a more reasonable position, it is essential that this prohibition be communicated strongly to store employees. Consideration should be given to the use of key locks or other safeguards to limit access and to control the operation of these machines±.

PENALTIES

What happens if DOL determines you are employing someone under 18 years of age in a hazardous operation? First, there are civil penalties of up to $10,000 for each employee and $1,000 for each separate violation. If it is held to be a "willful" violation, you are subject to a $10,000 fine and criminal liability of up to six months in jail. (You can go to jail only if you have been convicted of a prior offense. We are unaware of any criminal penalties having been imposed on retailers.) And "willful" doesn't mean that you knew that you were violating the law; it is "willful" if you were aware that the law possibly applied.

An employer who presents falsified records can be punished by a fine of $10,000 and six months in jail. Criminal prosecutions, while rare since they are based on "willful and flagrant" violations, can be triggered by submission of falsified records.

In determining the amount of civil penalty to be assessed, the Administrator looks at the seriousness of the violation, the size of the business, the number of employees involved, previous history of violations, the employer's explanation and whether the employer has made good faith efforts to comply with the law.

ENFORCEMENT

Inspections are made both on the Wage and Hour Administrator's own initiative or to investigate complaints. The name of the person making the complaint will not be revealed. Upon arrival on your premises, the Wage-Hour Division inspector will ask for "the person in authority" to whom they will show their credentials and explain that they are there to make an investigation in connection with the Wage-Hour Law. The Wage-Hour Division can subpoena the employer's records if necessary.

After the inspection, if the Wage and Hour Administration determines that there is a violation, it serves a formal notice of violation and the penalty, if any, to be imposed on the employer.

Generally, there will be an opportunity to discuss the results of the investigation with the compliance officer before a formal notice of violation is served. It is appropriate to request such an opportunity and it is appropriate for counsel to be present at this conference. At this point the investigator's conclusions should be checked for accuracy. Find out when the alleged activity occurred. Is the alleged violation based on physical records or on uncorroborated statements from employees or former employees? If it is a former employee, under what circumstances did the individual leave the company?

If differences still remain after discussion between the investigator and employer, you can request a conference with a supervisor at the regional office. As mentioned, in determining the level of fine, DOL will look at the employer's good faith efforts to comply with the law. It is certainly relevant to argue, if it is accurate, that the employee violated well-established company policy; that this policy is well-publicized; that signs are posted; that employees are disciplined when they violated the policy; that training is provided; that access to the baler is limited, etc. These mitigating factors could result in reduced penalties.

If you are hit with a formal notice of violation, you have 15 days to take exception to the determination and request an administrative hearing. This request should be sent to your local Wage and Hour office or the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor and must: be dated; be typewritten or legibly written; specify the issue(s) stated in the notice of determination, giving rise to such request; state the specific reason(s) why the person requesting the hearing believes such determination is in error; be signed by the employer or his representative; and include the address for receipt of further communications from the Administrator.

While you can do it yourself, if you decide to seek a hearing, it is probably wise to seek counsel familiar with the Wage-Hour Law. The administrative hearing is conducted by a DOL Administrative Law Judge whose decision will be limited to a determination of whether the employer has committed a violation of the act, and the appropriateness of the penalty.

The decision of the Administrative Law Judge constitutes the final order of the Administrator, unless an appeal is filed with the Secretary of Labor within 30 days of the date of the decision. The final order of the Secretary is appealable to the federal courts.

AGE CERTIFICATES

While you can't prevent the Wage and Hour Administration from conducting an inspection, you can immunize yourself from liability by obtaining a "certificate of age" for an employee 18 or older (so that he or she can preform hazardous duties) and for employees 16 years or older (so that they can perform non-hazardous duties).

The federal regulations regarding child labor suggest that a certificate of age should be obtained for each person who might be under age, or who gives his age as a year or two older than the minimum age. Certificates of age may be obtained by contacting the appropriate agency in your State, probably the Department of Labor or the Industrial Commissioner.

□ 1930

SAVE AMERICA'S MARITIME INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MALONEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Speaker, a few days ago, I met with the Hampton Roads Maritime Association in my district and expressed optimism that the Clinton administration, with Secretary of Transportation Pena in the lead, would find a way to begin the revitalization of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet. Much to my dismay, I now find that I was wrong.

In what has to be one of the most disappointing actions taken thus far by the young administration, Secretary of Transportation Pena confirmed that the Department of Transportation will not seek an extension of the Operating Differential Subsidy [ODS] Program for our Nation's dwindling supply of privately owned, deep draft commercial ships.

The Clinton administration's decision represents bad transportation policy, bad economic policy, and even worse national security policy.

Ever since the end of World War II, when there were more than 5,000 privately owned, deep draft vessels in the U.S. commercial fleet, our nation's merchant marine has been in a precipitous decline.

Today, the Federal Maritime Administration reports that there are only 467 U.S.-flag commercial ships. There has been a corresponding decline in the number of skilled merchant seamen capable of manning these ships. And more than 100,000 shipbuilding and ship repair jobs have been lost since 1981.

Not coincidentally, Madam Speaker, 1981 was also the year in which the Reagan administration eliminated construction subsidies for American shipbuilding.

Now, 12 years later, the Clinton administration stands ready to scuttle the only other subsidy program designed to promote a strong U.S. merchant marine.

Faced with this prospect the Nation's only U.S. flag carriers have told Congress and the administration repeatedly that without legislation extending ODS subsidies, they will reflag their vessels under a foreign flag.

Even a Desert Storm size military operation will require our nation to charter foreign flag vessels to transport essential weapons, supplies, and troops.

What other risks and consequences may we expect from the abandonment of our merchant marine industries?

First, we will be ceding control of ocean-going trade and commerce to our competitor nations without a whimper, without any benefit from trade negotiations, and without any meaningful assessment of where this ruinous policy will lead us.

Second, while our military sealift will become increasingly dependent upon foreign-flagged ships, so also will the shipment of American made products shipped in international commerce. The consequent pricing and competitiveness of these American products may well suffer.

And third, there will be a shocking deficiency in our industrial base and a missed opportunity for trade, jobs, and world leadership in the maritime industries.

Madam Speaker, no one likes Government subsidies, particularly in today's fiscal and budget environment. But throughout American history, our Government has recognized the need for different subsidies to preserve, promote, and advance socially and economically beneficial programs that are essential to the domestic and economic objectives and standards of our Nation. Few would dispute, for example, that the billions of dollars paid to American farmers have helped to ensure that the American people receive a stable and reliable supply of food. We subsidize mass transit systems to provide more efficient and economical transportation for our people. Government underwrites the cost of some research for national security purposes and to protect against technological surprise. And now there is even discussion about subsidizing America's aerospace industry.

If we can afford these things, and we largely do, then surely we can continue to expend the modest amounts required to insure that our Nation has a merchant fleet that is worthy of our history as a maritime nation and that is deserving of our future as the world's economic leader. A healthy and competitive maritime industry for our Nation is not a luxury; it is an absolute necessity.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to give up on America's maritime industries. We have recognized, supported, and profited from this industry in the past. We can and must do so in the future.

FORMATION OF THE MANUFACTURING TASK FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, since March 1991, my home State of New Jersey has seen more than 9 percent of its manufacturing jobs disappear. And although New Jersey's loss has been dramatic—in fact it's four times the national average—across the country we are steadily losing one of our Nation's great economic assets.

Over the past 2 years, 378,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost throughout the Nation. Last month alone, 65,000 jobs were wiped out. At the rate we are going, by the 21st century "Made in the USA" could be nothing more than a memory of a more prosperous era.

The loss of any job is a hardship. But the loss of our industrial base is a severe jolt to our Nation's economic stability. People employed in manufacturing are among our best paid workers, with wages averaging 15 percent higher than other workers. They have excellent benefit packages, with 98 percent of these workers having company-paid health coverage.

As we stand by and watch one factory after another close down, we see families' dreams of a better life fade away. The leading source of advances in technology and research are being shut down. And we are seeing our best hope for narrowing the trade deficit eroding away.

To use health care analogy, manufacturing is on the critical list. The time has come to take manufacturing off life supports and develop a national action plan that will make manufacturing healthy again.

To that end, yesterday my colleague and friend, a member of the other party, MARTY MEEHAN of Massachusetts, and I announced the formation of the first ever Congressional Task Force on Manufacturing. The goal of this bipartisan task force will be to develop specific recommendations that will enable the United States to build a stronger, more diverse manufacturing base that can tap into new markets both here at home and around the globe.

The Northeast-Midwest region has long been the center of our Nation's manufacturing. But over the past three decades, the South and the West have been experiencing a surge in manufacturing, while the Northeast-Midwest States have been suffering a hemorrhaging loss. Even though manufacturing still represents 18 percent of the total employment in the Northeast-Midwest region, the loss of jobs has been staggering—more than 2 million manufacturing jobs were lost in the last decade.

Before this task force can begin to develop a recovery plan, it must first find out what went wrong—why we as a nation turned our back on manufacturing while encouraging the development of service industries. Through briefings and hearings in Washington and in industrialized centers throughout the Northeast and Midwest, the manufacturing task force will be dissecting the manufacturing sector, looking at all the factors that have contributed to its decline.

The task force will be focusing on some key areas of concern.

The first is education. Due to the failure of America's education system, manufacturers now report that they reject five out of every six job applicants. The sad fact is they lack the basic education skills needed to do the job. Every year, manufacturers spend $30 billion just to train workers. The task force will be exploring ways to raise educational standards and improve training of workers to ensure a high performance, first-class work force.

Second, we must consider changes in national tax and regulatory policies that will stimulate business expansion and factory modernization. Tax increases and mounds of new bureaucratic regulations have made manufacturing a risky business venture. Manufacturers have seen their profit margin cut by one-third since the 1960's. Our major competitors in the world marketplace, Japan and Germany, enjoy the advantage of lower effective corporate tax rates and less oppressive regulatory climates.

Ask a manufacturer the biggest obstacle to progress, and chances are he'll tell you excessive Government regulation. National environmental laws alone are costing businesses more than $75 billion a year. The total cost of complying with regulations, by some estimates, now exceeds the aggregate after-tax profits of manufacturing.

No one can argue with the intent of the myriad of new environmental laws and regulations enacted over the past three decades. But there must be a more effective and efficient way of protecting the environment and the health and safety of workers without draining manufacturers of the capital they could otherwise be investing in plant modernization, the development of new products, and creating new jobs.

Third, manufacturing will never rebound unless it's prepared to face the challenges of a constantly changing marketplace. That requires a long-term investment in research and development of new technologies. Since the mid-1980's manufacturers, particularly small ones, have been so preoccupied with just staying afloat, they have been unable to plan ahead. While other industrialized nations, such as Germany and Japan, have been investing heavily in research and development, here in the United Sates we are lagging way behind. The United States, once the world leader in innovation and technological advances, is allowing its competitive edge to slip away.

In forming this manufacturing task force we are recognizing that our Nation cannot be as strong without a vibrant and diverse manufacturing base.

Although the challenges facing our economy are great, the next 20 years

hold the opportunity of being manufacturing's golden age. The end of the cold war has opened up a new world of opportunities for U.S. manufacturers to explore. We need to seize the moment. Opportunities like these may not come along again in our lifetime or even in our children's lifetime. The task force will be analyzing ways to strengthen our global competitiveness through greater market access, stronger trade laws, and a national campaign to increase exports of manufactured goods.

I've visited dozens of manufacturing facilities in my home State of New Jersey that are expanding and researching exciting new technologies. Nationally, manufacturing exports are on the rise and actually have doubled over the last decade. Manufacturing is down, but it's certainly not out.

Madam Speaker, we, as a nation, must begin to look at manufacturing in a whole new light. It's no longer smoke stacks clogging the air or chemicals spilling into our streams. Manufacturing today is robotics and computers manned by highly skilled workers. It's also a tremendous source of new jobs. Every new manufacturing job creates four new jobs elsewhere in the economy. We need a solid manufacturing base to have a strong and prosperous nation. Without it, the quality of life as we know it may never be the same.

□ 1940

DEATH OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL CHAIRMAN JOHN A. WILSON

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

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I have just learned that D.C. City Council Chairman John Wilson passed away suddenly this afternoon. Chairman Wilson has been a tireless fighter for the District of Columbia and in recent days has spent hours right in this Capitol, working with the D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, JULIAN DIXON, on the D.C. budget.

I would ask that all Members of this body pray for the Wilson family in this hour of great sadness.

A CLEAR MESSAGE: CUT SPENDING, DON'T RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, at an appearance in Birmingham, AL, on May 11, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary characterized President Clinton's $70 billion energy tax as a "piss-ant tax." Secretary O'Leary apparently used this vulgar term to indicate that this tax is insignificant, nominal, or unimportant. But it was not insignificant to the aluminum industry which has activated a huge and apparently successful effort to have itself exempted from this tax. And it is not significant to the steel industry or the plastics industry which successfully lobbied the Clinton administration for exemption from this tax.

I am delighted to hear that the administration and the Democrat leadership has realized how devastating this tax would be on the aluminum, steel, and plastics industries—all of which are energy intensive industries. But America's private citizens can't afford and don't have an army of lobbyists to protect them from what Secretary O'Leary believes is an insignificant tax. And the people I represent certainly don't think this tax is insignificant. The State of Alabama has a general fund budget of $827 million. That is what we operate our entire State Government on, excepting education, $827 million. This tax, if it had been enacted in Alabama would raise $550 million, enough money to operate our State general fund and State Government for a period of 7 months out of the year. If this tax which Secretary O'Leary calls insignificant passes in Alabama, Alabama drivers will pay almost $250 million a year in additional gasoline taxes. If this tax passes Alabama homeowners and households will pay $76 million in additional electricity costs, certainly not insignificant.

This tax will take $500 a year out of the pockets of every family in Alabama. That may not seem like much to Secretary O'Leary, but for a struggling family it's enough to buy a month's worth of groceries or to pay a month's rent. For a struggling family, $500 is enough to pay for necessary visits to the doctor; it's even enough to buy shoes and clothes needed for the children to start the school year. In short, this tax is significant—it's costly. And it hurts most those very people that Bill Clinton promised tax relief not so long ago—the now, judging from this tax proposal, forgotten middle class.

This tax is very damaging to businesses who are trying to compete with foreign companies. Its effect is anything but nominal. It will cripple companies who are fighting to protect their markets at home in tough competition against foreign companies who do not have to pay this tax in their production facilities.

This tax is certainly not inconsequential to our Nation's manufacturers and the 18 million people employed by them. They rely on energy to keep their assembly lines going and to transport their goods to the marketplace. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that more than 600,000 jobs will be lost if it is implemented. Try to tell those American families that this tax is insignificant. This tax is also significant to American farmers who will pay an unfair burden due to their heavy reliance on fuel to work their fields and to travel the longer distances required of those who live in our rural communities.

Secretary O'Leary's insensitivity regarding this tax is only exceeded by the arrogance of the Democrat majority members of the Ways and Means Committee who met in secret to act on this and all the other tax increases. These Democrat members essentially locked out not only members of the press but the American people. They apparently had to huddle behind closed doors because they knew that the Clinton tax plan couldn't bear the light of day, or the scrutiny of the American people.

Madam Speaker, whenever people from my district in Alabama come to Washington, I take great pride in telling them that the Capitol is their building; Washington is their city; and they can visit the gallery or committee meetings at any time.

Well, I guess I was wrong. First it was Hillary Rodham Clinton's secret health care group—meeting in closed sessions—that felt it should be above the law. Now, it is the Democrat members of the powerful Ways and Means Committee. All of this because the Democrat majority can't bear to raise taxes in public.

Ordinary Americans and small businesses have a right to feel outraged by the arrogance of the Democrat members of the Ways and Means Committee for shutting them out.

Since they cannot hire lobbyists, ordinary, rank-and-file Americans and small businesses apparently are not being heard by the Clinton administration and the Democrat members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you: these ordinary, grassroots Americans contact me every day, and their message is clear—cut spending; don't raise taxes. My constituents in Alabama understand the effect of the energy tax far more clearly than Secretary O'Leary, and they do not consider the effects of a $70 billion tax costing $500 a family to be insignificant or nominal. The Ways and Means Committee as well as the Democrat leadership of this House would be well advised to listen to the peoples' good advice: cut spending first.

Madam Speaker, for the RECORD I include information on Alabama State funds:

STATE GENERAL FUND SUMMARY

[Fiscal Years 1988–89 through 1993–94]

	Fiscal year (actual)				Fiscal year (estimated)	
	1988–89	1989–90	1990–91	1991–92	1992–93	1993–94
Balance to begin year	32,666,489	18,694,446	30,957,400	609,782	23,365,616	
Receipts	[1] 713,463,977	[2] 750,230,918	797,383,173	808,334,687	788,000,000	818,046,526
Add agency transfers:						
ABC board						2,506,113
Public Service Commission						1,300,000
Total available	746,130,466	768,925,364	828,340,573	808,944,469	811,365,616	821,852,639
Less:						
Expenditures and encumbrances	727,436,020	737,967,964	827,730,791	[3] 785,578,853	[4] 807,668,781	821,852,639
Anticipated proration reduction					3,696,835	
Balance at end of year	18,694,446	30,957,400	609,782	23,365,616	0	0

[1] Revenue and fee increase measures passed in 1988 special sessions of $85,167,790.
[2] Hazardous waste fee increase. One-fourth year collection for FY90 $6,984,547 and full year for FY91 and thereafter.
[3] Reflects proration at 5.5%.
[4] Reflects proration at 3.2%.

ALABAMA SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND SUMMARY

[Fiscal years 1988–89 through 1993–94]

	Fiscal year (actual)				Fiscal year (estimated)	
	1988–89	1989–90	1990–91	1991–92	1992–93	1993–94
Balance to begin year	143,833,170	34,254,022	34,082,483	415,885	2,523,903	32,137,027
Receipts	2,379,795,463	2,467,657,540	2,498,708,590	2,628,893,510	2,725,178,640	2,850,107,479
Add:						
Proration prevention transfer	0	21,000,000	33,314,779	0	0	0
Less:						
Trade school and junior college authority bonds	1,762,903	1,743,750	1,743,000	0	0	0
Revenue Departments—administrative costs	4,551,036	5,080,802	5,740,137	5,740,137	5,878,640	6,557,479
Net receipts	2,373,481,524	2,481,832,988	2,524,540,232	2,623,153,373	2,719,300,000	2,843,550,000
Total available	2,517,314,694	2,516,087,010	2,558,622,715	2,623,569,258	2,721,823,903	2,875,687,027
Less:						
Expenditures and encumbrances	2,483,672	2,482,004,527	[1] 2,558,206,830	2,621,045,355	2,700,052,066	2,875,687,027
Reversion from State board of education—local boards					(10,365,190)	
Balance at end of year	34,254,022	34,082,483	415,885	2,523,903	32,137,027	0

[1] Includes amounts for 8% teachers' and 7.5% employees' pay raises.

□ 1950

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AVAILABILITY OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE SECTIONS OF RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise to alert my colleagues that text of the Ways and Means Committee sections of the reconciliation bill are now available for their examination. I have introduced the two Ways and Means titles as H.R. 2141 for the sole purpose of making the text available for discussion. Of course, this bill will not be considered, but will be included in the reconciliation legislation that we will vote on next week. Report language is also available.

This means that Members will have more than a week to analyze and understand our package before it comes to a vote.

CONSIDERATION OF ROBERT CARTER RANDOLPH IV FOR U.S. ATTORNEY POSITION IN WASHINGTON STATE

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

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I said on election night, November 3, 1992, that I would be willing to extend my own personal 6 months of so-called honeymoon period to the President to see what he could put together, and how he would maintain his promises and his constant emphasis upon the word change. And I expected my 6 months to run from election night itself, because in our great system, and with our great freedom of speech, and our news fascination with winners, and not with those who finish second, and that generally extends even to our great international Olympics, I knew that the President would command media focus all during the interim period of November, December, and up through January. Certainly leading up to the January 20 Inauguration they commanded all of the attention with bus rides, Monticello, and grandiose ringing of bells, and staged by Hollywood producers an exit from the Lincoln Memorial, and that was fine. It was all very euphoric, if you were a Democrat, and particularly if you were a liberal Democrat and you knew exactly that that is what this so-called new Democrat—not—really was.

So the countdown from November to December, January, February, March, April, May, and for me was up on April 30, and then here it is 2 weeks after that. I think it is time for me to fulfill the second half of that promise, that if the President fell far short of what he was talking about during the campaign that I would start to come to the well of this House again, whether there are four or five Members on the floor, which there are tonight, because we still know that the audience is now way over a million taxpaying citizens watching through the collectively funded services of all of our cable companies across America. They have all support voluntarily for C–SPAN I televising this Chamber and C–SPAN II.

Today I received a memo from one of my staffers about yet another Clinton appointment that I think flies in the face of decency, fairness, and brings back the revenge of the late 1960's and early 1970's where draft-dodging cowards are being put in high offices. In this case we are talking about a U.S. attorney's job in the State of Washington. That is supposed to be the main Federal man going after law breakers.

Listen to this story. Congressmen, we, my office, received a call today from a concerned citizen. He spent two tours in Vietnam as a marine officer, has two Silver Stars, two Purple Hearts, one of them earned during the Tet offensive. He called to bring attention to Robert Carter Randolph IV, one of his classmates from VMI, Virginia Military Institute, an excellent school giving this country a great percentage

of its officer corps for more than two centuries. Robert Carter Randolph IV is being proposed as U.S. attorney in Washington State, and he thought you might be interested in this story.

Robert Carter Randolph IV was a platoon leader with the Marine Corps ROTC program at VMI. He received a full scholarship for his final 3 years from the U.S. Marine Corps. He was selected class president on June 10, 1967. He was commissioned as an officer in the Marine Corps. By the way, President Johnson then used to talk about polls showing 80 percent support for the war against communism, Communist expansionism in Indo-China. On finishing Virginia Military Institute, he was awarded a Rhodes scholarship. Part of that was because he was an outstanding military student and was going into the Marine Corps.

While all of his classmates went off to Vietnam, many to die for their country and the cause of freedom from communism, Randolph left for Oxford, having been given a 2-year deferral of service from the Marine Corps. Nothing wrong with that. Some Oxford students, four of them from West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy did their 2 years and went to Vietnam and excelled brilliantly, and many of them received Purple Hearts and higher decorations for valor.

In 1969 Randolph returns from England and then he declares himself a conscientious objector, now that he has his masters from Oxford, and he tells the Marine Corps that he cannot serve. The Marines tell him that he must enter the Platoon Leaders Corps until his case is resolved. He is sent to Quantico, VA. There Randolph begins to organize enlisted recruits to protest against the war in Vietnam. I believe that is insidious. Randolph, in a Marine Corps officer's uniform, goes on national television to condemn the United States. You know, "ho, ho, Ho Chi Minh," aid and comfort to the Communist enemies slaughtering people and slitting the throats of village chieftans.

He then is discharged from the Marines. That is a given. Three months later he enters Harvard Law School where he very conscientiously applied at the same time that he had declared himself an objector, and on graduation from Harvard he accepts a position with a British firm in Singapore.

The President of Singapore, President Lee, told me that our young men died in Vietnam and saved his country from the Communist struggle, that he was a domino. He said this in front of 10 Congressmen, liberals and conservatives alike. He said that with me and with Brig. Gen. Ben Blaz, then Congressman Blaz from Guam, and I stayed behind with him, and General Blaz said, "I never met a better public servant in my life. Thank you, President Lee, for telling me what I always knew in my heart, that our children did not go and die in vain in Vietnam, but were saving Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia." And here Randolph finds himself drawing big dollars in Singapore as a Rhodes scholar and a VMI graduate.

Then he worked for a law firm in Seattle. In 1992, he was a big fund raiser for Clinton-Gore. Now he is being considered, or I should say moving through the process for U.S. Federal attorney in Washington State.

He could not serve his country in 1969, but he wants to now on the Federal payroll. Some scrutiny needs to be brought to this nomination, and 1 minute would be great, Congressman, "Clinton's idea of moral leadership."

Madam Speaker, I say thank you to this citizen for fighting communism and helping with the cold war, which our President did not do.

ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, May 20th, marks a special anniversary for all freedom loving people of the world for it is the anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba. It is Cuba's Fourth of July.

Yet instead of a true celebration, there is nothing but sorrow this 20th of May for the Cuban people. For this date marks just another year of brutal repression, another year of tyrannical rule, another year of total lack of liberties, another year of suppression of democracy.

Just yesterday, the Miami Herald published this interesting one line article:

"Cuba—two Cuban dissidents, Paula Valiente and Juan Guarino, on Monday were given a 1-year suspended sentence for calling an alternative May Day rally in Havana, official sources said."

The mere announcement that you are calling for a rally is enough to get you arrested, tried, and convicted.

The freedom that we take so lightly here in the United States is a cause of criminal sanctions in Cuba.

How much further proof is needed that Cuba is a horrid police state?

There are dozens of reports from international human rights groups which have carefully documented the continued abuses of the Castro regime. There are dozens of studies which have proven that the repression of dissidents is increasing in Cuba.

I have here just three such reports:

First, the country reports on human rights practices for 1992, as prepared by the Department of State, second, the report by Amnesty International, and third, the Human Rights Watch World Report for 1992, written by Americas Watch.

All carefully analyze the totalitarian state of Cuba, dominated, as the State Department points out, by Fidel Castro, who is President, Chief of State, head of government, First Secretary of the Communist Party, and Commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces.

In every category, Castro's abysmal record stands out.

In the category of respect for human rights, the following are included in the State Department report: political and extrajudicial killing, torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, arbitrary arrest, detention or exile, denial of fair public trial, and arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home, or correspondence.

In all of these areas, Fidel Castro's cruelty to the Cuban people seems to know no bounds.

In the next section of the State Department report labeled "Respect for Civil Liberties," the list of abuses is equally repugnant.

For there is no: Freedom of speech and press, no freedom of peaceful assembly and association—Remember what happened just on Monday? A conviction for trying to have a rally that was not sanctioned by the Castro regime—no freedom of religion and no freedom of movement within the county, foreign travel, immigration, or reparation.

In the other sections of the report, the tragic story of Cuban people is repeated: No respect for political rights, no right of citizens to change their government, and no right for international and non-governmental investigation of human rights violations.

Workers rights are also ignored: There are no independent unions, no collective bargaining exists, there is no prohibition on forced labor, and any child 11 years old and above is expected to work 8 hours a day in the summer in farm labor.

As every credible report points out, there are no basic civil and political rights and peaceful dissenters are routinely imprisoned for trumped up charges of incitement and rebellion. By law merely insulting Castro means a 3-year prison sentence.

But there are signs of hope in Cuba. The days of Castro's repression will soon be over and a new dawn of freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights will flourish once again.

I am honored that distinguished Members of Congress have joined me in this special order to highlight Castro's abuses and to call for a new beginning of democracy in my native homeland.

□ 2000

Joining us tonight will be the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], my dear colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], of Miami, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], a neighbor, of Miami, as well as, of course, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who will join us to finish this special order.

I am now pleased to call upon and yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who will speak to us about the human-rights abuses in Cuba.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I want to thank her for

taking out this special order, and I especially want to thank her for her leadership on behalf of human rights in general and human rights in Central America and Cuba in particular.

As ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been able to watch the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN]. She has done an outstanding job in advocating freedom and democratization for Cubans who have unfortunately suffered the tyranny of Castro since 1959.

Madam Speaker, just let me say that Cuban Independence Day celebrates the freedom of the Cuban people from the colonial rule of Spain on May 20, 1902. It is symbolized in the person of Jose Julian Marti. Marti organized and unified the Cuban independence movement and was killed on the battlefield fighting for independence 7 years before independence was realized. The United States assisted Cuba in its fight for independence in the Spanish-American War.

Cubans continue to fight for freedom from oppression which today takes the form of Castro and his Communist regime, in power since January 1, 1959. The human rights situation in Cuba is abysmal, prompting many to continue seeking ways to escape the repression and indignity of the Castro regime and to continue their struggle to free Cuba from dictatorial rule.

There are many restrictions, as the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] pointed out a moment ago, on individual liberty and on freedom of expression, movement, and assembly. Actions are taken against human rights activists, free trade union leaders, and people seeking peaceful democratic change in Cuba. The arrest of free trade union leader Rafael Gutierrez and the physical attacks on human rights leaders such as Gustavo Arcos and Rodolfo Gonzalez and Jesus Yanes Pelletier are examples of the violence on the persons who opposed the Castro regime.

I remember, Madam Speaker, several years ago when I first had the privilege of meeting Amando Vallidares, and when I sat down and read this book, read it in two nights, could not put it down. It was a shocking expose of the kind of brutality that Castro visits upon his opponents, upon people who espouse democratic change and human rights in Cuba.

I am very happy to report that Amando Vallidares has served, as I think most of us, if not all of us, certainly all of us in this Chamber, know, with great distinction as our Ambassador to the United Nations Convention on Human Rights, and when I served as the congressional delegate to the United Nations, I had the distinct privilege of working with him in Geneva and seeing him firsthand working with other ambassadors to bring fact-finding missions to Cuba to investigate these many abuses.

The U.N. Human Rights Commission until then had been pretty much of a paper tiger issuing reports, doing very little of substance. Amando Vallidares changed all of that, and a very substantive report and series of reports resulted from that.

Regrettably, many of those people who came forward to speak out to the U.N. factfinders were harassed and beaten and incarcerated by the thugs in Cuba, but, nevertheless, with the continued pressure for reform, the information got out, and the pressure for reform was at least heightened.

Madam Speaker, Amnesty International has issued many reports on the beatings and arrests of several leaders of human rights organizations and democratic organizations. For example, the president of the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation was arrested in December 1992 and beaten until nearly unconscious. His house was ransacked, and much of the contents destroyed. His family was subject to harassment by pro-government crowds. He was released later in the month but a trial is still pending. He is charged with disrespect toward the Castro regime.

A member of the Cuban Committee for Human Rights, Rodolfo Gonzalez, was arrested in December 1992, as well, following a search of his home in Havana. He is being detained and charged with enemy propaganda. Amnesty International reports that he is being detained at the headquarters of the Department of State Security.

In a recent report Amnesty International also lists at least 10 short-term, 22 long-term, and 38 probable prisoners of conscience, along with several hundred who are currently in prison for trying to leave Cuba without permission. Those who manage to avoid the long-term prison sentences are subject to other forms of harassment which include frequent questioning by the police, fines, threats against them and their families, loss of employment, and physical attacks.

Madam Speaker, as was pointed out, there is continued harassment in the area of religious freedom. Catholics and Protestants are victims. They experience discrimination in education and employment, lack of access to the media, and the imposition of atheistic teachings in the schools upon their children.

Free speech is curtailed, very much curtailed, by the state-owned media, and all other press and broadcasting is illegal.

Let me just finally say, Madam Speaker, that a recent appeal by 40 human rights and prodemocracy organizations in Cuba to Members of this Congress says, "We, the people of Cuba, remain enslaved under Castro's dictatorship, persecuted each day for our beliefs, denied our most fundamental and natural rights. This week, May 20, Cuba will pass one more Independence Day as a captive people under Castro's tyranny. On that day, who knows how many more of our brothers and sisters will be beaten and arrested or how many will die trying to flee the island on rafts in search of liberty. We have not given up hope, and our hope rests in international solidarity with our desire for freedom."

Madam Speaker, with the leadership of the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and others, I just want to say that we are in solidarity with the suffering people of Cuba. We will remain so until that island nation is free.

Even family members of prisoners are victims of abuse. Xiomara Gonzalez Figueroa, a wife of a prisoner of conscience, Fernando Velazquez Medina, was reportedly dismissed from her job at a magazine where she had worked for 23 years. They terminated her job because they said that she was no longer suitable to work for a publication of a political organization.

PRISON CONDITIONS

Amnesty International also reports that conditions in Cuban prisons continue to deteriorate. The amount and quality of food is extremely poor. Prisoners suffer from a variety of diseases because of poor food, poor sanitary conditions, and lack of medical attention. Reports say that many prisoners are sleeping on the floors with no mattresses. Many political prisoners have been transferred to prisons far from their families, limiting visitations. Amnesty International: Cuba, Silencing the Voices of Dissent, December 1992.

ELECTION LAWS

Americas Watch cites restrictive election laws where only candidates who are acceptable to the government can be elected. The law also forbids campaigning. The only information about candidates which is given to voters is biographical data, which is state distributed.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Free speech is curtailed by the state-owned media, all other press and broadcasting is illegal. There are also laws which prohibit enemy propaganda, clandestine printing, defamation of public institutions. And 3-year prison terms for insulting Castro. Americas Watch report on Cuba "Perfecting" the System of Control, Human Rights Violations in Castro's 34th Year, February 25, 1993.

RELIGIOUS REPRESSION

Catholics and Protestants are also victims. They experience discrimination in education and employment, lack of access to the media and the imposition of atheistic teaching in the

schools. Maj. Orestes Lorenzo, the pilot who bravely rescued his family so dramatically last year, said that the forced atheistic indoctrination of the children was one of the main reasons he wanted to remove them from Cuba.

The Catholic bishops have pointed out that there are plainclothes security agents with guns and blunt instruments in the churches during religious services. The bishops have said that "Far from contributing to good order, this behavior generates anxiety and aggressiveness that threatens to explode in any situation of this kind." The bishops have condemned the violence that people experience for expressing themselves within the church.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The worsening economic conditions, brought on not only by the collapse of the Soviet Union, but also by Castro's economic policies has led to a crisis which is officially termed "A Special Period in Times of Peace." This special period includes food rationing, which has led to increased activity in black market trading, and scheduled power outages. A report from the Stanley Foundation Courier says "When an outage occurs, Cubans will just point to the dark light bulb and say 'special period.' No other explanation is needed." Spring 1993 Courier.

CUBANS FLEEING CUBA

The desperation of the Cuban people to flee the repression of the Castro regime was focused on in a recent Associated Press article. A 28-year-old woman, Raiza Teresa Santana and her 10-year-old son, Frank survived an 11-day raft trip from Cuba hoping to join relatives in Florida. Two other companions were lost when they left the raft and floated out of reach. When the mother and son were found the mother was in a coma, suffering from respiratory failure, kidney failure, and a swollen brain. They, like 2,500 Cubans last year, and 771 already this year, risk the winds and currents of the Gulf Stream to escape Cuba. AP News report 5/18/93.

CONCLUSION

A recent appeal by 40 human rights and pro-democracy organizations in Cuba to Members of Congress says "(W)e the people of Cuba remain enslaved under Castro's dictatorship, persecuted each day for our beliefs, denied our most fundamental and natural rights. . . . This week, May 20th, Cuba will pass one more Independence Day as a captive people under Castro's tyranny. On that day, who knows how many more of our brothers and sisters will be beaten and arrested, or how many will die trying to flee the island on rafts in search of liberty. But we have not given up hope, and our hope rests in international solidarity with our desire for freedom."

As the people of Cuba once again commemorate Cuban Independence Day, these human rights abuses remind us that Cubans have not yet attained the freedom that they fought for earlier this century.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. We are so gifted and privileged to have him as the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. As all of us can see, he has been a longtime outspoken opponent of human rights abuses in Cuba, and we thank him for his strong leadership.

Tonight we are joined by some freshman Members of the House, but the two of them I had the privilege of serving with in the house and in the senate in the State legislature, and before we get to the fine orator, who is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], I would like to introduce a person who also brings some fine oratory skills to our Chamber with a great deal of passion and intellect that he brings to issues especially when it comes to the subject of a free and democratic Cuba, and that is our dear Congressman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

□ 2010

Mr. DEUTSCH. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I will tell you that as the Member of Congress who literally has the district closest to Cuba, where Cuba is literally 90 miles from the shore and many of those that make their way from the shores of Cuba on rafts that are as small as toy things that we throw into pools, it is a special honor to be with you today.

Also, as someone who was recently in the Cuban base of Guantanamo Bay, the last bastion of freedom on that island, and had the opportunity while I was there to meet some true heroes, several people who had literally walked through minefields or who had swam in shark-infested waters to make their way to Guantanamo Bay and to freedom, to talk to people who have traveled that road is an experience that I wish all Americans could have because it would give us a sense of what really truly we take for granted, unfortunately, too often in this country, because the numbers that are used add up to less than 50 percent of those that cross the minefields or try to swim out of the waters of Castro's terror die in that process.

To think of what it takes for a person to literally be willing to risk their lives in such conditions is clearly beyond our imagination.

Tomorrow, Cuban's around the world will remember the 91st anniversary of Cuba's independence from Spain. Sadly, this event acts as a reminder that these same people are no longer enjoying the freedoms for which they struggled and perished. It is ironic that my colleagues and I rise today to celebrate Cuban independence 1 day prior to its actual commemoration.

It is today that we mark the 98th anniversary of Jose Marti's death, Cuba's best loved patriot and the symbol of Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain. Under his leadership, the Cuban independence movement was conceived. On April 11, 1895, Marti led Cuban troops in an invasion of the island. And, it was during these early days of the invasion that he died on the battlefield.

The death of Jose Marti has today become the most appropriate symbol for the people of Cuba. The same hopes and dreams that he embodied for the Cuba people have died under the Castro regime. The system that exists under the Castro regime is one of systematic repression, humanitarian abuse, and poverty. This was not the vision for which the Cuban people struggled, committing their lives and souls.

This year, as in years past, the United Nations has condemned the human rights situation in Cuba under Castro. The Castro government continues to bar the entry of U.N. human rights investigators and refuses to ratify the main U.N. human rights accord. The silencing of dissidents through incarceration and physical violence is a common practice of which the world is well aware.

But perhaps the best testament to the unbearable situation on the island is the willingness of thousands of Cubans to risk their lives in order to live in freedom in the United States. As I mentioned many Cubans have made the journey to the United States on rafts barely suitable as pool toys. They take to these rafts, known as balsas, risking death from dehydration, starvation, and exposure. We know of thousands of Cuban refugees who have made it to United States shores this way and can only guess at how many have perished on their journey.

I notice it has been reported in the papers, unfortunately, a mother who is dying in Miami right now, is dying because she drank saltwater during her trip on the raft because she had given her bottle of fresh water to her 10-year-old son, who was also traveling toward the shores of freedom.

There are other Cuban immigrants, as well, who have traded their privileged lives for lives of freedom that their wealth could not buy in Cuba. These individuals have left behind careers as doctors, engineers, professors, and journalists in order to live freely as manual laborers and street sweepers. Not only have all of these brave individuals taken risks to make the trip to the United States, their very intentions placed them and their families at risk of persecution should these intentions have been discovered.

It appears that years of Castro's attempts to stifle free thought have not been able to squelch the Cuban people's commitment to democracy and freedom. The tactic of consistent humani-

tarian abuse has not been sufficient to break the will and the spirit of the Cuban people. And it is in honor of Cuban Independence Day that I take this opportunity to celebrate the unwavering spirit of the Cuban people.

Today, I stand with my colleagues in solidarity with the people of Cuba. As we celebrate their will and strength, we recall the legacy of Jose Marti and his commitment to the principle of personal liberty. And, as Americans we remember our own struggle for sovereignty and the belief that this was, and is, our fundamental right. I sincerely hope that soon the Cuban people will share my feelings of freedom and have the ability to live without fear.

And I will tell you that when I ran for Congress, there was no greater desire, and hope, and expectation that in my term in the United States Congress I expect to be part of the Congress that sees the day when the Cuban people are free.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Amen.

I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent statement on the dismal conditions in Cuba.

Next I would like to present to you Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART.

While in the State legislature, LINCOLN and I served together, and LINCOLN was rated highly in all of the polls for being effective, intelligent, forceful, and, as we will find out tonight, a great debater and a person who uses words wisely and very effectively.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I commend the gentlewoman for having thought of and moved forward with this important commemoration of the 91st anniversary of the birth of the Cuban Republic.

All of us, all of us pray and work with the hope that tonight is not only the eve of the 91st anniversary of the Cuban Republic but that we are really on the eve of the birth of a new Cuba, and we feel it.

We know it is coming, we know that it requires, however, consistent work, prayer, much dedication, with passion and commitment. And I know that the gentlewoman is passionately committed to this cause, as are all of the colleagues who have spoken and who will speak this evening. The people of Cuba are very grateful for that, in addition to the people of the United States, because the people of the United States have shown throughout their history great solidarity for the Cuban people.

And today, after 34 years of the most brutal dictatorship in the history of this hemisphere, it is the people of the United States, through the Congress of the United States, who maintain the only sanction in the world, the only sanction in the world existing against the brutality and the inhumanity which has been described and Congressman SMITH and Congressman DEUTSCH have described and which the gentlewoman, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, know very well, because we spent our weekend, the gentlewoman and I, in Miami, taking time from our families and our constituents last weekend, when we heard about Raiza Teresa Santana, the Cuban mother, 28 years old, about whom Congressman DEUTSCH, spoke, who left on a makeshift raft with her 10-year-old son and gave all of her drinking water and her food to her son. She then lost consciousness. Her son later sighted one of those large cruise ships and was rescued. By that time, the mother was unconscious, had slipped, in fact, into a coma. We worked diligently, and we express our gratitude through this means to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for having heeded our call and permitted Raiza Santana to be brought to the United States for treatment. Yet we have heard today that she passed away.

Madam Speaker, I dedicate my words this evening to that 28-year-old mother who demonstrated many things, but among the many things that she demonstrated was that Cuba is alive and that after 34 years of the most brutal dictatorship in the history of this hemisphere, the Cuban people are alive and the best interests and the best feelings of those people, the best traditions of those people are alive and are being manifested in glorious ways day in and day out despite the indifference of the world and the media that all too often simply ignores or certainly makes no effort to find the constant examples of heroism.

□ 2020

How many people who are listening to us on C-SPAN this evening have heard about Raisa Santana and her 10-year-old son, Frank, who tonight is fine with family members in Hialeah, my district?

How many people in the United States have heard that story, one of the most glorious, heroic stories that I certainly have ever heard about?

I think it is indicative of the indifference of the world at large that everyone in the world has not been informed of that example of heroism, and yet we see a massive campaign by the dictatorship. Here this week in the Congress there is a group of people who call themselves religious leaders from Cuba. They are lobbying Congress this week. They get exit visas. They are let in by the State Department and they come to lobby against our policy. They come to lobby against the only sanction that exists in the entire world against the brutality of the Castro regime, and they are here.

That delegation is composed, among the reverends in that delegation is a Rev. Luis Suarez, a member of parliament from Castro's Cuba, who has sworn allegiance to the socialist and atheist constitution and who ends his sermon with—you all know how Castro ends his speeches, "Patria o Muerte, Venceremos."

"Fatherland, or death. We shall triumph."

He ends with "Patria o Muerte, Amen."

That is a pastor here. I have a letter from the Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organization, and the Pastors for Peace, talking about how these people are in Congress lobbying this week.

Last week there was a so-called dissident who was lobbying Congress and the administration, gets an exit visa, gets a visa from our Government to come here and lobby against our policy, against the only sanction in the world against the barbarian, against the torture of the Castro regime.

We asked if Raisa Santana could have gotten an exit visa, or if Rafael Gutierrez Santos, who was mentioned by Congressman SMITH, could have gotten an exit visa. Well, he is in prison. He is head of the Independent Labor Movement.

Or Maria Celina Rodriguez, who is head of Liberty and Faith, a Christian organization, who has been in prison. Her son, 5 years old, the youngest political prisoner in the world, spent time in Villa Marista, the Interior Ministry Building, when she was sent for psychiatric treatment. I wonder if Maria Celina or her son could get an exit visa to come and lobby Congress.

Or Oswaldo Paya Sardinas, coordinator of the Christian Liberation Movement, in prison. I wonder if he would have gotten an exit visa, or even permission from the Government to come and lobby our Congress against our policy.

No, they do not get permission, but the Government is desperate because they know that history has passed them by and that the rope is at the neck of the dictator and that it is only a matter of time, because of the heroism that people are demonstrating on a day-in and day-out basis, despite the indifference and the ignorance of an all too different world, except for the people of the United States; except for the people of the United States who in another demonstration of generosity and solidarity toward an oppressed people, as I have stated before, but I think it cannot be repeated too often, have supported and continue to support the only sanction in the world against the horror of that regime.

I think it is time, however, that others join us. It is time for our allies to join us. It is time for the Russian Government to join us. They are seeking another $2 billion in our assistance.

And by the way, we all support President Yeltsin. I think he is the best friend we have there in Russia and I think it is great for freedom and democracy that he is in power; but he must maintain a strong position and he

should not be providing oil anymore to the Castro dictatorship. That is simply an intolerable reality.

We certainly cannot be providing more aid to Russia if Russia continues to provide assistance and especially oil, which is the lifeblood of the Castro regime to Havana.

As the debate comes on Russian aid, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] and I have spoken about this often.

Madam Speaker, as the debate approaches and intensifies on aid to Russia, this will be heard more, because it is simply unacceptable and it has to stop. The lifeblood to the dictatorship has got to stop.

Our prayers and our intense efforts are dedicated to accelerating the arrival of the day that the Cuban nightmare of today will be but a memory of the dreadful past.

This last weekend a classroom full of small children in France, that had been kidnapped by a crazed madman, was freed by the French police. The French Security Minister addressed the nation on television and he declared, "Fellow countrymen, the nightmare is over. The madman is dead."

As we commemorate this, the 91st anniversary of Cuban independence in 1902, we hope and we pray and we intensely work so that soon those words of the French Security Minister will be applicable to the Cuban people as well.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] so much. He is such a wonderful addition to the U.S. Congress. His eloquence is breathtaking and his passion is so strong that I hope it is contagious to all the other Members in our body. Congressman DIAZ-BALART and I have a warm positive working relationship and it has been such a joy for me, and the members of my staff, to have worked closely with the gentleman, and the members of his staff, on the important task of liberating our native homeland.

I say thank you to Congressman DIAZ-BALART.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield to my mentor on foreign affairs before he became a big shot on the Rules Committee. That is Congressman PORTER GOSS whose guidance and leadership I miss so much, but I know he is representing our views very well in that committee. Congressman GOSS has a great deal of experience on the issues of foreign affairs, especially as it relates to seeking democracy in Cuba. I thank Congressman GOSS, as always, for joining us every time that the discussion lends itself to establishing freedom and democracy in Cuba.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I want very much to thank her especially for the opportunity to speak on this subject.

I would also like to say, this is an observation of Independence Day in Cuba. I think it is very appropriate that Florida's voice has always been loud, and in the forefront, when the subject of Cuban independence has been raised, but this is not a Florida issue. This is truly a national issue and it deserves the attention of every American.

I want to say congratulations and thank you not only to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] but my other colleagues as well, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART] who has spoken so eloquently, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETER DEUTSCH] who has spoken so factually about what is going on; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CHRIS SMITH] who has talked about the human rights aspects, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] who is unique in his own way in bringing his experience and passion to his statement that we have heard before and I am sure we will hear at this most appropriate time of independence.

It is critical that we keep this on the national radar scope. I think that is what this effort is about.

Tomorrow I know will be a day of celebration, the 91st anniversary of the ascension to power of the first elected President of the New Republic of Cuba.

For most Americans, when we talk about Independence Day it is a time of celebration for the rewards that we gained from our own struggle for freedom, for the right to speak our minds, the right to make our own decisions, the opportunity to build a safe and secure life for ourselves and our families and our children, regardless of whatever political or religious beliefs we may hold.

Regrettably, as we are on the eve of Cuban Independence Day, the Cuban people do not enjoy the rights and privileges that we associate with independence in this country; things, frankly, that we take for granted.

For 34 years now under the tyranny of Fidel Castro and communism and his cronies, the realization of these freedoms have been denied. They have been denied to the Cuban people. They have been quashed by organized civilian goon squads, plainclothes police, and the Brigadas Accion Rapidas, that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART] will tell us more about when we get in a colloquy about how the reaction in Fidel's Cuba took place to persecute the surviving family members of indeed the lady that we tragically learned died today, giving her life to save her son and escaping from Fidel's Cuba.

These brigades go out and seek and crush any political dissent or any attempts to improve human rights in that country. These are things that we will not tolerate for even an instant in this country, and yet just a few miles off our shores they are going on, and somehow our media are not picking up on it.

Very simply put, I think Fidel Castro has it exactly backwards. Instead of governing for the people, he enforces his will at the expense of the Cuban people.

□ 2030

Instead of independence, Madam Speaker, Castro has given the Cuban people a lose/lose choice of socialism or death. True independence is, sadly, still a dream that most Cubans do not have. Cuba lives, I think, for a tomorrow that has yet to come. Lives there continue to be dominated by a repressive dictator and a political and economic system that, almost everywhere else on the globe where it has been tried, has failed. It has gone the way of the dinosaur. It has crashed into a black tar pit of oblivion, never to be seen again. It is called socialism, and it does not work.

Castro and Cuba are isolated, not because of policies of the United States Government, not because of things that we have done here, but because Castro's Cuba has chosen to identify itself with the criminals of the world, the Libyas, the Iraqs, the people who are in business for themselves, not for their people. The economic philosophy in Castro's Cuba truly has bankrupted the country and truly has jeopardized the future of the Cuban people.

One thing is very clear, Madam Speaker, and it may give us hope: Time is not on Fidel's side. As the tide of democracy and capitalism continues to sweep over the Western Hemisphere, we see Castro is alone; he is barely keeping his head above water. The glare of international attention is shining on the human rights abuses and political repression. Other people know about it, and they care. Cuba's economy is in free fall. In fact, many believe Castro would be gone now except for the fear he has been able to introduce into society. Maybe there is some naivete there in the younger generation. Maybe there is some residue of some ideological faith of those who do not understand. But it is mostly fear that prevents Cubans from imagining anything other than life under Castro.

But just because this is today's Cuba does not mean it has to be that way tomorrow. In fact, under the leadership of many who have spoken here tonight, and again I congratulate particularly my colleagues who understand this so well, personally and passionately, being from Cuba, as the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART]. Under their leadership we see the spirit of the Cuban people and their struggle for freedom, and we want to support and encourage that, and I think perhaps the embodiment of that spirit is well shown in the tragic death

of the mother who died today in her effort to escape with her son. I am delighted to hear that her son lives, and I hope, when we do get into a colloquy, that we can have a little talk on what the brigades have done.

The United States, as their neighbors to the north, obviously, have got to do what we can to help the Cuban people achieve their dream, but we must not forget, and I know the Cuban people do not forget, the change in Cuba will ultimately depend on the Cuban people themselves. Throughout Cuba we know there are educated, motivated, patriotic individuals who see how the Castro revolution has failed, has betrayed the country, and devastated its people.

So, today it is our sincere hope that the combined efforts of the people of Cuba will soon, and I say very soon, enjoy peaceful transition to the free democratic future that their grandparents envisioned 91 years ago. I say, "Happy anniversary. Viva Cuba Libra."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] so much. We pray that day will soon come, and I say to the gentleman, "You're always a reliable ally, always ready to denounce the human rights abuses in Cuba even at this late hour of the night, and now all of the viewers of C-SPAN know why we miss you so much on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Thank you so much, Congressman GOSS."

Now I would like to hear the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a U.S. veteran, a patriot, a man who knows what freedom is all about, a man who knows that repression must be condemned, and the gentleman from California will speak to us, I hope, tonight about a very important issue, and that is of the plantados, the Cuban political prisoners who will not bend, who will not cooperate with their captors, and for that they live, if that can be the word, under very special rules that are even more repressive than the normal prisons in Cuba.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. LEHTINEN], and all of my other colleagues from Florida, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Each of us brings to this Congress the full measure of all of our background and experience, and each of us can contribute in a unique way, coming from all of our 50 States and territories.

Madam Speaker, the Representatives from Florida are 90 miles away from a Communist tyranny, and they bring a special vision, a special message, to this House that I, frankly, find exhilarating. I say to the gentlewoman from Florida, "ILEANA, when you were a young girl coming to this country, fleeing political oppression, about first-grade age I would imagine, I was a 28-year-old Air Force pilot qualified to fight for freedom. It was the last months of my combat readiness in 1961, when the Bay of Pigs invasion failed." And I know the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] was in knee pants, possibly standing on a stool raiding in his kitchen. He is here, also newly arrived at age 4 in the United States.

But I remember that period vividly, and when I was asked in the well earlier if I would participate, I realized that once again—it has been 4 or 5 years—I could pull out of my wallet something that I have carried for over three decades that refreshes my memory about those who first died in great numbers facing the terror that Castro had brought to Cuba. It is the words of the beach commander of the Bay of Pigs, the noble, but failed, effort, and it begins at 5 a.m. in the morning. To young people in that million-plus audience that watches us on C-SPAN, I would like them to understand how tragic it was that a young President, only 43 years of age, 3 years younger than President Clinton, who had had combat experience in the South Pacific in his early twenties, that he had signed off on a plan to liberate Cuba from Castro's evil. The plan was signed off on by a five-star-general who had driven Hitler to suicide only 6 years before, President Eisenhower. He signed off on the plan, and the plan was key—if it had air power, and at the last minute, because of bad advice, the young combat naval officer John F. Kennedy pulled the air power, and it caused hundreds to die and others to live in captivity until they were released for hard cash, tractors, and medicine through the good offices of Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General.

Here is the way Pepe—it was his code name on the beach—and let me read the close, and some of the sentences are obliterated from being crushed around in my wallet for decades. The end says:

"Through all the chaos and despair of defeat Pepe retained the calm that was his hallmark. Even his anger was quiet. He was not a pounder or a shouter. Those who heard him * * *" and it trails off there, but I remember that there was not a dry eye on the deck of the U.S.S. *Boxer* off the coast of Cuba where North American Fury jet aircraft had had their stars removed. They were painted in a stealthy way. It is all bizarre now that I think back as covert air cover for these men in our uniforms, with our weapons, young Cubans, some not so young in their forties and fifties. During the campaign I met with the Venceremos Brigade, 2506. These men were absolutely as full of passion now as they were when they were younger men willing to die on the beaches there for freedom. But they still speak well of Pepe, the commander.

Here is just his last sentence to teach young Americans how fully committed we were and then how we jerked the key component of air power and left these men to die.

Pepe says: "Do you realize how desperate the situation is?"

This was being pumped over the public address system of the U.S.S. *Boxer* and other U.S. naval support ships who were unable to help.

We are unable to implement the plan to establish the beachhead. Do you realize how desperate the situation is? Do you back us or quit? All I want is low jet air cover. The enemy has this support. I need it badly or cannot survive.

An hour and 13 minutes later, 6:13 a.m.: "Blue Beach under attack by a B-26, a Communist Castro B-26 invader. Where is the promised air cover, Pepe?"

Six forty-two: "A C-54 drops supplies on Blue Beach. All went into the sea. Send more, Pepe."

Seven twelve: "Enemy on trucks coming from Red Beach, and I am sorry." The next line is obliterated.

Seven fifty: "We are fighting in the west flank of Blue Beach against tanks, Pepe. Situation critical, left flank, west Blue Beach. Need urgently air support, Pepe."

Eight forty: "Blue Beach is under air attack, Pepe.

"Nine fourteen, men dying all during these hours. Blue Beach under attack by two T-33 jets and artillery. Where the hell is jet cover, Pepe?"

□ 2040

9:25 a.m.: "2,000 militia attacking Blue Beach from east and west. Need close air support immediately, Pepe."

9:55: "Can you throw something into this vital point in the battle? Anything? Just let the jet pilots loose, Pepe."

At this moment Navy pilots are pounding on the side of their Fury jets, tears streaming down their face. These guys are dying. We promised we would help them. They are unable to fly, because our commander in chief said no.

And that was the end. Let the jet pilots loose, and they wanted to help.

I will combine that with the last words out of Radio Free Hungary 5 years earlier, and Russian fighters talking among themselves as they killed 17 people on the crew of a C-130 over what used to be called Yugoslavia.

Now, I cannot add to the beautiful, articulated cries for decency and freedom and human rights that all of my colleagues from Florida and that Chris, one of our leaders in human rights, has said, but let me see if I can put in perspective for a lot of Americans who see Castro with Diane Sawyer, who I know in her heart had to be of some conservative philosophy. She worked for Richard Nixon.

But Diane Sawyer, as is her job, treats Castro with the respect that a mass killer does not deserve.

You mentioned the prontotos. These are people that if we find respect for

SAM JOHNSON of Texas here because he spent 7 years in a Communist, hellish situation, four of those years in solitary confinement, what do we make of Armando Viaderes, who spent 23 years, most of it in solitary confinement? Some of it stark naked in a totally blackened cell where you get a horrible pain of disorientation, where you do not know whether you are up or down, and you are begging for a little sliver, a crack of light, under a door, or through a solid rock wall to orientate yourself. Living in a cell where your own waste matter is not evacuated from the cell for weeks and weeks on end.

What struck me most about this evil, rotten human being, Fidel Castro, watching with Barbara Walters, showing off and exercising his Jesuit education, this avowed atheist pretending to be such a charming man, is the following story. And I had this confirmed from Armando Viaderes himself.

Castro would let years and years go by, never forgetting one of the prontotos that he had left to rot or still being tortured in some dungeon somewhere on that beautiful little island, and he would say to one of his Communist thugs, one of his bootlicking associates, and I will use Viaderes' name, "Armando, Armando Viaderes, what is he doing?"

"Listen, he is still in prison."

Now, considering again our Vietnam experience of 9 years, our longest prisoner, 1 week short of 9 years, this is in year 10, 15, 20.

"Where is he?"

"Oh, he is in solitary confinement."

"Good. Good. Keep him there."

And then another 4 or 5 years would go by, the entire length of World War II and the Korean war put together, and he would suddenly remember this person again.

This reminds you of some sort of sadist who would set fire to cats, or pull the wings off of little flying creatures. This is a man torturing human beings, knowing that the families are going to bed every night praying for their loved ones, wondering as they are trying to enjoy a meal or live a normal life out or raise children or enjoy grandchildren, that their loved one, maybe the patriarch in a family who moved from young father to grandfather in Castro's dungeons, how could anybody live a normal life wondering what the fate is of this person, that he thinks of every 4 or 5 years and says, "Good, let him suffer. Leave him there until I next think of him."

That is the experience of these heroes, some of them associates of his, who said to him during the euphoric period of throwing over the Batista corrupt regime, "Fidel, this is not what we had in mind, to sell out to Soviet communism."

"What did you say?"

I remember Jova Montos said, "Just let me go." This man was not only a teacher, but a C–47 pilot bringing supplies up to the Sierra Meistermass.

He said, "Fidel, I am gone. Do what you want, but I am going."

He would not let him leave. He would not let him leave. He threw him in jail for most of his life. His number one associate, his intellectual companion. It would be like Thomas Jefferson to George Washington. I feel embarrassed putting the names of great heroes of liberty in the same sentence, not with Jova Montos, but with this thug Castro.

I cannot believe that there are people in college, and a handful must be in this House, I hope not. Maybe they realize after they have been elected to represent people in the name of freedom and dignity and human rights they would give up these twisted views of their college days.

But there are people out there in America who developed an affection for this mass killer Castro in their youth, and they have not given up on him. Even though they have witnessed the collapse of the Soviet evil empire. All of the evil secrets of the gulags have been spilled forth to equal the horror of Hitler's concentration camps. We know what they have done, from despoiling the environment, to keeping people locked up, including maybe American air crews, until they died old men in captivity, lost to their nation and their relatives, those horrible words "Fate unknown." And they sill are pulling for this guy and coming up and lobbying around the country and giving acceptance to these Communist stooges that he sends up here.

What is this group called, the Cuban Ecumenical Council. How is that for twisting a word that has religious roots? A Cuban Communist-sanctioned government body that does not represent the views of the Cuban people.

I am reading from an ad in our inhouse published organ here, the Roll Call, in which there is a quarter-page ad here that lists all these groups that Lincoln told me are groups inside Cuba. A lot of these founders and organizers are in prison. There are at least 3, 10, 15, about 45 or 50 groups here, all of them inside Cuba, lending their name to this ad, tiny little ad to American Congressmen saying that this week, tomorrow, Cuba will pass yet one more independence day, independence from European colonialism, still a captive people, still under Castro's tyranny.

On that day, tomorrow, how many more of our brothers and sisters will be beaten, arrested, these action brigades that sound like the action commandos that followed Hitler's troops into the Ukraine, and the people welcomed them, applauding, because they were getting away from Stalin's tyranny, and then they find themselves being beaten and tortured, and their churches and synagogues burned. So he uses the same name. Action brigades all right. As Lincoln was just telling me, beating on houses, breaking windows, graffiti, beating older people. A grandmother's little 10-year-old that is now an orphan from his mother, so they terrorize the grandmother.

Well, how many more are going to die fleeing that island on rafts in search of liberty.

I think of my Vietnamese friends, that my daughter went to work in their camp for a year in 1980, and their little signs, "Death on the high seas or liberty."

Then the signs from the camps in Indochina apply also to the great Cuban people fleeing for freedom. It was one of the little hand-carved things my daughter Robin brought back, "Some of us are here; the rest are with God."

Literally, this line we use so freely, "Only God knows." I will say it slowly, Only God knows, our Creator, how many Cuban men, women, children, and babies have been ripped apart by sharks or died of dehydration even at the moment of salvation like this 28-year-old mother, how many died fleeing this mass killer's tyranny.

We have not given up hope, and our hope rests in international solidarity with our desire for freedom.

They want solidarity with us. And the closing line is please remain united with us in our struggle for a free and democratic Cuba.

From the time I was 28 to my 60th birthday a few weeks ago, I watched this man live through and terrorize through eight, eight United States Presidents, who have seen this guy around. And it will be a sorry day for this American and this Congressman if somehow or other we do not listen to the Americans of Cuban descent who treasure their dual citizenship in Florida, and like my doctor friend Tirso del Junco, chairman of the Republican Party in California, we must listen. Our State Department and the young people in the White House must listen to the Cuban-Americans and all lovers of freedom in this country as to what to do about Castro, and not come up with innovative ideas to be the first administration that lets him off the hook.

□ 2050

So I stand by the sanctions, and the day you want to release the sanctions is the day I follow your lead and LINC and all the other great Members that the great State of Florida sends to this House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for a very eloquent description of the abuses going on in Cuba and for all of our hope for a free and democratic Cuba one day.

We have just a few minutes left tonight, and I would like to see if the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] could join us, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], and we can make some final remarks on this, another sad but yet at the same time hopeful anniversary that one day soon Cuba will once again be free.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Madam Speaker, I have a followup on what the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said, because for those of us who have met freedom fighters, and I would put the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] in that category, because when you hear the personal stories, as I have, from living in south Florida and from knowing so many people whose lives, when you meet them, you have no sense of what they have gone through on a very personal level. Homes and families that have been separated for scores of years.

I look at people my own age, my own friends who might never have seen their grandparents ever because they were lucky enough to leave Cuba. And literally, you never knew them, when they passed away. It is an opportunity that we have as American people and as this Congress. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has introduced legislation that I am proud to be an original cosponsor of, which would extend the Torricelli bill to our neighbors and our allies through the other governments in the Western Alliance.

That is the method that will be part of the efforts that I think all of us are hoping for and expecting, when the Cuban people will be free again and next year and, hopefully, very shortly next year, even before the celebration of independence, we will have that meeting.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. You certainly see that human tragedy exposed every day as the Congressman of the Florida Keys. You see the desperate Cubans washing ashore, sometimes those rafts, unfortunately, have no one onboard. So you live that tragedy every day.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I want to pose two questions, because I am not sure we have underscored the point well enough. I was commenting with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] about this.

The action brigades, what they do. Perhaps you could describe what they did to this woman's family in Cuba, and then I wanted to ask you whether Fidel Castro knew about this.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, their action brigades were a creation, they are a creation of Castro. They are an enforcer institution.

Whenever someone obtains publicity in the outside world or is heard of in terms of opposition, the action brigades immediately go into action.

They are dressed like civilians. In other words, they are not identifiable as military people. And they simply go to your home. And the word "harass" is certainly not strong enough.

They brutalize you. They brutalize your family. They destroy your home. They insult you, break your windows, your doors, spit on you, chant insults for hours after hours, disconnect the electricity. It is a form of physical and psychological torture, which Castro has sought to perfect and to utilize as part of the machinery of repression.

Mr. GOSS. Does he know about this?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. He created them. He knows about them and obtains pleasure from their action.

This is something that is very important for people to know. Castro, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] pointed out, personally obtains pleasure from the effects of his oppression and his repression. And just as charming as he can be one moment, with Diane Sawyer, who made a fool of herself in that interview, I had respect for her before, just as he can be quite charming in one moment in that interview, in the next instant, he could be listening to the details of, like the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said, of continued solitary confinement of an opponent or of the brutality on a grandmother because her grandson or daughter has received publicity that he does not like out of the world.

I would like to, if I may, because I think it is an obligation for those who are in prison and who overcome somehow the fear inherent in the totalitarian system, for example, Gustavo Arcos, perhaps among the most respected of the dissidents or the opposition leaders in Cuba, in a recent interview he said,

> You can tell them, and I think it is our obligation to speak out and say what he wants the world to be told, you can tell them that we say here not one drop of economic or political oxygen should be given to Fidel Castro's regime.

Just a few sentences before, Gustavo Arcos in Cuba, speaking to a journalist who visited him said,

> Castro has no pity or compassion for the people such that he might find an honorable way out, so that all the hatred built up in this country might not slip its bonds and explode in violence and bloodshed. He reminds me of Louis XV of France at the end of his life, when the foreign wars had been lost and with the great differences between the mass of the people and those who governed them, who said: "After me the deluge." One can see no pity, no commiseration with the people.

This is Arcos speaking. He is in prison.

We owe it to the Arcoses and to that grandmother, who was harassed and brutalized. We owe it to them to let their message be heard and to maintain our solidarity with them.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of the House's human rights activists.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I think it is important that Castro know that the opposition to any economic changes, as a matter of fact, we are in favor of additional pressures and sanctions, that this is bipartisan, there is a sense that both Democrats, Republicans are fighting this with a unified voice. And we stand opposed to this kind of tyranny in Cuba.

We stand with the oppressed, against the oppressor. And no one will be fooled, except the most gullible of gullibles, by this group that is coming up, the so-called clergymen, to try to get people to go the other way with regard to sanctions and with regard to the Torricelli bill.

I think the message that goes out from this Chamber tonight, we are united, we stand in solidarity with those suffering in prison as well as with their loved ones and that we hope and we pray, and I mean pray hard, that the day for the liberation of Cuba is not far in the future.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey so much. I thank all of my colleagues for presenting the points of view that are so important for us to discuss every day in the Halls of Congress.

We touched upon important subjects: the rafters, the Cuban political prisoners, the rapid response brigades.

I thank my colleagues, each and every one.

DEFICIT SPENDING AND TAXES

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, this evening I wanted to take an opportunity to talk about deficit spending and taxes. I know that a lot of my colleagues, in the last several weeks and months, as the budget and the economic package has come to the forefront, we have heard a lot of different language or lingo, as one might put it.

Let me start this evening by saying that I am approaching my comments on a bipartisan manner to the extent that I can do that. Let me say that some of the lingo that we have heard, such as the lingo of gridlock around here, if you object to a tax, if you question a tax, if you question anything, then all of a sudden the other side, the special interests, start to say, "You are guilty of gridlock."

Let us ignore that for my comments this evening. Let us ignore the com-

ments of shared sacrifice, the comments of investment, and the comments of contributions and let us call things what they are.

□ 2100

Let us call a tax increase a tax increase, and let us call spending spending.

Let me say at the beginning of our remarks that George Washington, our first President, was the first President and the last President not to blame a previous administration for problems. I think that the most significant problem that faces our country today, without question, is the Federal deficit.

The Federal deficit is a problem that accumulates at a rate of about $44 million an hour, so as you watch TV tonight, if you have an opportunity, just think that from hour to hour that your Government is spending $44 million an hour more than it brings in. There is not a family in this country in proportion that could outspend that amount of money over their income as compared to the Federal Government.

Fifteen percent of the budget—15 percent of the money that this Government will spend this year—will have to go just to pay interest on that $44 million an hour accrual in regards to the deficit.

When you ask about the deficit, you need to look historically at what has brought that deficit onto us. Is it a lack of revenue? In fact, it is not a lack of revenue. Government receipts have doubled in a decade, yet the national debt continues to rise. There is no way that anyone—there is no way that anyone can raise more money than Congress can spend, no matter what kind of taxes you charge.

Let me repeat that. There is no way anyone can raise more money than Congress can spend, no matter what tax rates or what amount of tax you charge to the people.

The question is, then, what can we do? What is the solution? First we have to redefine the problem. Again, as I say, the problem is not tax revenues or lack of revenues, the problem is simply spending. Let us talk about spending for a few minutes. Since 1947, Federal spending has gone up $1.50 or more for every $1 of additional revenue.

We are never going to reduce the deficit by raising taxes. Raising taxes is like spinning a dog faster so that the hopes of him catching his tail increase by the velocity of the speed. It does not happen. You need to cut spending.

Yesterday I noticed on the TV, on the national TV, that a comment was made in response to a heckler, "The free lunch is over." It has not been a free lunch for the working stiff. What about the working individual out there? How many people in this country are saying that they are tired of taking money from people that work and giving money to people who do not?

What is probably the most frustrating thing that we see when we come into the fine Halls of the U.S. Congress is the tendency of political establishments to pay lip service to management reform while doing little to curb inefficiency and waste.

Let me give the Members an excellent example that has just occurred in the last couple of days. I sit on the Committee on Small Business, and I have had an opportunity to review the Small Business Administration budget. I know that many of my colleagues here on the House floor have had some of their constituents call up and say, "Gee, we are trying to get a small business loan. The money is tied up. There is not money there. Help us out."

I entered into this budget hearing or the markup of the Small Business Administration bill with a very open mind. One of the first items that I see in that budget is $17 million in the Small Business Administration budget to plant trees, $17 million to plant trees.

I asked the Administrator of the Small Business Administration—who, by the way, has only been on the job for a week—I asked the Administrator if "for every $1 million in your budget, what are you able to leverage in additional loans to small businesses throughout this country, for every $1 million?"

The response to that, "$20 million under program 78." So, in other words, for every $1 million we could find of excess money in the Small Business Administration budget, we can raise $20 million more, leverage $20 million more for small businesses in this country.

I simply applied that equation to the $17 million in tree planting, and lo and behold, you come up with a figure somewhere around $340 million of additional leverage for small business in this country that is being sacrificed under the guise of efficiency for the planting of trees.

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

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is it his opinion that were the Government to have to live under the same standards as private business in a recession, whereby they are laying off people, reducing overhead, doing everything they can—and yet here we have the Government with a projected annual deficit this year of $320 billion, and a cumulative national debt of $4 trillion—is the gentleman saying by citing these statistics that were the Government to have to live by the same standards as private business, that perhaps they would not be spending this money on trees?

Mr. McINNIS. Madam Speaker, to my respected colleague I would reply, absolutely. What I am saying is that the Government does not live by the standards that we expect of our constituents or expect of our own citizens of this country. In fact, the citizens of this country, if they overran their checking account like this Federal Government overruns its budget or the trust funds and so on and so forth, our citizens are required that they face civil penalties or criminal penalties.

The gentleman is absolutely on point, and I think the only way to introduce discipline in this process is not to continue to feed the process more money, but that we demand that the process cut its spending, that we do not spend $17 million to plant trees.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I commend the gentleman, because he makes a very, very valid point. It is fascinating to me to really think of what this Government is doing. It does not seem to matter what the state of the economy is. Private business can cut back all it is forced to do so by economic conditions, and we keep employing more people, legislating more costly regulations which raise the cost of doing business, and put even more people out of work. That is just fine as far as the Government is concerned, because that is what it is supposed to be doing.

When the gentleman cites the example of planting trees, we could talk about the outrages that have occurred under the Endangered Species Act or under the Forest Lands Management Practices Act, or any number of Federal acts that are absolutely becoming a millstone around the necks of businesses in this economy, and it is not businesses that are ultimately being hurt, it is men and women who work for a living and who depend upon having a vibrant economy in order to get ahead in this life.

Mr. McINNIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. His point is very valid.

Let me go on and visit just for a few moments about taxes in this country. Really, what is a tax? I think the easiest way to say this is: It is money that comes out of your pocket, out of the constituents' pockets that you represent, and that money is not kept in your local economy, at least for a Federal tax, that money is transferred to Washington, DC, to be put into the hands of the bureaucracy to refilter that money, or the trickle theory, to retrickle that money back through the system.

I have to ask, does the tax make more sense than letting that person keep that money and recirculating that money within his own community?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield further, I have seen studies that suggest that when we take that dollar out of the taxpayer's pocket and run it through the Washington bureaucracy and back out through the

State bureaucracy and trickle it down to the intended recipients, those studies show that we lose about two-thirds of the purchasing power of that tax dollar, so it is ludicrous that we keep raising taxes to fund more and more programs for the further impoverishment of Americans.

The solution would clearly seem to be: Don't take the money in the first place, because you will vastly increase the purchasing power of that dollar if you don't squander it on the Federal bureaucracy, which has to have employees to work in that bureaucracy, and counterpart employees in some State or local bureaucracy to administer this.

Mr. McINNIS. To my respected colleague, I would say he is absolutely correct. Last week I was in Craig, CO, a small town in northwestern Colorado, a very small town of no significance politically, if you looked from a broad perspective as to political power in this country, but a lot of hard-working people, a lot of very hard-working people.

These are people that are willing to pay taxes for a strong defense, that are willing to pay taxes for a social program that, really, where they are getting a bang for the buck, and where the dollar that they pay in taxes really goes to the needy people and not to the people who have just chosen not to work. Those people are willing to stand up on the front line and pay those taxes, but they are not willing to pay taxes on a system of which they have no accountability.

The only accountability that comes up shows that dollar is not getting a bang for the buck, that there is an extreme amount of waste that goes on there. That is where the concern is.

The American people, in my opinion, are saying, and the people of Colorado are saying, "Hey, before we have any more taxes, cut spending first. Prove to us, prove to us, the people of Colorado, prove to us, the people of America, that the Government in fact can run its budget in an efficient manner just like we are expected to balance our budget as a family on a monthly basis."

In 1948 the average family in this country paid 2.3 percent of its annual earnings in Federal taxes. Can you guess today what that percentage is? From 2.3 percent in 1948 to over 30 percent of its income in Federal taxes today. Total taxes today consume more than 40 percent of our constituents' family income.

□ 2110

And we talk about families in this country and the need to enhance families.

Let me go further. The average family will work, the average American working stiff in our country, who sometimes I think is being forgotten, will work the first 123 days of the year, the first 123 days, 8 hours a day devoted totally to pay Federal, State, and local taxes.

The average American worker spends the first 2 hours and 41 minutes, and I say the first 2 hours and 41 minutes because the Government always gets its money first, spends the first 2 hours and 41 minutes of his or her 8-hour workday working just to meet their tax obligation, Federal taxes taking the biggest mouthful, accounting for an hour and 43 minutes. So for the first hour and 43 minutes, to my respected colleague who has just commented, the first hour and 43 minutes of every working person in this country is devoted to send money to Washington, DC, to this fine Chamber, and the Senate Chamber, and the administration down the street to redistribute back into society.

They expect to get a bang for their dollar.

Let me say that the typical American family pays more in Federal taxes, pays more in Federal taxes than it spends on food, clothing, transportation, insurance premiums, and recreation combined.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, I might just observe that you are talking about the direct taxes that these good people in this country pay. We are not really even in this discussion considering the enormous cost to individuals of overregulation in this country, which I believe is extremely significant, I would say even more so than the deficit, which I think is an enormous problem in this country. I think overregulation is even more detrimental to the welfare of individuals who are seeking to better themselves in the workplace.

We are slowing down the growth of the economy. It has been going on since 1970, even during the relatively good years under President Ronald Reagan when every income group improved in this country, and even then the rate of economic growth was still about half what it had been between the years following World War II and 1970 when regulation really began to kick in at all levels of government. And we are just slowly being asphyxiated. We do not even truly realize what is going on.

But I am reminded of an article that was in Fortune magazine last year that said people in the so-called baby boom generation today, when they retire, they will on the average have only half the wealth accumulated that their parents had. And why is that? Because of the slow growing economy. It is just invisible. We do not really stop to think of the cumulative impact.

But you take regulation, you take the massive taxes that we have got, and you take the President of the United States who says he is going to give us all of these new taxes, and all of this new regulation, and what is the purpose of that, as revealed in the Washington Post last Friday, right on the front page, so we can spend more.

Now that is the last thing that the Government needs to do, is spend more. They need to spend less so that we as individuals can spend more.

Mr. McINNIS. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think they are very prudent and on point.

Let me say that the people in America are soon to experience the largest tax increase in the history of the world, not just in the history of this country, but in the history of the world. In fact, it will be twice the size, it is the next largest tax increase in history. And all I am asking is that the American people take a moment to sit down and ask are we getting a bang for our dollar.

For example, if you went to the local car dealership and bought a car, the first question you would ask, first, is the car what I wanted. Second, is the car necessary, and third, did I get a good buy. Did I get a good buy down at the dealership? Those exact same questions I am urging for all Americans to ask when they consider what this huge tax increase is and the kind of impact it is going to have on them.

I understand that CNN did a poll about 6 weeks ago, and in that poll they said that four out of every five Americans believe that somebody else is going to pay these taxes. Ladies and gentlemen, citizens of America, it is you who is going to be paying those taxes, and it is you who has the absolute right to demand accountability from the U.S. Congress. It is you who has the absolute right to say cut spending first.

Let me just conclude by saying that the answer is clearly not raising taxes. The answer is to cut spending.

Not long ago I had a rancher come up and he summed it all up very well for me in one sentence. He said, "Before you put more water in the bucket, plug the hole."

GUAM EXCESS LANDS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MALONEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide a method of returning excess lands no longer needed for military purposes on Guam. By the end of World War II, the Department of Defense had seized and controlled nearly one-half of the land on the island. Today, approximately one-third of Guam is owned by the military, one-third by the government of Guam, and the remaining one-third is owned by private citizens.

The district I represent is nearly 10,000 miles from Washington, DC. Covering an area of approximately 225

square miles, Guam is about 30 miles long and 4 to 9 miles wide.

Though limited in size, Guam is of vital importance to America because of the island's strategic location in the Asian-Pacific region. As you may know Madam Speaker, Guam was occupied by the imperial forces of Japan during World War II, but was recaptured by American forces in 1944. However, the people of Guam suffered 2½ years of terror under enemy occupation, including deplorable living conditions in concentration camps. Following the recapture of Guam, the indigenous people of Guam—the Chamorros—started to return to their original homes and farms, only to find that the U.S. military had confiscated their lands for national security reasons.

The people of Guam were originally told that the land was needed to build bases to defeat the Japanese. The people were all too happy to be of assistance. In the years after the conclusion of the war, the land remained in military hands. The land was taken through misrepresentation and deception from hundreds of families. And no family on Guam remained unaffected. This is not a commonly known story of how the military became a major landowner, a land baron on Guam.

Here, for example, are how some people lost or were underpaid for their lands after the war:

FRANCISCO ANDERSON

Mr. Anderson, a first class petty officer in the United States Navy, and a small group of other Chamorros, organized a resistance party which fought the Japanese and gathered information about Japanese activities on Guam. In July, 1944, the Japanese executed this group, and Frank Anderson was one of the few survivors. Although seriously wounded, he managed to find a boat and row to a United States warship about a mile off Guam's coast. There he gave his information to Navy Intelligence officers. When the Navy condemned his land, Mr. Anderson was dissatisfied with the amount of compensation offered, but he was too patriotic to deny the Navy the right to take the land. He received $1,065 for his land—1,500 square meters—in Sumay; this sum represented payment for his two houses, also. He set value at $10,000 on one of the houses.

JUAN CRUZ

After the war, Juan Cruz was notified by the Land Claims Commission office that the military was condemning his property and that he had 20 days to file a complaint regarding the condemnation; otherwise, the property would be taken without compensation. Juan Cruz listed his complaints, and appraised his property's worth at $72,000. He was offered $940 by the Land Claims Commission. When he refused this, a representative of the Land Claims Commission told him that the $940 was only for rental of his property by the military. He was given rental papers to sign. Mr. Cruz signed them; he could not read English, so he had only the representative's word to go on. He later found out that he had signed transfer papers, not rental papers. When he discovered this, Mr. Cruz submitted an application to acquire another piece of land from the Naval government. There was no response to his request. Mr. Cruz received $940 for his land.

JESUS CRISOSTOMO GARRIDO

Maria C. Guerrero was 89 years old when Joaquin Perez, a military representative, told her that her land had been condemned. She could neither read, speak, nor understand English. Mrs. Guerrero's son, Jesus Crisostomo Garrido, advised her not to sell when Perez first visited her, so Perez visited again when Jesus was not there. This time, he persuaded Tan Maria to sign transfer papers. She received $1,485 for 12 hectares.

MARTINA SABLAN LIMTIACO

After the war, Jose Cruz and Mr. Balser, Navy representatives, told Mrs. Martina Sablan Limtiaco that her property had been condemned by the Navy for defense purposes. They told her that she couldn't refuse to sell because the Navy was already using the property and would take her land without compensation unless she signed transfer papers. Mrs. Limitaco signed the papers and received $420 for her property in Piti—584 square meters. This land was beach property and is now being used for USO.

JOSE TORRE PANGELINAN

In June 1944, a group of Japanese soldiers came to the Pangelinan farm in Dededo and arrested Juan Pangelinan, the owner of the property. They accused him of being an American spy because he had been in the U.S. Navy, and because he was hiding George Tweed, an American sailor, on his property. The Japanese interrogated Mr. Pangelinan, but he did not give them any information. He was then taken to Sinajana and beheaded. Mr. Pangelinan's family was forced to stay in hiding until the American forces arrived. After the war, they found that they could not return to their property because the U.S. military had restricted the area. The military promised that the property would be returned to them. Shortly after this, however, three military representatives visited Maria Pangelinan—Juan's widow—and told her that her property had been condemned and she would have to sell it to the military. Maria signed transfer papers and received $4,100 for 150 hectares of good farmland. In or around 1946, a Navy chief petty officer asked Maria Pangelinan for the Spanish grant document for the Pangelinan property. He promised her he would return the document; however, Maria never saw it again.

FRANCISCO U. VILLAGOMEZ

After the war, Seabees occupied Mr. Villagomez's property in Barrigada without his consent. They cleared the land with a bulldozer. In 1946, Jose Bitanga, a military representative, told Mr. Villagomez that his land was being condemned. Bitanga explained that the owner had no choice but to sell since the Seabees were already on the land. Also, if Mr. Villagomez did not sign perpetual easement papers, his property would be taken for nothing. Mr. Villagomez signed the papers; he received $139.90 for 7 hectares.

For decades after the war, the United States was pressured to reassess its needs for land holdings on Guam. Over these years, there was a consensus among the local citizens that some military property was unused, underutilized, and unnecessarily in Federal lands.

In the early 1970's, at the request of the late Congressman Antonio Borja Won Pat, a study of the military land use on Guam was initiated by the U.S. Department of Defense. That military land use study revealed excess properties which no longer served the operational needs of the armed services on the island. In 1986, the Secretary of Defense signed off on the transfer of approximately 3,500 acres of land back to Guam. Succeeding Secretaries of Defense have endorsed this policy. I have been advised by high levels at the Defense Department that the current DOD officials do not object to this transfer of excess lands.

While we applaud the DOD's decision on this matter, we disagree with their terminology, because on an island of only 215 square miles, there is no such thing as excess lands. In fact the only thing that is excessive is the manner in which the lands were originally taken.

The legislation I am introducing today will bring a closure to this issue and will begin the process of addressing historical injustices in land takings experienced by the indigenous people of Guam.

First came the Spaniards in the 1500's who made Guam a colony of Spain for approximately 300 years. As a result of the Spanish-American War, Guam became a possession of the United States in 1898. Then came the Japanese occupation of Guam for about 2½ years during World War II. Finally, the people of Guam experienced the postwar land condemnations and land takings by the United States.

The significance of land ownership for the people of Guam and for the government of Guam cannot be underestimated. The lack of real estate hinders economic growth and development on this tiny island territory.

For individuals and families, having adequate land properties translate into access to affordable housing. Because there tend to be large families on Guam, adequate housing is a signifi-

cant and potentially explosive problem.

The return of excess lands to the government of Guam will help stimulate the local economy. As required in the legislation, the local government will decide, by developing a local land use plan, how best to utilize the properties returned by the Federal Government. We know that there are significant needs for affordable housing, parks and recreation, public utilities projects, public safety projects, and for the expansion of health care facilities on the island. The return of excess lands will produce jobs in construction and in service industries. Likewise, the return of excess lands will assist the local economy which was affected by the damages of last year's typhoons as well as by Japan's economic downturn.

As major Southeast Asian economies continue to generate a solid outbound tourist industry, Guam's geographic location will continue to benefit. Guam is close to the Asian and Pacific markets which have the most rapid growth, and potential future growth, in the world today.

The military presence on Guam has been, and continues to be, an important aspect of Guam's economic development. We recognize that the defense activities on the island create a multiplier effect on the community—from housing military families to providing them with recreational outlets.

While the legislation before us today addresses the return of identified excess lands no longer needed by the U.S. military on Guam, there remains outstanding a number of unresolved land disputes between individual landowners and the Government. As I speak today, there are increasing numbers of families on Guam who claim that the U.S. Government unlawfully condemned and seized private lands following World War II. These individuals are demanding that their ancestral lands be returned immediately. We cannot afford to ignore their pleas for redress, regardless of their legal status.

In order to adequately address these disputes and address the issue of land planning in Guam, I am convening a Federal/territorial land conference on Guam later this year. Representatives from the Federal Government, the government of Guam, the local legislature, and individual landowners will have a common venue to air their concerns and to identify possible solutions to the problem of land takings on Guam. My office will be the facilitator in these proceedings.

In addition, I will work closely with the leadership of the Natural Resources Committee and the Armed Services Committee, as well as with the representatives of the Department of Defense and with Secretary Babbitt of the Interior Department to move this important legislation on a fast track.

Many people in my district lost their lands after World War II. The U.S. Government has an obligation to rectify these land takings by returning to Guam those properties no longer determined to be necessary for military purposes. We paid dearly for our loyalty to America during World War II. We made our contribution to America and as we can see by some of the experiences I have outlined, some of the greatest contributors suffered the greatest wrongs subsequent to World War II.

Returning Federal excess lands on Guam to the people of Guam is not just a good thing to do, it is the right thing to do, the just thing to do. The economic vitality of this star in the Pacific depends on it.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation when being considered by the appropriate committees and on the floor of the U.S. Congress. The people of Guam and I thank you for your support.

□ 2130

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING THE AMERICAN FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. MALONEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I would observe in these special orders, and I would say to those who have agreed to participate, that now is the time to come forth, that it is 9:30 eastern time.

I also make the point for these who are viewing this over C-SPAN, we are in an empty Chamber, but the fact of the matter is we are here to discuss some very important issues facing the American family. Although our numbers are not large, I think the ideas we have to discuss are very significant. It is an opportunity to have a frank exchange of views on issues that we consider to be absolutely vital to our Republic.

Dr. James Dobson observed in his "Focus on the Family" newsletter, the March 1993 issue:

> What is occurring in our country today is the moral equivalent to war. We are, as Gary Bauer and I wrote in our book, 'Children at Risk,' engaged in a civil war of ideas that will be won or lost in the next few years.

Madam Speaker, the American family is under attack from all sides. During he course of this special order I anticipate that a variety of subjects will be touched on, dealing with perhaps abortion, the promotion of special rights for homosexuals, including their admission into the military, the issue of women in combat, which has now just been greatly advanced by action of the Clinton administration, and we will continue to talk about, as has already been referenced by the gentleman from Colorado, the impact of the economy, the state of the economy upon family.

I would like to introduce and yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. SMITH] at this point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I very much appreciate the gentleman taking this time today to address these very, very important issues which face our country.

Madam Speaker, the supreme irony of the Clinton-Gore administration is that while purporting to embrace the disenfranchised and forgotten, especially children, the Clintonites have begun to systematically wage war against unborn children.

Mr. Clinton promised Americans he would have his economic plan on the table the day he was inaugurated; it was not. The transition team apparently focused on other things.

In a revelation of priorities, the abortion President began pushing his antichild agenda just 2 days after his inauguration. Despite his repeated claim that he wanted to make abortions rare, Mr. Clinton's new pro-abortion policies, many of which were promulgated on January 22, will inevitably yield to more dead babies and more wounded mothers.

Presidential orders promoting abortions for teenagers and military personnel, speeding up the importation of the new baby poison from France called RU-46, promoting abortion as birth control in developing countries by repeal of the Mexico City policy, and using baby brains and body parts for transplantation undermine the carefully orchestrated illusion of Mr. Clinton and Mr. GORE as child advocates.

You do not protect children, Madam Speaker, by killing some of them.

Mr. Clinton's deeds thus far smack of Orwellian double-speak. The rhetoric of choice, to be sure, is slick, but it cannot mask the violence and the cruelty of abortion.

Madam Speaker, the so-called Freedom of Choice Act marked up in the Committee on the Judiciary earlier today, which has been embraced by Mr. Clinton, is the most radical, extreme antichild legislation ever proposed in the U.S. Congress. The co-called Freedom of Choice Act dehumanizes unborn baby girls and boys; it reduces children to the status of objects, of throwaways; it turns them into chattel and recklessly abandons them to the abortionists in our land.

Even modest restrictions that Mr. Clinton claims to support will be nullified by this antichild legislation. For example, on February 19 of this year, in Ohio, the President said, and I quote:

> Very few Americans believe that all abortions all the time are all right. Almost all Americans believe that abortion should be illegal when the children can live without the mother's assistance, when the children could live outside the mother's womb.

The President is correct in his assessment of public opinion regarding late-

term abortions and in his description of the unborn as "children." Despite this fine-sounding rhetroic, the President's support for the so-called Freedom of Choice Act would nullify the very protections he claims to support. With a straight face he says one thing and he does another.

Madam Speaker, the sponsors of the Freedom of Choice Act have made it clear that it is totally within the discretion of the abortionist to determine viability; that is to say, that time when the baby can live outside the mother's womb.

Post-viability abortions are also permitted if the abortionsit determines tht the procedure will enhance the woman's so-called health. Again, the committee report makes very clear that health includes all factors, "physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age relative to the well-being of the patient." Under that sweeping definition of "health," even a mild headache, or mild distress, frankly anything at all, would justify the abortion.

Clearly, it is a sham, and for anyone to claim that they support restrictions on late-term abortions if they support the so-called Freedom of Choice Act.

The number of children killed in second- and third-trimester abortions is staggering. Estimates exceed 188,000 babies butchered each year after the 12th week of gestation.

Then of course there is the 1.4 million to 1.5 million unlucky kids who are killed during the first trimester.

Since 1973, more than 30 million children have been exterminated.

I recall seeing a billboard not so long ago that said in a very poignant way, "This toy won't have anyone to play with anymore." We have the toy but not the baby. Multiply that, Madam Speaker, by 30 million times. That is a lot of empty classrooms, a lot of kids who will nvever visit Toys-R-Us or go to Bob's Big Boy. Madam Speaker, on the issue of parental notice, Mr. Clinton again says one thing and does another.

In an October 25, 1992, interview with the Catholic News Service, Presidential nominee Bill Clinton expressed the opinion that, "States should absolutely have the freedom to have parental notice."

□ 2140

Despite this rhetoric, Mr. Clinton endorsed a version of the Freedom of Choice Act which would allow any responsible adult to circumvent the right of a parent or legal guardian to guide their daughter in this wrenching decision; that is to say the abortionist himself or herself, a clinic counselor, or a neighbor, qualifies as a responsible adult, this person could prevent the parent from ever knowing that the child was about to undergo abortion. That is what their version of parental involvement is.

The Freedom of Choice Act would also invalidate laws in the 49 States which limit the practice of abortions to licensed physicians.

The radical legislation would also nullify the 24-hour waiting periods and women's right-to-know laws, which are currently on the books in many, many States.

Why I ask, Madam Speaker, do the abortionists object to women being fully informed and fully briefed prior to that irreversible decision?

Members should be aware that as we move through this process, there is likely to be a number of phony amendments to be offered to this bill in an effort to finesse these ramifications of the bill, and to provide political cover, but nobody will be fooled by yet another effort to disguise the true effect of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I am also saddened to say that the abortion President proposed in his budget for the fiscal year 1994 Health and Human Services Budget the repeal of the federal Hyde amendment. The Hyde amendment, as we all know, stops most abortions under the Medicaid program. Prior to its enactment in 1977, the Government paid for nearly 300,000 abortions annually through the Medicaid program.

Incredibly, the abortion President also proposes to include abortion on demand as a mandated provision in his National Health Care Plan. If he succeeds in this wrong-headed antichild policy, every American taxpayer will be forced to subsidize millions of abortions at any stage of pregnancy for any reason.

In fact, abortion will be treated as just another method of birth control, the unborn child as a disease like a tumor to be killed.

Of course, we all know if the Government subsidizes something and begins promoting it, we get more of it, and once again the President's stated desire to make abortions rare is contradicted by a course of action and a series of actions that will cause abortions to occur more frequently.

Madam Speaker, a review of the President's record shows that he has abandoned his previously-stated beliefs and capitulated to the most extreme elements of the pro-abortion lobby.

In his September 26, 1986, letter to an Arkansas constituent, then-Governor Clinton wrote:

> I am opposed to abortion and to government funding of abortions. We should not spend state funds on abortions because so many people believe abortion is wrong.

As recently as July 16, 1991, Mr. Clinton told the Arkansas Gazette, "I have also supported parental notification and restrictions on public funding for abortions."

Vice President AL GORE also had a pretty consistent record of supporting limitations on abortion funding when he was a Member of the House and the Senate.

"During my 11 years," he wrote to a constituent on May 26, 1987, "I have consistently opposed Federal funding of abortions. In my opinion," Vice President GORE wrote, "it is wrong to spend Federal funds for what is arguably the taking of human life. Let me assure you that I share your belief that innocent human life must be protected and I am committed to furthering this goal."

Sadly, Mr. GORE now supports Mr. Clinton's efforts to mandate nationwide funding of abortion on demand.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, if the gentleman will permit, I would just like to show the gentleman this chart on which the moving target keeps changing in its details. This is roughly accurate still, the impact of the Clinton so-called economic plan.

After we have over $300 billion in new taxes over 5 years and $140 billion in net spending increases, we are going to end up at the end of 5 years with a $228½ billion annual deficit. We will have added in this time over $1 trillion in new cumulative debt.

Is the gentleman telling us that with the crisis of the deficit which the President likes to talk about and posture on, is the gentleman telling us that we are about ready now to receive his proposal to repeal the Hyde language, which I think goes back into the late 1970's and has been our Federal policy for years so that we can have taxpayer paid-for abortions?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Absolutely, that is exactly what we are talking about. The policy has been in effect since 1977. I think it is amazing that with all the crises we are facing from Bosnia on the foreign policy front to the domestic problems of the budget as the gentleman is speaking to now, we are talking about sidetracking that agenda for a very extreme narrow agenda, even national health reform. Some like it, some do not. We do not know exactly what is going to be in it, but to inject abortion into the center of that and force each and every one of us who conscientiously oppose the taking of human life just demonstrates to all of us that that is his real priority, and I say that with sadness.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So I am to understand then that we are going to pass a Btu tax, an energy tax on all Americans, a $70 billion tax that will cost the average household about $475 a year, we are going to hit senior citizens with a tax now taking up to 85 percent of their benefits for those individuals who make more than $25,000 or couples more than $32,000 a year, we are going to raise the corporate and personal income tax rates, and for what, so we can spend more on taxpayer paid-for abortions?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is exactly it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I would just conclude because I know there are others waiting to speak.

But just let me add, one of the things that we very often in this Chamber and really in America at large do not do is focus on at least what some of the methods do to the unborn child, whether it be literal dismemberment by way of a D&C abortion, that a child is killed with a high-powered suction device that literally rips the unsuspecting baby to pieces, or the injection of high-concentrated salt solutions that poison the child. The baby breathes in the amniotic fluid, often does that to develop the organs of respiration, in this case takes in this salt saline solution which poisons the baby in between a 2 to 3-hour period, and then the mother delivers a very dead, obviously badly burned baby.

But there is a new breakthrough, an absolutely horrific breakthrough on the abortion front that was recently announced by a doctor by the name of Martin Haskell, an Ohio abortionist, who recently at a National Abortion Federal symposium delivered a paper on what he is calling the D&X method of dilation and extraction. This method, and I will put some of the details into the RECORD, but it is for later-term abortions, this is Dr. Haskell. This is what Mr. Clinton is asking us to subsidize in national health insurance, repeal of the Hyde amendment and to give further credence and legality to under the so-called Freedom of Choice Act.

Dr. Haskell, an abortionist in good standing, describes how a surgical assistant uses an ultrasound probe to identify what is called in his words the "fetal lower extremities." That is to say, Madam Speaker, the baby's legs.

"The surgeon then applies firm traction to the instrument, and pulls the extremity out of the woman."

He then goes on to say, "The surgeon uses his fingers," and this is him talking, the abortionist, and we are being told we should pay for it, "the surgeon uses his fingers to deliver the opposite lower extremity," the other leg, then the torso, the shoulders and the upper extremities."

"The skull lodges at the internal cervical os. Usually there is not enough dilation for it to pass through."

"At this point, the right-handed surgeon slides the fingers of the left hand along the back of the fetus and hooks the shoulders of the fetus with the index and ring fingers. Next he slides the tip of the middle finger along the spine toward the skull while applying tension to the shoulders and lower extremities."

This abortionist then goes on to say, "The surgeon takes a pair of blunt curved scissors in his right hand, advances the tip curved down, along the spine."

Reassessing the proper placement, he makes a hole in the base of the skull and then aspirates, or vacuums out the brain tissue.

This is the kind of thing, dilation and extraction, that the Members of this body, you know, as HENRY HYDE says so eloquently very often, the procedure that dares not say its name, we are being asked to subsidize it, pay for it, deny parents their ability to know that their daughters are engaged or perhaps contemplating an abortion, and now we are being asked to subsidize and to give legality to that kind of child abuse where the child has his or her brain destroyed in such a way and the rest of their bodies.

□ 2150

Madam Speaker, I would hope, I would hope, that even the most so-called pro-choice Member in this body and in America would take a second look at exactly what is involved in abortion, that there are positive, nonviolent alternatives to abortion, loving and compassionate alternatives that we need to be promoting, not the killing and the demise of these helpless, unborn baby girls and baby boys.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to shed some light on another fact. The worst fear of an abortionist, which is to me not even a medical specialty, it is just killing—an abortionist's worst fear is—and they call it a botched abortion. The child comes out alive. I mean it is alive to begin with, but it comes out still alive like little Rosa whose arm was ripped off, and that guy is going to prison in New York, and what is so obvious and never said enough about on the floor in this once-august Chamber is that, if he had killed little Rosa, who is now about what? About 2 years old, CHRIS? If he had killed her, that is it, just another day on the job, another abortion out of a dozen a day. But because she is alive and has been on even the Phil Donahue show minus her little arm, and I do not know what point Phil was making in his anti-Christian confusion, but it was something along the lines: "Well, I guess we need better abortions, and better hospitals and a safer procedure," and he was completely forgetting how stupid that is, that here is a live child.

Now this removal of the brain by the doctor while the child is still in the birth canal precludes ever again them having the nightmare of the child fighting for its life, maintaining its life, and coming out where the doctor, like the one, Kenneth Edelman was his name, the one up in Massachusetts, and he is now one of the main mouthpieces for NARAL, and Planned Parenthood and everybody, says to the nurses, "Look, what are we going to do about it," and I forget in this case because there is one in my own Orange County where the doctor said, "I can't kill this little son-of-a-bitch." The nurses all cried on the stand, and he got away with a hung jury, 11 to 1, and then 9 to 3, and then the State said, "We have no more interest," but obviously the jury believed that he said, "I can't kill this little baby, this S.O.B."

I think with Dr. Kim up in Massachusetts, he was found guilty of manslaughter, stripped of his M.D. status, just went to another State, and I forget whether he left the baby in a closet. Was that the routine?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. They found the baby in a morgue, a little black child, and they could not determine how that child got there, and they backtracked and found out that this was the result of one of his abortions.

Mr. DORNAN. Ah, but it had survived, fought for its life, taken down on some gurney in some bag or something, and put in the morgue where it starved to death or just passed away from exposure.

So, I just wanted to point out—was the gentleman reading from the medical paper submitted at their seminar?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That was right from the doctor's words, and they are even more gruesome to behold if one wants to read the entire report. He speaks as one in the Nazi era would have spoken about cruel experimentation on Jewish people and other unfortunate people who were caught as guinea pigs. Here we are talking about this child in a way where legs are pulled out with impunity, and then, as the gentleman has pointed out and as I pointed out as well, the brain is aspirated as the brain content or the skull contents. The brain is sucked out.

If I could just make one additional point, the Philadelphia Inquirer, a Pulitzer Prize-winning newspaper in Philadelphia, some years ago did an expose on the abortion industry, and the headline of their particular article was: "The Dreaded Complication," and the dreaded complication was those many hundreds of children who each year were surviving these later terms abortions, and the abortion industry felt it had a marketing problem on its hands, not caring one whit about those children who were being flushed down the toilet, but they had a marketing P.R. problem on their hands, and what they finally did was come up with more lethal means of killing these babies of which D&E is foolproof. No child survives when his or her brain——

Mr. DORNAN. Well, let us discuss this again when the health bill comes up and we are being asked to pay for the D&X, the taking out of the brains while the baby is still inside the mother so they do not run the risk of a public relations problem.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Although I have

addressed here the absurd budgetary consequences of this, let it be said clearly that this is ethically wrong, abortion. It is morally wrong. And it is not legally wrong only because by an unprecedented raw grab of judicial power by the Supreme Court of the United States 20 years ago they gave to the abortion advocates what no legislative body in this country, including the U.S. Congress, was willing to give them, and now, 20 years later, they think they have softened up the legislators enough where they can ram through this Freedom of Choice Act which is an abomination, and I thank the gentlemen for commenting in such stark terms upon what the realities really are here.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield now to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE]. I certainly appreciate his putting together this family address, and I would like to speak in the area of jobs. There is no more important item for the family than employment.

Madam Speaker, in my district we have areas with as high as 30-percent unemployment. I know my colleagues in California have parts where there is extremely high unemployment. The strength of the economy undergirds every other section of the family: education, health care, housing. They all depend upon that family having a strong job and a job that can take care of those valuable needs.

And most people who supported President Clinton a year ago thought that was the concentration that this administration would have, that it would concentrate on building jobs, not increasing taxes, not talking about homosexuals in the military, not talking about the other litany of things that the President has strayed into, but working toward creating jobs. That has not been the case.

Madam Speaker, I serve on the Committee on Appropriations on the Commerce Subcommittee, and we recently had given to us a report from the National Policy Council on the economy. It was a bipartisan group that was put together 2 years ago by Congress, asked to study how we can strengthen the economy and our competitiveness in this country. It was bipartisan in the sense that the Speaker made appointments, the President of the Senate made appointments, the President of the United States made appointments. They had to be appointments made up of labor, management, general public, and governmental leaders. Those four areas were represented. There were some 200 subcouncils picked from all branches of business, and industry and public life.

Madam Speaker, These councils came together, and met for periods of time, and then came to us with its final report just a few weeks ago. They have made substantial recommendations on what to do to strengthen the economy in this country, to make ourselves more efficient, more competitive. There is no question that this is a thorough, national presentation of what needs to be done. This has been given to the President of the United States.

Madam Speaker, what it pointed out to us in the committee is—these very specific recommendations—that the Clinton administration is heading this way, and the council, the bipartisan council made up of many elements of our country, recommends that we go this way. The President is just contrary to what all of the national leaders have been talking about, and I will give my colleagues some specifics.

First of all, Madam Speaker, they pointed out in the area of labor that we need to learn to stop national labor strife as much as possible, to learn to work together better, to use the team approach for high-efficiency employment. Now that is being done in plants all over this country where the workers come together, work with management in a team approach. They become more efficient, they learn a multitude of jobs, and they work on a productive unit inside the plant, and they are rewarded on that basis. They are working toward creating a working environment that is efficient and competitive, not working toward labor strife, and yet the first bill the President has endorsed, striker replacement, the sponsor of that bill said it was designed, and I am quoting, "to create more labor strife." That is what he thinks would be good.

Madam Speaker, that is entirely contrary to what the Council on Competitiveness was talking about and entirely contrary to what is in the best interest of this country.

The second area they talked about was in the area of regulations. They point out that the rapidity of growth in regulations in this country is bringing about hundreds and billions of dollars of needless cost to small business and to our economy and that ultimately it is going to greatly stifle our competitiveness and the ability of our families and our economy to succeed. That recommendation was made by the council. The President, on the other hand, has, through his administration, endorsed numerous new regulations coming in the area of OSHA, numerous new regulations coming in the area of the environment, on top of regulations that are just now being promulgated.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and several other Members of Congress joined in a piece of legislation that we have introduced that would state that no regulations promulgated by the bureaucracy, often years after the original legislation has been passed, could take effect until both Houses of Congress have an opportunity to approve, review, and then they must approve that legislation and it be signed by the President before it can take effect.

□ 2200

We have got to get on top of these regulations. As this report shows, it is putting hundreds of billions of dollars of extra costs into the area. Here again, the report recommends we go this way, and the President is going just the opposite way.

Then finally it talks about tort reform.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, I think this is so critical and it is not often focused upon in this way. That regulation the gentleman is talking about is hurting families. It is denying people the right to advance in their jobs and in what they can save. It is making it so that families can barely keep pace with inflation because it is directly resulting in a slowdown of economic growth.

This has been going on for years and years. I think the gentleman's bill is long overdue, because finally it is going to place back in the hands of the people's elected representatives the ability to get some real handle on this.

I think if the whole membership of the House and the Senate had to decide whether the Valley Longhorn's elderberry beetle should go on the endangered species list, costing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars to the economy, I think we might have a more reasonable approach to this type of thing.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman points out quite correctly that our small businesses are made up of families, that our working men and women are usually made up of families. It is not some obscure makeup of the economy we are talking about, it is family members, individual members, that must suffer when the economy fails.

The third area we are talking about, and the council pointed out, was the area of tort reform. They pointed out that we need substantial reform in this area.

The recommendations were very specific. Here again they made recommendations in this direction, and we see the administration going another way.

Now, it is true that the President is an attorney, his wife is an attorney, the Vice President is an attorney, and 14 out of 16 members of the Cabinet are attorneys. But we must, as the report pointed out, have tort reform in this area.

Twenty-two percent of our health care costs are tied to medical malpractice. This is an area that was not touched upon by the President or by Mrs. Clinton.

The President, when he spoke here, criticized the drug companies. He criticized health care givers, doctors, and others, but he never once mentioned the need for malpractice reform in his State of the Union Message to people in this area.

Product liability was another area they pointed out that we are causing ourselves to reverse much of our progress in many areas out of the fear of product liability and the great cost of product liability.

Even in the area of drugs where the President made his criticism earlier on the floor, out of the $250 million that it takes to develop a new drug, almost $100 million of that, 40 percent, is tied to tort actions.

So if we are to make real progress in this country in many areas, we must reassess our litigious nature and have tort reform in many, many areas.

So I am saying to you that these are three areas, and there are other parts of the report that I will not go into tonight, where they made specific recommendations and directions that the economy needs to go in to be competitive, to produce more jobs, and to strengthen the economy itself, that the President's recommendations almost exclusively have been going in the opposite direction. That is why I think in order to strengthen the economy, for this Nation and our families, the President must remove himself from the wrong direction he is taking and go back to the basic ideas of strengthening the economy.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his efforts in organizing this special order on the family.

I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for the great leadership he has provided the pro-life and pro-family cause in the Congress of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I think this is very sadly an appropriate day for this special order to occur, a day in which the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Congress has marked up and recommended out the so-called Freedom of Choice Act, a bill that we will soon be debating and voting upon here on the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, the administration has now lifted the Federal restrictions on abortion and is now eyeing the Hyde amendment as its next victim. In spite of the number of abortions already being performed, the President would like to make abortion available on demand at the expense of the American taxpayer. This is ironic, and it is ironic for a number of reasons.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute records that in 1972, a year before the tragic Roe versus Wade decision and before Washington began to pay for abortions, there were only 12.9 percent of pregnancies ending in abortion. By 1976 that percentage had doubled to 23.1 percent.

The Hyde amendment, when it was enacted, leveled the number of pregnancies ending with abortions at roughly 25 percent. And yet what level can we expect to reach if the Hyde amendment, the commonsense Hyde amendment, supported by millions of Americans and the vast majority of Americans, if that amendment is repealed?

A 1992 survey conducted by the Reader's Digest revealed some very interesting facts with regard to public funding of abortions.

Among those earning less than $15,000 a year, opposition to publicly funded abortions ran at 63 percent to 32 percent for that funding, while those making over $60,000 favored it by 57 to 41 percent.

I think the lesson from that is that the vast majority of mainstream America, middle income, low income Americans, they do not support abortion on demand, and in fact they strongly oppose Federal funding for abortion.

Madam Speaker, even with restrictions on Federal funding of abortion, there are 4,400 abortions that are performed every day in the United States of America. That adds up to 1.6 million abortions every year.

Since Roe versus Wade in 1973, more than 26 million abortions have occurred in the United States. Tragically, the United States leads and surpasses all Western nations in the number of abortions performed per 1,000 women of childbearing age.

It is hard to imagine the number of abortions that would occur should the administration prevail in including abortions in their upcoming health care reform plan. It is unconscionable, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] pointed out, it is absolutely unconscionable to ask good people, taxpaying Americans who happen to regard abortion as the deliberate taking of a human life, to pay for a procedure that to them is morally offensive and morally wrong.

The distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, Robert D. Casey, testified before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights against the so-called Freedom of Choice Act.

Our friend's name, which is so recognizable to most of us, was named in the Planned Parenthood lawsuit challenging Pennsylvania's moderate regulations on abortion, which included things like parental consent with judicial bypass. Incidentally, President Clinton, who was then Governor of the State of Arkansas when I was serving in the State legislature, supported parental notification, and in fact signed parental notification laws into law in the State of Arkansas.

Well, that is part of what was in the Pennsylvania case. Also prohibition of third trimester abortions, 25 weeks to birth. No State funding of abortions was in the Pennsylvania law.

Informed consent, the requirement that a doctor provide a woman considering abortion information on the dangers of abortion, alternatives to abortion, and it included a 24-hour waiting period for a woman to consider that information provided to her by her physician. All of those very commonsense restrictions that are supported by the vast majority of Americans would suddenly be stricken if the Freedom of Choice Act becomes law.

That is what the Governor of Pennsylvania testified. None of these very reasonable limitations would even survive. They would fall like dominoes should the Freedom of Choice Act pass.

President Clinton said when he was a candidate campaigning he thought abortions ought to be safe, legal, and they ought to be rare. Unfortunately, he is fulfilling two-thirds of that promise. But the part about it being rare he is not fulfilling. In fact, Federal funding of abortion will not make it more rare. Including it in a health care plan is not going to make it more rare. Applying and making abortions available at military installations is not going to make abortion more rate. In fact, it is going to have just the opposite impact.

□ 2210

Let me add, while I have the floor, that the attack on my family, and I so appreciate this order dealing with the family, the attack upon my family is very broad-based. And it is not just in the area of abortion, as critically important as that is. But the attack on the family goes to our very tax laws and our Tax Code.

In recent years, the Federal Government has waged a veritable war on the American family. Policies have been formulated and legislation has been enacted that run in direct opposition to the best interests of the family.

This turn of events is especially tragic in light of the fact that the family is the very basic unit upon which our Nation was built and through which our greatest achievements have been realized.

During the past four decades there has been a steady erosion, an erosion of the personal tax exemption for families with children.

The income tax burden on a median income family of four has risen 150 percent, the tax burden upon the median income family has risen 150 percent since the mid-1950's. If the personal exemption had kept pace with inflation and per capita income since 1948, it would now be over $8,000 instead of the current level, only $2,300.

It is this type of tax inequity that indicates the Federal Government's bias against children and hostility toward the traditional American family. So I want to urge my colleagues this evening and in this Chamber to support the Family and Economic Recovery Act of 1993.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [FRANK WOLF], has authored a bold new bill to afford middle income American families the opportunity to better provide for their own family and invest in their own future.

Under the Family and Economic Recovery Act, families would be allowed a $600 per child tax credit to offset the high costs of raising a child.

In addition, an adoption tax credit would be implemented to promote the choice of adoption and to encourage this option for young women who are unable to care for their child.

Then on another front, the administration is currently fighting to reclassify multipurpose passenger vehicles, more commonly referred to as minivans or, in many families, as mom's taxi.

They want to reclassify these as cargo vehicles. This unsound trade policy can only tighten the financial vise squeezing the American family. So while the Federal Government, as the gentleman pointed out, raises taxes, increases its own revenues, starts new spending programs, middle-class families have to tighten their belts even more.

An average increase of $3,700 will be added to the price of imported minivans, and Detroit will not be far behind in raising their prices as well.

By virtually eliminating competition in the minivan market, we are ensuring dramatically higher prices upon middle-income families. In addition, thousands of working men and women are going to be jobless at American dealerships. And then the Federal Tax Code and public policy reward, amazingly enough, reward cohabitation over marriage and penalize the marriage relationship, as we provide a greater benefit for those who might live together as opposed to those who get married and file a joint return. So our whole Tax Code has a bias and a tilt against the family.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Supposing this proposed law took effect, related to the imported vans, and it throws people out of work. What do you suppose would be the response of the Federal Government to that result?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I suppose we would, among other things, we would probably have another supplemental appropriation to expand unemployment benefits.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It would seem reasonable, since we have had four of those now. Probably it would be done also under the emergency exception to the disastrous 1990 budget summit agreement and, therefore, we would simply pile on more and more debt without having to meet the pay-as-you-go requirements. Would that not be a reasonable supposition?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I think that is not only reasonable, I think it is that which we could expect. So the deficit gets worse, the debt continues to grow, and the American family continues to be penalized.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. And we may get a new Federal program along with it, something to do with retraining of displaced workers, import companies deal in vans and then perhaps a new cadre of bureaucrats to oversee that program and new taxes to fund it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Exactly.

Let me make one additional point. The Federal Tax Code cheers the policies that really created latchkey kids and shuns parents who choose to work at home. No one would argue that a woman does not have the right to go out and work in the American work force. In fact, they make great contributions and every opportunity should be afforded them. But there are mothers who make that choice to stay at home, and our current Tax Code penalizes the mother who makes that choice by providing tax credits for the mother who puts their child in a daycare center but penalizes the mother who stays at home and takes care of her own children.

So in short, the Federal Tax Code and our public policy in general is hostile toward the family and says, in effect, that children were more valuable to America four decades ago than they are now. I disagree with that.

The family is a resource more precious than oil, more precious than gold. It has survived, despite the fact that it is paying more today in Federal taxes than it spends on food, more in Federal taxes than it spends on clothing, more in Federal taxes than it spends on transportation, on insurance, on recreation, in fact, all of those combined.

And so it is imperative that we enact measures that support the family. In the war that is being waged against the family, we must maintain and defend the position that preservation and protection of the family are central components to our national defense.

I look around this great parliamentary building, and I see above the exits in the balcony profiles of great lawmakers of the past, everything from Moses to Thomas Jefferson.

I think of all of those great lawmakers. There is at least one thing that they all had in common. That was a recognition of the centrality of the family to the future of any society. That is what we are talking about tonight.

We are talking about the future of our society and the future of our Nation, those things that many would say, would relegate to the least important and that are deserving of the least amount of time are, in fact, the most critical to the future of our Nation.

Therefore, I applaud the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for arranging this special order this evening and an opportunity for us to address some of those issues that affect the American family in this 20th century, as we approach a new century.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arkansas.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

I am a little bit miffed over the emphasis that this country places on the integrity of maintaining the American family and yet, at the same time, there is a very insidious tax that will begin to rip thread by thread small businesses, large businesses and, yes, impact on eventually the small family, the American family.

I was raised in a small business. My dad had a grocery store right after World War II. The store was located in Rockford, IL.

At that time Dad extended on credit people coming in from the captive nations after World War II and people, incidentally, coming from Arkansas and other areas of the South because of tremendous crop failures.

And Pop had a policy of extending credit to people who simply could not make it. And after a period of time, they got on their feet.

And there were times when Pop would take old Blue Star potato chip boxes, which were an inch thick, and I would see him go to the homes where these people lived, many of them lived in tents in the middle of the wintertime in Rockford, IL, and he would put those potato chip boxes on the walls and insulate their homes because of a well-founded fear that these people would starve to death and would die from the elements.

Now comes the Btu tax. Madam Speaker, exactly what would this do?

Well, if a small business, let us say my brother's restaurant business, is impacted by this tax, which it will, what is going to happen?

First of all, his heating bill is going to go up dramatically.

□ 2220

He is going to have to charge higher prices for the food that he sells at the restaurant because all of his various suppliers, including the pasta supplier, the meat supplier, the vegetable supplier, all of these people deliver groceries at night to his restaurant, and all his wholesalers in turn have deliveries made to them in vehicles, and then the farmer who is actually producing these vegetables has to pay more for the production, not only because of the cost of

fuel but because of the cost of the petroleum-based chemicals that he uses as fertilizer and also to control pests.

This is a ball that gathers up all kinds of mud as it goes down a slippery slope, and by the time all these costs get passed on to my brother Frankie at his restaurant, he has to do one thing. He has to charge higher prices. Therefore, the Btu tax not only costs people more but it fuels inflation, which is the greatest robber baron of the American family. Of course, the people that travel to his restaurant travel by automobile, and they have to pay more.

If we listen to the testimony of Tim Wirth, a former member of the other body who is a special counsel to the President, he stated in the meeting before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that one of the purposes of the gasoline Btu tax would be to conserve energy, and energy is being conserved because gasoline costs so much that people cannot afford to drive.

I live in Ogle County, which is part of the 16th Congressional District, and practiced law in a little bitty town there for 22 years. Madam Speaker, there are people that drive 25 and 30 miles each way for a job that pays $5 to $6 an hour, and they are proud of that. Many times it is the best job that they can get under the circumstances.

To hit those people with higher costs for gasoline——

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is he saying to us that the people who are going to get hurt the most by the Btu tax are the hard-working middle-income families who happen to live in rural areas where they use a lot of fuel?

Mr. MANZULLO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Have we ever had a tax, I would ask the gentleman, quite like this energy tax?

Mr. MANZULLO. There has never been one, but the gentleman will recall back in the 1970's when gasoline skyrocketed, I know of people who quit their jobs because they could not afford to drive. It was cheaper for them to go on welfare. They simply could not afford to put gasoline in their automobiles.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I have seen today estimates by the proponents of this energy tax that it is only going to be a few dollars a month is all it is going to impact the average American.

Mr. MANZULLO. That does not add up to $70 billion over 5 years. The economics are faulty.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I have seen everything from 8 cents to 20 cents a gallon on gasoline, plus what it costs for utility bills, plus all of the other costs, the petrochemicals involved. It is hard for me to believe there is any way that that tax could be held to only a few dollars each month.

Mr. MANZULLO. It certainly could not be. There is something else that happens. I shared my experience in the rural areas, but again, in the county where we live now, we have an incredible proportion of senior citizens. One estimate is that out of 45,000 people there are 6,000 senior citizens that live alone. Many of those senior citizens heat with oil, which is the highest costing energy there is.

For Mr. Wirth to state that the Btu tax would conserve energy means that many of these seniors will not have enough money in order to pay their fuel bills so they can stay warm.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. If this tax, as it seems, will ripple through the economy at every level from time of production right through processing right on through transportation and delivery to the retailer, if it ripples through at every level, hits utility bills, hits the home heating and propane, natural gas, the gasoline in the automobiles, if it hits at all those levels, doesn't that kind of tax have to be inflationary?

Mr. MANZULLO. Absolutely.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. And if it is inflationary, doesn't that hit the retired people, the older homeowner on a fixed income, harder than anybody else?

Mr. MANZULLO. Inflation does that.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. This is an antifamily kind of tax, isn't it?

Mr. MANZULLO. It is an anti everybody kind of tax, because not only does it impact the family unit as we know it, but the costs of production in factories—in one of our other counties, Winnebago County, it has close to 1,000 factories. Half of the exports from Illinois come from Winnebago County.

I talked to industrialists who talked about electrical bills being raised by hundreds of thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars in additional energy costs to keep open their factories. What is that going to do? That is going to drive up the cost of production, and if the cost of production becomes so high, they may end up, and they probably will end up, selling less manufactured goods. That means that people will become unemployed.

The Btu tax, Madam Speaker, should be known as Bill's Taxes Unlimited.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield on this point?

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I learned in the Committee on Agriculture, on which I sit, an interesting piece of information. This tax is going to raise $70 billion, this Btu tax, over the next 5 years.

What I do not think people realize, however, is that under the Clinton plan they are going to turn right around and give $40 billion of the tax in earned income tax credits, and billions of dollars of new food stamp handouts that we are going to be giving. So what it is really going to mean is that the good old middle class, once again, is going to be hit for really the $70 billion, the poor people are going to get $40 billion back, so we can see once again the brunt of this, here we are with a $70 billion tax that is only a net revenue increase of $30 billion, because they are giving away $40 billion back to a certain group that they want to benefit. That is how we get this $40 billion in spending increases right here.

What an inefficient tax that is going to burden everybody in this fashion. It is a disaster. The idea should be killed. They ought to cut $30 billion in spending. That would accomplish the same result, and no one would have to pay this ridiculous Btu tax.

Mr. MANZULLO. The gentleman is correct. The big problem with the Btu tax is that it is not practical, for people like us that sit down and think about these taxes. It is people who are theorists, people who have jobs, well-paying jobs, that don't even estimate the impact.

In fact in the hearing yesterday I said,

> Counselor, as a representative of the Clinton administration, I appreciate the fact and commend you that we have environmental impact statements whenever something is done to nature. That is good. That is good for the environment. But the Clinton administration fails consistently to come up with an impact statement on how taxes will actually affect the people, regardless of income brackets.

The ones that are most hurt are the millions of families, the millions of families in this country that are barely hanging on financially, that have no savings. In fact, Madam Speaker, this country's savings rate is at an all time low, seven times less than the country of Japan. Why is that? Because the American family simply has no more money to give by way of taxes.

I would urge the President, out of compassion for saving small businesses, out of compassion for keeping seniors from spending what little money they have on more energy, out of compassion for allowing industries not to increase their cost of production, which could result in a net loss of work, I would urge the administration to deep six, to scuttle, to ditch, to burn once and for all any notion that the deficit of this country would be narrowed in any manner whatsoever by the passing of a Btu tax.

□ 2130

I thank the gentleman for arranging this forum.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We are obviously going to have an extension of this family order of yours and my good colleague from California with a focus on what is happening to the American family by Government excess taxation, and taxation without hesitation is the motto of the current administration. And also the moral impact on our families from unlimited abortion on demand for any reason or no reason, and then making all taxpayers pay for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MALONEY). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] has expired.

SUPPORT FOR THE AMERICAN HEALTH SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker. I am here today to show my strong support for the American Health Security Act, H.R. 1200. As a new Member of Congress, I consider this bill the most important, far-reaching legislation I have had the opportunity to cosponsor.

I campaigned in favor of the single-payer health care system, and believe that my endorsement for the concept was a factor in my election. One main sentiment came across during my campaign and since then at town halls and meetings with constituents, physicians, and hospital administrators. That is that the American people are ready for total reform.

They don't want a Band-Aid. They want a health care system that encompasses all five principles for real health care reform. Those principles are: Universal coverage, regardless of employment, income, or health status; comprehensive benefits, including the full range of reproductive services; consumer choice of providers; affordability; and public accountability.

Of the many health care reform proposals that are being talked about, only one accomplishes all of these goals. That plan is the American Health Security Act.

The Congressional Budget Office agrees that the single payer is the most effective way to provide universal access and contain health care costs and that it is the most fiscally conservative plan under consideration.

How can my colleagues and the public assess health care reform plans to be certain that they are fair and equitable? There are 12 questions to ask about each plan. These questions, prepared by my distinguished colleague who himself is a physician, JIM MCDERMOTT, are useful because they explain the most important features of any plan in simple terms—a feat that is difficult on such a complex issue. To assist my colleagues, Madam Speaker, I will review the questions and point out how the single-payer system addresses the question more completely than any other plan.

First, does the plan provide insurance coverage to every American?

As you know, today, nearly 40 million Americans are living without health insurance coverage. That total has been increasing by about 100,000 each month, and another 40 million people are dangerously under-insured. Any health care reform must extend adequate coverage to these Americans.

The American Health Security Act guarantees coverage to every citizen. Under this plan, everyone could be given a card—looking like a simple credit card—entitling the bearer to full quality medical care.

Second, is the coverage portable, stable, and continuous?

One major problem for people who do have insurance is the fear that they will lose it if they move to another job or if they have a pre-existing condition which wouldn't be covered under their new employer's plan.

Because the American Health Security Act is in no way tied to employment, the coverage is completely portable and stable.

Third, is the standard benefit package comprehensive enough to prevent the need for a large secondary insurance market?

In this country, it is essential to have a quality health care system available to everyone. If the standard benefit package provided to all citizens guarantees only minimal benefits, many people will look for better programs. If we have a system where people buy out of the national program, or buy supplemental private insurance, we will have a two-tiered, or possibly three-tiered program, and continued uncontrollable costs.

The single-payer plan offers a comprehensive, generous package of benefits, so people will stay in the system preserving the ability to control costs while providing the necessary services.

Fourth, does it allow individuals or families to choose their own physician or other health care providers?

Many Americans cite the ability to select their own doctor as the single most important aspect of any health care plan, even over cost and convenience. One of the fundamental elements of getting well and staying well is the relationship between the healer and the patient. If the patient has no choice of provider, an essential component of the health process is removed.

The single-payer approach solves this problem by allowing all patients to see the medical professional of their choice. All healers will be accessible since there will be one uniform system of payment.

Fifth, does it guarantee coverage regardless of physical condition or the presence of a preexisting condition?

Increasingly, insurance in this country is available only when you do not need it. For example, if you have cancer, insurance companies will cover every illness but cancer. If you are HIV positive, they will either refuse to cover you or cover you for the first $500 and that's it.

The American Health Security Act corrects this current problem by covering all preexisting illnesses.

Sixth, does the plan provide for effective and measurable cost-containment?

Today, the American health care system has no cost controls. That is why the United States pays 14 percent of the gross domestic product in health care costs today, and why costs continue to spiral out of control.

The single-payer system includes verifiable cost-containing measures basing payments on geographics, demographics, and similar factors.

Seventh, does cost containment apply to the entire health care delivery system without loopholes or exemptions for the secondary insurance market or self-insured entities?

It is impossible to control costs and put an end to wasteful spending when large numbers of people are outside the system. To be effective, cost-containment measures must be applied to the entire health care delivery system.

The American Health Security Act eliminates this problem by covering everyone, and providing a comprehensive benefit package, thus eliminating the need for any secondary market.

Eighth, is there one simplified administrative system that applies to all Americans?

A primary function of any health care reform plan must enable us to identify and reduce waste. Overlapping layers of private and Federal health care bureaucracies needlessly waste billions of health care dollars every year.

According to the General Accounting Office, Americans incur nearly $60 billion a year in unnecessary health care costs because of the numbers and variety of forms and paperwork required by over 1,500 private insurance companies.

The single-payer system streamlines the paperwork and will have one standard form to file which will save billions of dollars.

Ninth, does the health care delivery system enhance access to health care in rural areas and inner cities?

Over a third of all Americans who live in rural areas or inner cities have been severely underserved by the current health care system. A health care plan must address this demographic spread, and health insurance collectives cannot do so.

H.R. 1200 would correct this inadequacy in two ways. First, it doubles the funding to community health centers which serve primarily inner-city and rural areas. More importantly, however, the single-payer system

equalizes the profit of medical practitioners. Currently, there is a huge dearth of medical personnel in these two areas because people there have a harder time affording physicians. It is much more profitable for doctors to practice in the suburbs since payment rates are far higher there.

Under the single-payer system, medical service providers are compensated equally. They will no longer have to worry about surviving economically in rural or inner-city regions.

Tenth, does the plan enhance the quality of health care and eliminate interference by insurance companies who second guess medical decisions?

The current system positions insurance companies between the patient and the health care provider through precertification requirements for hospital admissions, length of hospital stays, and for certain medical procedures. This practice, which was intended to reduce health care costs by eliminating unnecessary medical procedures by doctors had hospitals, has been ineffective.

We need a system that allows doctors to make their own medical decisions concerning their patients and encourages them to become better practitioners.

The American Health Security Act eliminates interference and profit-driven medical decisions by eliminating the need for insurance companies. There will no longer be a third party making medical decisions.

Eleventh, does the plan provide for continuity of care?

When consumers are constantly being forced to switch plans because of expense or coverage options, care becomes sporadic. Having consistent, thorough, high quality care is essential for long-term prevention and patient recovery.

The single-payer system provides complete continuity of care by allowing everyone to choose his or her provider. You may switch as often or as little as you care to.

Twelfth, finally, does the system significantly reduce administrative costs of the health care budget?

About one-fourth of all health care dollars in America are thrown away by administrative expenses. To find the savings necessary to finance comprehensive health care coverage for all Americans, this incredible waste must be reduced. Nearly 25 percent of the U.S. health care costs relate directly to administration.

The single-payer system cuts administrative costs. Canada's single-payer system uses less than 3 percent of all health care dollars to administer it's program.

Madam Speaker, as a newly elected Member of Congress who focused on health care reform as a campaign issue, I know that the people I represent in Marin and Sonoma Counties, in California except me to have the courage to fight for the best possible health care system. Their hopes are high, and they expect effective solutions. We must move ahead with a proven solution. Our Nation, our families, and our businesses, cannot wait for additional years of experimentation and tiny fixes. The time is right for change. The American Health Security Act is the answer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

□ 2240

A PRESIDENT'S EFFECTIVE YEARS

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I thank you.

I would yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I wanted to say that I was up in New Hampshire over the weekend. I wanted to tell my colleagues something that I used. It was not on the spur of the moment but hours before this luncheon, I sat down and was thinking about economics, and I was writing down in order all of the things that I thought would go up or down in the next 800 or so days of this administration.

The reason I am not using the 1,461 days of a 4-year Presidency is that 119 days are already gone. Whoever gets elected President in November 1996 will dominate the news, as Clinton did after November 3, and the losing President, as was President Bush's fate, moves to the back page, and that interregnum period, we call it, of November, December, and January belongs to the President-elect, not the President.

So if this current President is defeated, those days in November-December of 1996 and January of 1997 are not going to be his days.

So if you take the days from today to November 1996, let us look at another period, the entire election period from late 1995 through 1996, I would ask anybody out there in the country, did President-want-to-be Clinton dominate the news as much as incumbent President George Bush? Of course he did, whether it was negative domination on Jennifer Flowers, or dodging the draft, or the suppression of other stories or Bobbie Ann Williams, or Miss Arkansas, Sally Purdue, all of those stories that the news media either deliberately through conspiracy or unconscious conspiracy suppressed, whether it was negative news or his dazzling bus trip, his 54-minute speech at the convention, the Gunga Dan Rather or Peter Perfect or Tom Terrific opening up every news shows actually giving out false and bad information that the recession was deepening, that it was the worst economic situation since the Depression of Hoover's time, I mean, whatever it was, the race was on, and the news was dominated by all of the challengers early on, my fellow Californian in his white turtleneck holding up the 800 phone number card, Jerry Brown, whoever it was, HARKIN yelling he was going to kick George Bush right in the you-know-what, all of that agony going on for President Bush in 1992, which means that a President's best years are the first 3 years.

So I took a real hard count and came up with not 1,461 days but 866 days from tomorrow. That is what Mr. Clinton has to make his mark on the economy and on our Nation's history.

Let us face it, my colleagues, he came within a whisker of destroying his Presidency by sending American air crews into Bosnia to choose sides and start killing either Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Croatians, or Bosnian Moslems.

□ 2050

He was getting ready to choose sides. How that thing unraveled, one of the news magazines called it, a squishy way, we will not know. But here is what I did at a Rotary luncheon up in New Hampshire 2 days ago, Monday.

I took these following letters, wrote them down in a column.

Mr. MANZULLO. If the gentleman would yield, before the gentleman gets into those letters, I wonder if the gentleman would yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS] for a few remarks so that he could catch up.

Mr. DORNAN. Yes.

Mr. MANZULLO. That was my fault.

Mr. DORNAN. We got off the beaten path with the fine remarks of our colleague from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MANZULLO. Yes.

Mr. DORNAN. I will tell you what I will do, I will do this real fast. Let me get this out of the way, and you just think in your minds that these people answered from the audience audibly when I had not really expected it, to the question: What do you think about the following, will they go up or down? Now, I have 10 ups, 5 downs, and 1 big up at the end.

Here is what we know is going to go up: Taxes, that is a given; spending, that is a given; regulations, givens; deficit—he says it is coming down—it is going up. The debt, both personal and the big Government debt, where Ed Rollins said on TV and Carville did not gainsay him, that a trillion dollars will be added in the next 3 or 4 years. Capital flight, Europe does not come here politically as the most stable regime in the world; capital flight is going to go up and out. Unemployment, up. Bankruptcies, up.

Look at some downs: Productivity will go down, taxes will see to that; investment, down, crushed by taxes; savings, down. Taxes go up, savings go down. That is a given.

Job creation, down. Economic growth, down; revenues, down. When taxes go up, revenues go down. Then comes crime, which always grows out of political instability, people without jobs, people angry, festering inner-city problems. Crime is going up under the Clinton administration. That is a given. There is not much inspiration coming out of that bloody pulpit.

I yield back.

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to return to something that was said earlier by my colleague from California, the other colleague, [Mr. DOOLITTLE], about how surprising it was that the things that would not have ever been considered in this body are suddenly now considered, including, I think, specifically you are talking about the Freedom of Choice Act, and that sort of thing. It is very important to note, I think, that ideas have consequences. That is really what we are about here tonight, as we are having the opportunity to talk here among Members of Congress about some ideas and have others listen in on that and understand that truly ideas do have tremendous consequences.

Some of the consequences that I am concerned about in this current administration have to do with some of those ideas. The other day, Monday, I guess it was, I was in my district, and a stockbroker gave me a report from Prudential Securities. You would not think of Prudential Securities as an outfit that worry too much about the moral condition of the current administration. But they are worried.

It comes as a big surprise to me that Wall Street would worry about the moral condition of the Clinton administration. But apparently they are worried.

I will explain that in a second.

This is a very well-written piece by Mark Melcher of Prudential Securities. Mr. Melcher lists some of the very interesting and, as he calls them, nontraditional views of members of the Clinton administration. One of them, probably one of the most interesting since we are dealing here with the family and with the impact of taxes and the economy on the family, has to do with the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Laura D'Andrea Tyson. Ms. Tyson has proposed as "elementary economic principle," the fact that, "There is no relationship between the level of taxes a nation pays and its economic performance."

She also argues, the article goes on, "Free market frenzy in the United States during the past decade," demonstrates why we should have "collective ownership of firms by groups of workers."

Then we have Donna Shalala, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, who is described by Newsweek as "the high priestess of political correctness." She once described in a speech how Thanksgiving would be for a typical 4-year-old kindergarten student in 2004, "If only the United States would make it a top priority in our communities and in our Congress to make this child think of herself as being part of the world—not just her town or the United States." Now, Mark Melcher assumes that she would say or write a description of what the Secretary would say about Thanksgiving: The teacher would tell the little girl a story about how "people from Europe came to the United States, where the Indians lived. She will say, 'It was just the same as if someone had come into your yard and taken all your toys and told you that they weren't yours anymore.'"

Then Shalala said:

> The little girl will feel sad, but she will be glad to have a day off to play at home and get together with her neighbors. Her favorate story about holidays at school will be a Chinese New Year, when Chang's mother brings a dragon puppet to school.

Of course, Mark Melcher again the adviser, the investment adviser for Prudential Securities, writes that this truly is part of an ongoing cultural war in this country. That is what this is all about.

He writes:

> Many Americans are proud of Thanksgiving and believe that schools might remind students that we honor that day because Congress specifically asked George Washington to establish a "day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts, the many and signal favors of Almighty God." Furthermore, many people believe that schools might consider following Washington's advice that on Thanksgiving day, citizens should "offer our prayer and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions."

This is not someone on the street corner preaching; this is George Washington. This is what he saw as the future of this country.

But the conclusion of what I point out here about this piece from Predential Securities, Mark Melcher, is something that I think really is where the cultural war boils down to: He says:

> Regardless of one's views of religion and patriotism, there is widespread sociological agreement that any society's ability to establish justice and ensure tranquility depends to a great extent on a commonality of beliefs among its citizens. And no matter how badly some people wish to deny it, most historians agree that America's Judaeo-Christian heritage and the widespread belief among its citizens that the United States is "the best country in the world" are the principal glues that have held this unique "melting pot" social together since its founding.

That is where we are. Right now there is a cultural war in this country to determine whose set of values rule in this country. Unfortunately, we have a number of people at the White House who apparently have rather nontraditional views and views that really do shake the confidence of the American family and truly remake what we think of as the family. Unfortunately, my options, there are people there that believe that the basic unit of society is not the family, it is the social worker and his or her client.

I do not think that is what the American people think. I do no think that is what mainstream America thinks. I think mainstream America thinks that the family is the basic unit of society, not a social worker and his or her client.

So that is what we are about here. I appreciate the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] in putting together this special order on the family. The family is the basic unit of society, and in order for it to survive we have got to lean against this cultural war that is being waged in the White House itself, and to reestablish the principle that the family is the basic unit of society that needs to be strengthened.

□ 2300

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I do not control the time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will yield?

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I would like to get a copy of what the gentleman is quoting from, the account of Donna Shalala's view of Thanksgiving is truly amazing. It illustrates perfectly the war on culture that the gentleman has discussed.

Our President campaigned that he was reinventing government, that he was going to do something for the middle class.

What we are seeing of the Clinton administration is a radicalism perhaps never even dreamed of when Michael Dukakis was campaigning for the Presidency. I mean, it is unbelievable the sorts of dangerous ideas hat are actually being advocated right out of the White House.

I just would like to touch on another one that I did not hear the gentleman mention. That is the nomination of Roberta Achtenberg to be the Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to oversee the fair employment laws and so forth.

Achtenberg is a radical lesbian activist who directed the National Center for Lesbian Rights.

She lives with Mary Morgan, or did live, I do not know if she still does, but she did, the presiding judge of the San Francisco Municipal Court. Neither women reportedly reveal which of the two is the birth mother of their child.

I can see where we are going to have to have another special order to get

into what really is happening to the disaster that is facing the family, the nonsense that we hear promoted by the left about family diversity is actually destroying our institution of the two biological parent family. It is under tremendous stress.

Ms. Achtenberg, by the way, I should point out claims as one of her accomplishments expelling the Boy Scouts of America from public facilities in the Bay Area. That cost the Boy Scouts about $848,000.

I just think it is important to know, our President who again claims by his rhetoric and associations with the town halls to be one of us is actually appointing people to office who are making war on the Boy Scouts of America, on traditional family values, and it is just something that everybody in this country ought to be aware of. It is truly bizarre to read the sorts of things that are coming out of this administration. It is almost unbelievable, except indeed these things are true.

Mr. DORNAN. May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], was the gentleman aware that Achtenberg brought Mary Morgan with her to the Senate confirmation hearing, introduced her as her partner, lover, or some such thing. It was fascinating, this last parade, or circus, with about 300,000 people out here on the Mall, the signs were a new title indicating a new high level for the word bi or bisexual.

Now, can we look forward on the second go-around of appointees when some of these people resign to go back to San Francisco or other places of someone coming in as a prominent bi and having two people with them and saying, "This is Mary over here and this is Freddie over here. These are the two people I live with in a very satisfying, loving menage à trois."

I mean, the gentleman is right. There is a deterioration of values going on here at warp speed.

I looked at some of her background on, for example, this committee that she formed under the Agriculture Department that she was appointed to on coming up with these new definitions of what is a family. It can include a group of golfing buddies, for Pete's sake. All it requires is the fuzzy qualification of strong emotional bonds.

What I thought was offensive, absolutely offensive, was she has had intense activity in this Boy Scout battle as a director of United Way right up until December of last year, just a few months ago, 5 or 6 months ago, and when she was asked the direct question by one of the minority members in her confirmation hearing, she looked steely eyed at the entire panel and said, "I don't remember the case," the case being the whole controversy over defunding the Boy Scouts and then demanding that the Boy Scouts succumb to having homosexual Scoutmasters or Scout leaders.

I thought, well, is someone going to challenge her on that?

If she had a scrapbook of press clippings on her entire life, a third to two-thirds would be totally consumed by press stories and clippings on Roberta Achtenberg's battle with the Boy Scouts of America, and to say in one simple statement, just flagrantly untrue on its face, "I don't remember the case," and to have our colleagues, Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues of principle dismiss that and have her only now held up by the hold of one courageous Senator from North Carolina is stunning to me. I do not know where the courage is of even our Members on the other side on this advice-and-consent process to the White House, but her case history, the gentleman is correct, is worthy of 1 solid hour all on its own.

Americans are still in a state of shock at the rapidity with which this administration is dumping this self-description of new kind of Democrat and presenting us not only with the old style of tax and spend and regulating Democrat only, but presenting us with new ground that would not have even been thought of in this Chamber or the other body just years ago, not to talk about our forefathers.

I would recommend that the remaining Members on the floor avail themselves of what I stumbled on, because inspiring is not the right word, the opening of the stunning and inspiring Holocaust Museum. In one of the brochures it said there was an exhibit of a Heinrich Himmler speech before 100 S.S. Nazi generals. That must have been a fine demonic gathering, where he first used the word specifically Aus Rottung, the rooting up or the extermination or the final extermination of slaughtering all Europe's Jewry.

I went over to see it and I said, "Well, come over early and see the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence at 9:30, come up out of the vaults, protected, from I guess even nuclear blasts. It takes a long time to come up from these metal walls and then rotate forward into their frames for public display.

The curator came down and asked me if I would like to go upstairs and see some very special documents. One of them, and the gentleman made me think of this, was Lincoln's first inaugural address. He opened up a manila folder that came out of a long drawer and showed it to me.

Again I was reminded of something that I took note of on the 200th anniversary in George Bush's first year, April 30, 1989, up in Wall Street, New York, in front of where the wooden Federal Building had been. It has been replaced with a big concrete edifice, a pillared edifice. I looked at this document and there again were George Washington's words. He used a word that we do not use very much around here, indissoluble. He said there is an indissoluble link between virtue and happiness. He is making reference to the economy. That word, economy, and other aspects of American life, he said in the economy and other things, I am going to bring it on the floor tomorrow, there was an indissoluble link between virtue and happiness.

How many people talk about virtue? Where was the discussion of virtue in this battle between Achtenberg and the Boy Scouts of America?

This Nation will never again know true happiness until we stop this assault upon the nuclear American family and its values and trying to say that the next step, and I say as shocking as this might sound now, if you look at the rapid speed we have deteriorated in just 4 years, the next step would be in the second term, thinking of Patrick Henry at this point, God forbid it, to say, well, we have to reanalyze pedolphilia. This is an orientation. People cannot help it if they like 15- and 16-year-olds, if they are attracted toward innocence and newness, so we have got to like Numblu and North American Man-Boy Love Association who marches in every so-called un-gay parade I have ever seen.

How are we going to differentiate? Where do we draw the line in the country and what mischief will a Roberta Achtenberg utilize in this important HUD agency that Jack Kemp took so many pains to make a real outreach to people to determine the course of their own lives.

So I recommend that you go over there and watch that Declaration of Independence come up which closes with a firm reliance upon divine providence.

"We mutually pledge our lives, our fortune, and our sacred honor."

Where is the sacred honor in this Chamber and the sacred honor of the U.S. Senate to not challenge some of the bizarre appointments that are coming up before us in this peculiar period in American history?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from California makes a very key point. I think the answer lies, how does this country get back on track? It gets back on track by strengthening its families, and there is a way to do that and the way begins—well, before I get into that, just let me call to the attention of the body a very key magazine article that appeared in the April 1993, issue of Atlantic Monthly, "Dan Quayle Was Right." It is a great article. I commend it to every American interested in seeing what confronts us relative to the family. I would just like to quote briefly from this.

□ 2310

Mr. DORNAN. Before the gentleman does so, Madam Speaker, I ask him,

"Did you catch Mario Cuomo on Larry King's show last week—Governor Cuomo?" He said Dan Quayle was right. He quoted the article.

"I saw that; of course he was right," he said.

He did not pull it off very well, and he got sidetracked talking about a fictitious character, Murphy Brown. He said, "But Dan Quayle was right. Family values are key, important, and we've got to address this problem."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, let me just quote from this, and this is just kind of—well, it is a lifted-out quote just above the headline of the article.

"The social science evidence is in. Though it may benefit the adults involved, the dissolution of intact, two-parent families is harmful to large numbers of children. Moreover," the author argues, "family diversity in the form of increasing numbers of single-parent and step-parent families does not strengthen the social fabric, but rather dramatically weakens and undermines society."

And that is exactly what we are talking about. The idea that two lesbians are going to raise a child is outrageous, and Americans need to stand up and confront these issues directly, and I hope in this special order we have been able to, at least, scratch the surface and give us an opportunity in subsequent discussions to come back and revisit this issue because this is so fundamental.

We have had preached for some many years that, oh, divorce, it is good sometimes for the people, and children bounce back quickly. Well, here we have an article by an expert in the field who basically has analyzed the data, and, as my colleagues know, the basic social science research now is showing what devastating impacts these situations have on single-parent families, divorces, children born out of wedlock, what devastating impacts these situations are having on the children themselves.

We heard earlier the very poignant testimony of the gentleman from New Jersey explaining what we are doing to our children. We refuse to call them children. We call them fetuses, or we call them some other term to try and deny the inhumanity that is going on here, over 27 million lives taken in abortions since the infamous Roe versus Wade decision when an act of Congress is now pending that seeks to legitimize through a statute, and it just—we have Dr. Death running around the country just rearrested once again for helping kill elderly people.

Mr. DORNAN. Kevorkian.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] mentioned Nazi Germany. These things are right out of Nazi Germany, and they are here in this country, and they are being actively promoted, and they are having a new banner placed upon them that makes them seem good, and noble, and just, when in reality it is the worst form of evil, and we must bring to the attention of the Nation what we are doing to our children, both born and unborn.

As my colleagues know, I do not think time permits to get into the other charts tonight. I would like to show——

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I have an idea here because I think it is going to end up to be an important series of special orders. I ask the gentleman, "Why don't you just headline the charts? Go through each one quickly, and we will elaborate on these in depth in future nights."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. All right; I will do that because I think these charts are very interesting. They come out of, in large part—by the way, I want to give credit to the Heritage Foundation which has supplied us with many of these charts. They are based on information coming out of this very important publication by William Bennett entitled "The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators," developed as a counterpart to the Index of Leading Economic Indicators.

Let me just cite for my colleagues some interesting statistics out of here, and I will show my colleagues the charts.

Since 1960 the population has increased 41 percent. Gross domestic product has nearly tripled, and social spending by all levels of Government measured in inflation-adjusted constant dollars, 1990 dollars—social spending has increased from $143.73 billion to $787 billion, more than a five-fold increase. So, population went up 41 percent. We had over a 500 percent increase in Government spending. I wonder how we got the $4 trillion cumulative national debt that we have today. It is because of all that spending.

Inflation-adjusted spending on welfare—quoting again—inflation-adjusted welfare has increased 630 percent, and inflation-adjusted spending on education has increased 225 percent.

Now let us go to education for a minute.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, while the gentleman is doing that, may I point out that one of the traps that the media tried to put my former classmate and fine Vice President, Dan Quayle, into was to try and twist his observation about the importance of a nuclear family into conveying to all single mothers across the country that there was something wrong with them. In all of the 1960's and 1970's my wife and I drew very close to single mothers by war, by force, the wives of all the missing-in-action Americans, POW Americans, who raised families like Jeremiah Denton, the great former U.S. Senator—seven children raised by his wife alone for 7 years. What about every police officer who dies in the line of duty, his wife raising children alone? That is not what we are talking about. There are almost 50,000 automobile fatalities every year. Let us say half are breadwinners, mothers or fathers. That leaves a father along with children, a mother, young mother, gone; a young father gone, with children.

Bill Clinton's own natural father died coming home late at night, working as a salesman, leaving Virgnia alone with her new little son, Bill Jefferson Blythe.

Madam Speaker, we are not saying that these women are not courageous frontier women. Men are killed by natural elements, lost out in the snow, dying from the elements, killed in Indian native American battles.

What we are talking about is what I saw during the height of the Quayle debate in May, and that was two intelligent-looking, trained women, psychologists, appeared on the "Today Show" with Katie Couric and said the following statement: "Evidence is coming in that families with only a mother seem to be producing stronger children who are higher achievers, and more emotionally stable." What? That means fathers are worthless. We are rewriting world history here, civilization. Who needs a father then if the children come out as higher achievers, and more emotionally stable, and more independent, more self-reliant—self-reliance and higher achievers; that is it.

I looked at this. I was frozen in my bedroom looking at this TV. I said to my wife, "Look at this. What are we doing to our children?"

And here they were, two female psychologists, both of African-American descent, which is an ethnic group in this country hit severely hard by single-mother families, because of a tragedy of welfarism causing some fathers to pretend to leave, and then, once gone from the house, staying away.

No, I admire, as does every person in this Chamber, a mother or a dad trying to work and to raise children alone, and what is surprising to me is that so many of them do do it when it is not by choice, do do it well, and of course some families are better rid of a drunk, or a gambler, or of an abusive or sexually molesting father. Of course it is better to have that animal out of the house.

But that is not what Mr. Quayle meant when he said it was not good for television shows to act like what those psychologists were saying: "You don't need a father. It's an optional call."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is absolutely right, and let me say that what we need to do is to strengthen the family ethic and to try and keep more families together so that the added

burden is not thrust upon one parent to try and raise the children because I mean those are heroic efforts. It is hard enough with two parents raising children.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would suggest the gentleman from California flip through those charts very rapidly, and then perhaps we can wind this up.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Let me just go through them quickly, Madam Speaker.

This shows—I told my colleagues the things about the 30-year period from 1960 to 1990, how the population increased 41 percent, and spending by all levels of Government increased fivefold, spending in education increased 225 percent.

Look at what this chart shows. We had an 80-point drop in SAT scores, so we increased funding by 225 percent, and the SAT scores over this period have dropped 80 points.

□ 2320

Mr. DORNAN. That looks like taxes up, revenues down.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. This one to me speaks volumes about where we are as a society. It is unbelievable to realize that during the same 30-year period, violent crime has gone up 560 percent. The FBI tells us, and I find this unbelievable, but I do believe it because it is their figures and they are based on their analysis, that during the life of an individual, 8 out of 10 Americans will be the victim of a violent crime. That is truly shocking, but we all know it, do we not? Look at what is happening in our communities.

This next one is fascinating. We just heard how during the 30-year period that spending at all levels of Government has gone up fivefold and welfare spending has 630 percent.

This next chart tells us about the miserable failure of liberalism in this country. This chart shows, starting back here you can see in the 50's, here is the poverty rate. The poverty rate is falling, falling, falling, falling, and falling.

Look when it levels off and goes back up. This happens when LBJ comes into power and launches the war on poverty. Look at the dramatic increases in spending. The more spending goes up, look what is happening to this line. The line is level, it goes down, it goes up a little bit. Then here we are in 1990 where it starts heading up.

Of course, these are the last years we have figures for, so I cannot tell you more recently. But the fact of the matter is we have spent in this 30-year period, I believe, $3.5 trillion that put us deeply in debt. To alleviate poverty we have created a dependent culture that just saps up more and more of out taxpayer dollars. This is resulting in broken homes and more violent crime of enormous proportions. This is why we have got to have further time to really talk about this on another occasion.

Next is births to unmarried women. Look at this line right here. In 1960 it was about 5 percent of unmarried women who gave birth. Look over here in 1990. We are almost at 28 percent, a fivefold increase.

What is happening to these children? These children are emotionally deprived for the most part. You saw that statistic on the 560-percent increase in violent crime. The fastest growing component of those violent crimes is juvenile crimes. That is what we are creating by the social policies that are entirely misplaced.

Here is the chart that illustrates the increase in welfare spending. Madam Speaker, it is never enough. All these trillions of dollars, and we still have people in power in the Federal Government, from the President on down, who tell us, "Oh, we have got to spend more."

That is what President Clinton was quoted as saying on the front page of the Washington Post last Friday. "We have got to raise some more revenues and get this economy going," which is totally inconsistent.

Why? So that we can "spend more." This is completely unbelievable.

Then he has given us a plan, and let us go back to this chart for a minute, a plan which is going to add $1 trillion to the national debt, cumulatively, and which is going to end us up after the largest tax increase in history at the end of the Clinton 5-year plan with an annual budget deficit of $228.5 billion. Some plan.

The family, we see Federal taxes. Look at this increase in the average family with median income. A family of four in 1948 paid about 2 percent of its total income to the U.S. Government in taxes. The same family in 1986 paid 24 percent of its income to the U.S. Government in taxes. And that figure went up where by 1990 it looks like over 25 percent.

Now, from 2 to 25 percent is a twelvefold increase, a 1,200-percent increase in taxes to the Federal Government. That is truly dramatic.

This last chart, which I think is very illustrative, and maybe we can end on this note, represents the Federal budget deficit, the annual deficit going clear back to the 1940's. These are inflation adjusted now.

Of course, look at what we have during the World War II years. We have annual budget deficits, one of them here looks like about 1943 we have an annual budget deficit inflation adjusted, of about $580 billion.

This is truly staggering. But look at what happens here. Of course, during the war years this goes on. Then we get right to here, which appears to be about 1947, you can see what it is, it is about $180 billion, a dramatic reduction.

Just by way of comparison, our budget deficit this year is $320 billion for the fiscal year ending September 30.

We are not in World War II. Under the Clinton plan in 5 years we are going to go from $320 to $228.5 billion.

Look at what happened here. You go in 5 years from an enormous budget deficit, here at over $500 billion, and, my word, you are up to here where you have nearly $100 billion in surplus.

Now, can you see the change there? It is a $600 billion change. We went from deep deficit to surplus.

We are not in World War II right now. Why can we not act more quickly? Why can we not eliminate these tax increases, cut the spending, bring the economy back up by reducing the deficit, reducing the regulation, reducing the burdens on the family, strengthening our families, provide incentives for people to help themselves in the inner cities and in the suburbs, and pull these families back together, transmit family values, make us stronger and better and make us grow faster economically?

That is the American dream. And that, Madam Speaker, is what I submit we need to examine in general detail to see just exactly how we can do it so that we can better serve the citizens of this republic whom we are elected to represent.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from California. We most of all want to thank the people who have the opportunity to listen in depth and examine the charts as to the impact of taxes on the American family.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today from 4 p.m., on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, today, in lieu of 5 minutes previously ordered.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day, on May 24 and 25.

Mr. DREIER, for 60 minutes each day, on May 24 and 25.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes each day, on May 24 and 25.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes each day, today and May 20.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes each day, on May 20 and 26, June 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, and 24.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes each day, on June 10, 17, and 24.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 5 minutes, on May 20.

Mr. ARCHER, for 60 minutes each day, on May 24, 25, and 26.

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

Mr. PICKETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MANZULLO, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. COX.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. WOLF in two instances.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana in two instances.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. CRAPO.

Mr. SUNDQUIST in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. TALENT.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mrs. FOWLER.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT in seven instances.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. KLEIN in seven instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. COSTELLO in two instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. HOLDEN.

Mr. SLATTERY.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. MORAN.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 1993, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 State.22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> "I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 103d Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable ROBERT J. PORTMAN, Second District Ohio.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1242. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1243. A letter from the Principal Deputy for Production and Logistics, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the 1993 National Defense Stockpile [NDS] Requirements Report, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1244. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Science Board, transmitting the report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on fiscal year 1994-99 Future Years Defense Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1245. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting Presidential Determination No. 93-19 regarding the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1246. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend certain provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1247. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1248. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1249. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice that the President has authorized the transfer of funds in fiscal year 1993 foreign military financing to the peacekeeping operations account to provide assistance for enforcement or sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro (Presidential Determination 93-20), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1250. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1251. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for environmental research, development, and demonstration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1252. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the cost effectiveness of extending Medicare coverage for therapeutic shoes to beneficiaries with severe diabetic foot disease, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395x note; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1253. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the effects of the use of clinical practice guidelines developed and determine the effects of the use of the guidelines on the quality, appropriateness, effectiveness, and cost of medical care; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1254. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a study of the effectiveness of influenza vaccine in averting hospital admissions caused by pneumonia; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1255. A letter from the Chairman, Physician Payment Review Commission, transmitting a report on "Fee Update and Medicare Volume Performance Standards for 1994"; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1256. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1994 Medicare physician fee schedule update and fiscal year 1994 Medicare volume performance standing [MVPS] recommendations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1257. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 2 years; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Science, Space, and Technology.

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. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a veterans education certification and outreach program; with an amendment (Rept. 103-98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1159. A bill to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-99). 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. BARLOW:

H.R. 2149. A bill to modify the project for replacement of Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Lower Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky, to provide a local resident hiring preference; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 2150. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. REED, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. FURSE, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KING, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to establish the Maritime Security Fleet Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage merchant marine investment, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2153. A bill to designate the Giant Sequoia National Forest Preserve in the State of California, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. BROWDER):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for separate limitations on contributions to qualifying and nonqualifying House of Representatives candidates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2155. A bill to improve the negotiation and implementation of arms control treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUNNING (by request):

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to restore the rate of duty applicable to manmade fiber felt fabric for technical uses that was in effect under the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for individuals who are blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for women an increase in the availability of preventive health services from certain grantees under such act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 2159. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate and publicly report on the violence contained in television programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for a study of El Camino Real Para Los Texas [the Royal Road for the Texas], and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to expand current restrictions on payment of benefits to prisoners by clarifying the types of offenses with respect to which such restrictions are applied, by including under such restrictions payments to individuals confined for substantial periods to public institutions pursuant to court order based on a verdict that the individual is not guilty of a criminal offense by reason of insanity or a similar finding, and by eliminating the rehabilitation exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 2162. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on diquat dibromide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2163. A bill to reduce the column 1-general rate of duty on piperonyl butoxide [PBO]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2164. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on lambdacyhalothrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2165. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on Tefluthrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2166. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on fluazifop-p-butyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2167. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on Fomesafen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2168. A bill to reduce the column 1-general rate of duty on piperonyl butoxide [PBO]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that foods derived from plant varieties developed by methods of genetic modification be labeled to identify their derivation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN (by request):

H.R. 2170. A bill to amend the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to enhance the safety and security of nuclear power facilities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of bonds eligible for financial institution purchase under small issuer exception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCMILLAN (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to establish categorical spending targets and sequestration against those targets to balance the Federal budget by fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey):

H.R. 2173. A bill relating to the procedures and criteria for the issuance of permits authorizing the ocean dumping of dredged material; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. HORN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, to create remedies for children and other victims of por-

nography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit issuers of credit cards from limiting the ability of governmental agencies to charge fees for honoring credit cards; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (by request):

H.R. 2176. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a new stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia and Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 2177. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to advance notice of changes of rates, fares, and charges for air transportation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 2178. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RAVENEL:

H.R. 2179. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the previously existing suspension of duty on anthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2180. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the previously existing suspension of duty on Paramine Acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2181. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the previously existing suspension of duty on Trimethyl Base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2182. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the previously existing suspensions of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2183. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the previously existing suspension of duty on naphthalic acid anhydride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2184. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on chromotropic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2185. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1996, the duty on Resolin Red F3BS Components I and II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2186. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1996, the duty on dimethl succinyl succinate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARPALIUS:

H.R. 2187. A bill to amend the Helium Act to cancel the accrued and unpaid interest on all notes issued for the purchase of helium and the net capital and retained earnings debt and interest related to the helium production fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 2188. A bill to allow certain individuals seeking part-time employment to be eligible to receive unemployment compensation, to require the Secretary of Labor to establish and carry out an annual survey relating to temporary workers, and to protect part-time and temporary workers relating to pension and group health plans; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 2189. A bill to provide for a delay in the effective date of certain regulations applicable to municipal solid waste landfills under the Solid Waste Disposal Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that multicandidate political committee contributions to a candidate in a Senate or House of Representatives election may constitute only one-third of the total of contributions accepted by the candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BLACKWELL):

H.R. 2191. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration program to make grants to community development corporations for reducing interest rates on loans for economic development activities in five federally designated enterprise zones; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2192. A bill to amend the FREEDOM Support Act to establish a program to provide loans for joint ventures between United States small businesses and small businesses or entrepreneurs in the independent states of the former Soviet Union; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.R. 2193. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for aeronautical research and technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FROST, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution designating the week of November 15 through 22, 1993, as the "National Sportsmen's Instruction Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should develop a strategy to bring the United States back into active and full membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANADY:

H. Res. 174. Resolution impeaching Robert F. Collins, judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for bribery and high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H. Res. 175. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require open committee meetings and to allow the broadcasting and still photography of any committee meetings or hearings that are open to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 176. Resolution impeaching Robert F. Collins, a judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 177. Resolution impeaching Robert P. Aguilar, a judge of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

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

143. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to federally mandated programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

144. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to Rights of Hawaii's; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

145. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Hawaiian Home Lands Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

146. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal trust obligations to native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

147. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to violence against women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWDER:

H.R. 2194. A bill for the relief of Merrill Lannen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Ariel*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2196. A bill for the relief of John W. Ruth, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 2197. A bill for the relief of Gorsha Michaelovich Sur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 178. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 2196) for the relief of John W. Ruth, Sr., to the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Ms. CANTWELL.

H.R. 11: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 18: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 21: Mr. PICKETT, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 27: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 59: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 65: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 115: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 123: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.R. 124: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 163: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 212: Mr. MICA, Mr. KIM, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 214: Mr. PETRI, Mr. CRANE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 242: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 280: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 299: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 303: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. LOWEY.

H.R. 322: Mr. STARK, Mr. REED, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 325: Mr. TANNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HANCOCK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 349: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 393: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 429: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 466: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 468: Ms. THURMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 501: Mr. KLINK and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 521: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 522: Mr. VENTO and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 561: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KYL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 591: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SABO, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 643: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GILCHREST, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 647: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 649: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 688: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 710: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 715: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 723: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 726: Ms. MEEK.

H.R. 799: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 806: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 827: Mr. WELDON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. KING, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KYL, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 840: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 847: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 962: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHAEFER, MR. MARTINEZ, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HORN, and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 963: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 967: Ms. THURMAN and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 977: Mr. PENNY and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1009: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1017: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1026: Ms. LOWEY and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1036: Mr. KING, Mr. EVANS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1080: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1086: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1088: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. KLUG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KREIDLER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1151: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FISH, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1172: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HILLIARD, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1173: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1174: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1181: Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1200: Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1214: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1231: Mr. FISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1270: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1278: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1295: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1309: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1312: Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. MCMILLAN.

H.R. 1431: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. MALONEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1442: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1455: Mr. FISH, Mr. STARK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1464: Mr. WATT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1470: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1504: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1517: Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1526: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1538: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MEEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1539: Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1559: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PARKER, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1563: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1566: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1580: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1600: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.R. 1638: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

H.R. 1670: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1687: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1697: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1709: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SPENCE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1738: Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 1744: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COLEMAN, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1747: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1761: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1762: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1763: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1764: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1766: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1768: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1769: Mr. CLINGER and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1772: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1773: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1774: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1778: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 1783: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 1793: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1794: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1800: Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 1840: Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KING, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1865: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1883: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1890: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. LONG, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1900: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 1944: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1950: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KING, Mr. PAXON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 1957: Mr. PENNY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1966: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 7) 50

H.R. 1967: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1969: Mr. SYNAR and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1970: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1986: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1987: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1996: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1999: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 2010: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YATES, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FROST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KOPETSKI, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2025: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2113: Mr. KIM, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2127: Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. START, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. HUTTO.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. DE LUGO.

H.J. Res. 75: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. PETE GEREN, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. BARLOW Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHENK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COX, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. FOWLER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EWING, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KASICH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. LEVY, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 139: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.J. Res. 162: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. QUINN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.J. Res. 166: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 193: Mr. PARKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. MANN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CARR, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VALENTINE, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DARDEN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. MEEK, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. REED, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. SPENCE.

H. Res. 22: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 38: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Res. 99: Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 100: Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 127: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H. Res. 135: Ms. LONG.

H. Res. 165: Mr. HYDE, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. ZIMMER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1914: Mr. GRAMS.