

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 8, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

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

May Your Spirit, O gracious God, that encourages and inspires toward good and noble deeds, be with us this day. May our hearts and minds be open to the gifts of the Spirit that move us from any selfishness or personal gain and kindle in us the desire to help others and promote actions that bring people together in the spirit of unity and common purpose. O loving God, who has made us one people and breathed into every person the spirit of unity and harmony, give us respect one for another so we will be the people You would have us be. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until later this afternoon.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GLICKMAN 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

1. Received at 10:06 a.m. on Friday, May 28, 1993 that the Senate passed without amendment: H.R. 2128; H.J. Res. 135 and H.J. Res. 78.

2. Received at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, May 28, 1993 that the Senate agreed to the Conference Report on S. 1 and passed without amendment H.R. 1313.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions on Tuesday, June 1, 1993:

H.R. 1313, to amend the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 with respect to joint ventures entered into for the purpose of providing a product, process, or service;

H.R. 2128, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for refugee assistance for fiscal years 1993 and 1994;

H.J. Res. 78, designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as "Emergency Medical Services Week;"

H.J. Res. 135, to designate the months of May 1993 and May 1994 as "National Trauma Awareness Month;" and

S. 1, to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of following title:

H.R. 890. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to improve the procedures for treating unclaimed insured deposits, and for other purposes.

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

S. 50. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

S. 183. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Richard "Red" Skelton, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to the public.

S. 216. An act to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games.

S. 685. An act to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.

S. 779. An act to continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week.

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week."

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to designate July 5, 1993, through July 12, 1993, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to designate July 1, 1993, as "National NYSP Day."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 103-13, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, announces the appointment, effective May 24, 1993, of—as voting members: Charles "Chip" M. Barclay, Robert F. Daniell, and Felix Rohatyn; as nonvoting members: Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. EXON, and Mrs. MURRAY; to serve on the National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader, announces the appointment of James L. Burgess of Kansas, to a 1-year term to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

SHOW RESPECT FOR OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post reported that an Air Force general is being investigated on charges he ridiculed President Clinton with very disparaging remarks at a banquet for Air Force personnel in the Netherlands. If the allegations are true, they would constitute a very serious violation of military law.

At the same time, the ridicule being tossed the President's way, especially by folks such as Rush Limbaugh and Ross Perot seem endless. This nasty rhetoric grows uglier by the day.

The lack of respect shown the President is worse than disgusting. It is also dangerous to the political integrity of this country. A President, even one who has made some mistakes, should count on being treated decently by Americans, even by those who disagree with his policies.

As the Wichita Eagle, my hometown paper, reported yesterday:

A President's proposals and blunders may be fair game for comment and criticism, but that comment and criticism should stop short of undermining the presidency as an institution.

We all have a stake in seeing President Clinton succeed. It is in everyone's interest, from Ross Perot to Rush Limbaugh to senior U.S. military leaders, that he succeed.

Showing respect for the Presidency, while preserving our right to criticize his policies, will help him do a better job, and will help America preserve the institution of the Presidency.

IF YOU DON'T WANT TO STUMBLE, DON'T WALK BACKWARD

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Democrat spin doctor James Carville tried to explain why his patient is on life-support. He told a South Carolina audience: "Remember this when they say the President stumbles: If You Never Want to Stumble, Stand Still."

Well, I have an even better prescription for the administration: If you don't want to stumble, don't walk backward. I say to my colleagues that standing still would be an improvement for this administration.

To paraphrase Lincoln, this administration has made it standard practice to put its hindquarters where its headquarters ought to be. As a result, they back into one problem after another. They increase spending when they should be decreasing it. They increase taxes when they should be cutting the deficit.

The White House should remember one thing: You don't have to spin the truth. If you just say what you will do and then you will just do what you say, you don't have to forever be backing up.

RANK AND FILE DEMOCRATS NOT TO BE RUBBERSTAMPS ANYMORE

(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, last week, the Pentagon set up competitive bids to select five new payroll centers. There were five winners: Indianapolis, IN; Jackson, MS; Southbridge, MA; Cleveland, OH; and Youngstown, OH. In fact, my community, Youngstown, OH, had the No. 1 proposal, \$600 million.

Candidate Clinton said, knowing that we lost 100,000 jobs in northeast Ohio and western Pennsylvania, if we were in the top five, he would personally take care of it.

Mr. Speaker, the election is over, and once again the Democrat Party has turned its back on loyal Democrats responsible for putting Bill Clinton in the White House. This is a shame. If the Democrat Party wants to talk about loyalty, the Democrat Party should look in the mirror.

Mr. Clinton promised, we delivered, and, by God, we are not going to be rubberstamps anymore.

WHERE ARE THE DEMOCRATS NOW?

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, where are the Democrats now? I well remember back in 1991, when HARRIS WOFFORD won a special election for the U.S. Sen-

ate. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of whom could not even spell Pennsylvania the day before, fell all over themselves trying to interpret the results of Pennsylvania's election. There was a stampede to the podium, as the Democrats sang a funeral dirge for President Bush.

Our friend from Connecticut said that "the people of Pennsylvania delivered a powerful message" to President Bush. Our friend from Florida said that the election meant that "this administration has failed." The senior Senator from Massachusetts said that this election meant that "George Bush may prefer to run from the issues, but the American people will no longer let him hide." The Senator from South Dakota said that Mr. WOFFORD won because he stood up for those Americans that have been ignored by Presidents Reagan and Bush.

Well my friends, this Saturday KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON beat BOB KRUEGER by margins that made WOFFORD-Thornburgh look like a squeaker. Pick a verb—she whipped him, she clobbered him, she cleaned his clock. And her message was simple: Bill Clinton's tax hikes stink. And the people of Texas couldn't agree more. The fact of the matter is this: People have had it up to here with the Clinton tax increases and big Government spending schemes.

Republicans won counties we have never won before, some by more than 60 points. Sixty points, my friends.

So where are all those Democrat pundits now? Funny thing, but they don't seem quite so eager to interpret Saturday's slaughter. They have a President with approval numbers in the toilet, and they just lost a Senate seat they have held since the beginning of time. If I were them, I would be keeping quiet too.

□ 1210

PASS THE BRADY BILL

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am not a great believer in polls, but I believe that this one that I am about to describe is important.

The Harris Poll conducted in April, the first few days of April, of 1,250 respondents illustrates that 52 percent of the people support a ban on handgun sales. That is an outright ban, something I myself do not support. But, that shows my colleagues what has been called the sea change in American thinking about handguns.

Eighty-nine percent of the people support the Brady bill, the 5-day waiting period, before a handgun can be sold, and 68 percent of the people, who identified themselves as members of the National Rifle Association, also support a waiting period.

Later this afternoon, I will meet in my office with the Casey family from Louisville, KY, who lost their son, brother and husband, John Patrick Casey, in 1990, from a handgun incident. They are here, as many people are from around the country, to encourage Congress to pass the Brady bill. Each House passed a bill last Congress though none reached President Bush's desk.

The Brady bill alone, a handgun waiting period, will not solve the crime problem in America. But it will, along with enforcement and sanctions and more police, help to solve the problem. So let us, before this year passes, let us enact the Brady bill into law.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

TO PRESIDENT CLINTON: A MESSAGE FROM TEXAS

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, far more reliable than polls are elections, and this Saturday in Texas there was an election. And voters in Texas sent this message to President Clinton in that election: Stop the taxing, cut the spending, scrap your deficit-busting budget plan.

The landslide election of a new Republican Senator from Texas represents a resounding repudiation of Clintonomics. If the President is serious about being a new Democrat, he should heed this message.

Until the President and the Democrat majority in Congress agree to abandon the tax increase and deficit-busting budget bill adopted in this House this month, the Clinton administration is doomed to failure.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers in Texas have sent an urgent message to Washington. For the sake of every American taxpayer, I hope the President is listening.

IMMIGRATION POLICY ON CHINA

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the horrifying pictures that we see nightly on television absolutely must be stopped. It is time for this administration to repeal the Reagan-Bush proposal that allows every single Chinese to be able to come into this country only by pleading that China's population policy is much too repressive on them.

What has happened is those people are being exploited by very awful, terrible folks trying to make millions of dollars off of them and sending them over here in a new form of bondage.

This absolutely must stop. It must stop as soon as possible, and it is a great tragedy that the immigration policy got that far out of control.

LOYALTY TO THE NATION

(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, we read in press reports that 11 chairmen of Democratic subcommittees will face removal from their positions because they dared to place loyalty to this Nation and their districts above loyalty to the Democratic Party.

As a freshman Member of Congress, who depends on Republican leadership for important committee assignments, I must tell you I have not always voted the way my leadership has voted. Yet, rather than being punished for my votes, last week I received a second major committee assignment. I am not alone. No Republican Member has been punished because of choosing personal conviction over party loyalty, because thinking was chosen over following a flawed program, and, because loyalty to this great Nation was chosen over blind loyalty to a tax program which would hurt poor and middle-class wage earners.

Mr. Speaker, I love the job of representing my district in this great House. But, this is not the President's House, it is not the Democrat's House and it is not the Republican's House. This is the people's House and if anyone ever demands that I place party loyalty over personal convictions and loyalty to this Nation—it will be time for that someone to go home.

A VICTORY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN BE PROUD OF

(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, I rise today with confidence and eager anticipation of victory. Tomorrow night, the Chicago Bulls will win their first game in a series with the Phoenix Suns that will lead to the 1993 National Basketball Association Championship. When the Chicago Bulls do their threepoint my city will be proud and victorious.

When the Senate passes President Clinton's deficit-busting plan that will get our national economy moving again the American people will win.

Nearly \$500 billion will be locked-in for deficit reduction and fairness will be restored to the Tax Code. Job oppor-

tunities will be expanded for struggling Americans through highway construction, mass transit, empowerment zones, and job training programs. Our children will finally receive the investments that they deserve through child immunizations, direct student lending, Head Start and the earned income tax credit.

Business leaders and not-for-profit groups throughout the country are rooting for passage of the Clinton economic plan. Together, as an all-American team, we can win victory in the Senate, and deliver to the American people the sweet victory they can be proud of.

THE MESSAGE OF THE TEXAS SENATE ELECTION

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the Texas election sent a basic message throughout America: Cut spending, no new taxes.

Mr. President, we need to get back to the mainstream. The appointment of David Gergen is a step in the right direction, but you have hundreds of more appointments to fill. You have a chance to build a consensus mainstream administration that reflects the diversity and the variety of interests in this country.

I must say, I am surprised, when I read that the Democratic Party, in this Chamber, is thinking of sanctioning the various subcommittee chairmen that voted against the budget resolution, which meant taxes first, spending cuts last.

Come on over to this side of the aisle. The air is free. There are not sanctions. My colleagues will have an opportunity to vote their conscience, vote with their constituency and vote with America.

DENNY'S/TW SERVICE RACIAL POLICY

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern and indignation over continued allegations of patterns and practices of racial discrimination at Denny's restaurants.

The Denny's chain, a subsidiary of TW Services, Inc., is headquartered in South Carolina and its CEO is Jerry Richardson, a former National Football League player currently seeking ownership of an NFL franchise.

Mr. Speaker, I am—like many other Americans—an NFL fan and supporter. But these allegations raise serious concerns about the commitment to racial fairness and equal opportunity within a possible NFL operation.

An NFL franchise generates millions of dollars of revenue and represents unlimited economic potential and prestige for the States, cities, and communities where they are located.

But such franchises also wield significant influence in those localities, and numerous statistics highlight the current lack of minorities in management and ownership positions in all professional sports.

In light of these statistics and the high number of minority athletes on NFL teams, it is critical that the ownership and management of any NFL franchise demonstrate unwavering commitment to racial tolerance and fundamental fairness before being awarded an NFL franchise.

□ 1220

PRESIDENT CLINTON SHOULD NOT UNDERESTIMATE THE ANGER OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, the American people are watching Washington very closely and they do not like what they see. That is why President Clinton's latest approval rating hovers around 37 percent. That is why voters in Texas last week elected, by a landslide, a new Republican Senator.

The President would be wise to take a step back and reevaluate his tax and spend philosophy. The taxpayers do not like it.

They want spending cuts now. Not promises of spending cuts later.

They want tax fairness. Not energy taxes. Not Social Security taxes.

They want Government reform. Not business as usual.

If President Clinton wants to change his course, we, Republicans, are here to help. We are willing to help him write a plan with real spending cuts. Without tax increases.

Madam Speaker, whenever, you and your President are ready, just give us a call.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Environmental Remediation Tax Credit Act of 1993. This legislation offers hope to cities and towns across this country grappling with the problem of contaminated former industrial sites.

The legislation, through tax credits and tax-exempt financing, offers substantial incentives to private investors

to acquire, clean up, and redevelop sites for commercial uses.

As manufacturing moved out of the cities, factories left behind environmental contamination which has proven costly to clean up. At thousands of sites across the country, the cost of cleaning up the contamination effectively deters potential businesses from locating at such sites. As a result, neighborhoods deteriorate, and jobs are lost.

This legislation offers the first real hope of restoring contaminated properties to productive use.

Enactment of this legislation not only will benefit our environment, but will benefit the surrounding community with renewed economic opportunities, and a restored sense of hope.

I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

NLRB RULINGS THREATEN LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Speaker, last Thursday the National Labor Relations Board ruled that seven labor-management cooperation teams at the du Pont Co. were illegal under the National Labor Relations Act.

This is the second Board decision in 6 months threatening the legal viability of all labor-management cooperation programs nationwide. In December 1992, the Board ruled that similar cooperation teams at Electromation, Inc., were also illegal.

Over the past several years more than 30,000 American companies have made employee participation programs a cornerstone of efforts to increase efficiency and productivity by giving workers a new and enhanced status in the companies that employ them. In key sectors of the U.S. economy—chemicals, autos, electronics—employee participation programs have been a vital ingredient in the prescription for renewed competitiveness and job security. If these programs are going to have an opportunity to develop and grow, legislation to amend the NLRA is essential.

What is Congress' response? Rather than legislating to promote cooperation in the workplace, the House is instead preparing to once again pass legislation—the so-called Workplace Fairness Act—which will encourage conflict and labor strikes. If the American people need one perfect indicator of just how far off on the wrong track the leadership in Congress is, this is it.

SYRACUSE TAKES NATIONAL LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIP IN HEART-STOPPER

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to rise today and offer warm congratulations to the 1993 Division I national champion lacrosse team from Syracuse University. This exciting team, coached by Roy Simmons, Jr., achieved a heart-stopping victory on May 31, with just 8 seconds to go over the North Carolina Tarheels by a 13 to 12 score.

These 2 great teams matched shots before over 20,000 fans throughout the afternoon at Byrd Stadium on the University of Maryland campus. For the fourth time in 6 years, the Orangemen of S.U. won the Division I national championship.

To every member of this championship team—coaches, players, and assistants—you have made your many followers and friends extremely proud. You fought your way back through a tough schedule and won. That is what great teams and champions are made of—the willingness to win no matter what the odds. All of central New York, the Cradle of Lacrosse, is extremely proud today.

TERM LIMITS SEEN AS CRUCIAL IN CAMPAIGN REFORM DEBATE

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, as we gear up for an inevitably contentious debate over campaign reform, the American people have already weighed heavily in with their preference: Term limits. In every State where voters were allowed to register their opinion, term limits passed easily. In Florida, three of four voters supported this fundamental reform.

In today's polls, term limits are favored by 75 percent of Americans who want to bring some accountability to the entrenched establishment in Congress.

The big question is will Congress lead, follow, or get out of the way. Will the leadership in Congress allow debate and a vote on what is unquestionably the most popular grassroots reform measure in America?

Unfortunately, the power of a few in the House can thwart the wishes of millions. So while millions of voters in 15 States expressed their support for term limits last November, the disconnect with official Washington continues. Madam Speaker, the Speaker and other powerful elements of the majority leadership have signaled opposition to term limits, but I hope they will not continue to obstruct the majority of Americans who want us to debate and vote on this issue.

If Congress is to regain its credibility, it has to deliver campaign reform that does more than put another hand

in the people's pockets. Allowing a full and fair debate over term limits would be a good start.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION: THE TOLL MOUNTS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, the freighter laden with illegal aliens that ran aground off Rockaway Beach in New York City is but the most recent signal that our immigration policy is desperately in need of repair. This ship was one of a growing number of foreign vessels that have begun to ply their highly lucrative illegal trade. Loading up their human cargo in coastal provinces of southern China, this ship offered 300 or more Chinese the hope of reaching America, with each passenger paying up to \$30,000 to be smuggled into the United States. Instead, at least eight of the illegal aliens drowned while swimming for shore, and the remainder will be held in custody until their asylum review is completed.

What we are seeing is the manipulation of U.S. immigration law on a grand scale. It has become big business. At our international airports and in our harbors, tens of thousands of illegal aliens are being smuggled into the country annually. The ship that ran aground in New York City is the 24th vessel that has been intercepted since August 1991. And for every ship that we catch, others manage to slip through. According to the INS and FBI, organized crime has become heavily involved in the smuggling of illegal aliens. Indeed, the head of the INS in New York recently said that: "While we will ensure protection to bona fide political refugees, we will not permit criminal syndicates to flaunt our immigration laws by bringing economic migrants here illegally."

Unfortunately, because of a gaping loophole in U.S. immigrating policy, this strong warning rings hollow. All an alien has to do is reach U.S. soil and demand political asylum. No matter how patently fraudulent the claim might be, all an alien has to do is utter the words political asylum. Then the illegal aliens cannot be deported. They must go through a lengthy review process that can take several years. And most of those who start on the political asylum review process simply disappear before their case is adjudicated.

Madam Speaker, our immigration policies have become the laughing stock of the international criminal world. As this Member has urged before from the well of this House, it is time to give our INS officers the power of summary exclusion. Our INS officers are begging to be given summary exclusion powers. It is well past time for

the Judiciary Committee to act on these summary exclusion provisions of the law, and to restore integrity to the notion of political asylum.

This Member strongly urges the adoption of the McCollum Immigration Reform Act, H.R. 1355. This is not a partisan issue. It is an American issue and a crisis situation. I ask my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to ignore the self-serving arguments of the greedy private immigration lawyers who resist any effectual reform, and to get down to business and give the INS the law they demand.

AMERICANS UNDERSTAND PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, it appears that President Clinton believes genuinely that if he could just sit down with each American in his or her own living room and explain his economic program to them that they would understand it. And at that point they would embrace it and say, "Mr. President, you're right. This is exactly what we should be doing for America. This is the right thing."

In fact, that is the whole problem. What the President does not understand is that this message is getting through loud and clear. It was not so clear on February 17 when the message was first imparted to the American people. But it is more and more clear on a daily basis. And we have seen that his approval rating has gone in direct inverse proportion to the amount of understanding that the American people have with respect to this economic program.

Madam Speaker, we have 3½ more years of this administration, and I urge the President to stop selling and start listening, because what would happen if he had the opportunity to sit down with each and every American in his or her own living room is that those people would say to him: "Mr. President, you are persuasive, you are articulate, you are attractive, you are intelligent, your thought is penetrating. But we don't want what you are selling. Please, Mr. President, cut spending first, then talk to us about a new tax program."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RULES COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, AMENDING NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AND RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, this is to notify Members of the House regarding the Rules Committee's plans for H.R. 5, legislation to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimi-

nation based on participation in labor disputes. The committee is planning to meet the week of June 14 to take testimony and grant a rule on the bill.

In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 5 should submit, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 5 p.m. on Friday, June 11, 1993.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 5.

THE SERVICE-LEARNING ACT

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

Mr. KLINK. Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of excitement in recent weeks about education reform and national service.

Today, I am introducing legislation that combines the two.

The Service-Learning Act will encourage local schools to use existing funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to infuse the service-learning approach into the entire school curriculum.

Service-learning is based on the idea that students learn best by doing, by being active, and engaged in the process of learning. Active learning through community service, especially if it is curriculum based, improves student achievement by making classroom learning more meaningful. And, it can reengage students turned off by traditional teaching methods.

The Service Learning Act will inspire and support innovative school curriculum reforms that combine classroom teaching with hands-on work experience. It will broaden classroom walls to include the entire community and enable new and veteran teachers alike to take advantage of teaching methods that promote both academics and civic responsibility. It also authorizes a special program of grants to local school districts for service learning programs that emphasize teacher training, especially in cooperation with local non-profit groups and other programs supported by the Commission on National and Community Service.

Many schools across the country are integrating community service and academic subjects with great success. In Pennsylvania, the statewide PennSERVE program is working to bring a culture of service into the schools.

The Service-Learning Act will help reinvent schools, train teachers, and challenge students.

I encourage you to join me as a co-sponsor of this legislation.

PUNISHING THE DISSENTERS

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

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, we have just learned later this week the Democratic Caucus will meet to decide the fate of eleven Democratic subcommittee chairmen who voted against the largest tax increase in history.

Some of the more rabid tax raisers of the majority party want to punish these Members who did not want to raise taxes as quickly as President Clinton would like to do.

At times like this, all I can say is I am glad to be a Republican.

Over on this side of the aisle, we do not punish Members who vote against the largest tax increase in history. We cheer them.

We do not punish Members who think Government spends too much money. We agree with them.

We do not punish Members who think Bill Clinton has been following bad advice. We join them.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we Republicans may not have a majority in the House or the Senate, but we do have this: The freedom to do what is right for the American people. And in the end, that is the only thing that matters.

MAY 27, 1993—A DAY OF INFAMY

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Madam Speaker, on May 27, 1993, the U.S. Congress passed into law the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. On that same date, the Governor of the State of Missouri, Mel Carnahan, signed into law the largest tax increase in the State of Missouri.

I have decided that May 27, 1993, may go down in history as the Day of Infamy, rather than December 7, 1941.

It is easier to bring a country down financially than it is to beat it militarily. The citizens of this country cannot continue to pay the amount of taxation for the bloated Government that we now have. We are going to have to return this Government and this country back to the people. That is who it belongs to. It does not belong to the U.S. Congress or to the various State legislators.

TEXANS VOTE 2-TO-1 AGAINST MORE TAXES

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

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, last Saturday, the people of Texas, by a margin of 2-to-1, elected a new Republican Senator, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON.

By a margin of 2-to-1, the people of Texas rejected the Democrat tax increase.

By a margin of 2-to-1, the people of Texas rejected Democrat spending increases and efforts by the Democrats to grow the Government first.

Madam Speaker, the people of Texas said, "Hasta la vista, Baby."

DISCIPLINING DEMOCRAT DISSENTERS

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, there is a lot of talk that the Democrats tomorrow may seek to discipline some of the Members of their party who voted against the biggest tax increase in history.

My guess is that that caucus might also want to discuss what is happening now as the process moves forward, because several Members were pressured against what they knew to be the wishes of their district to vote for that biggest tax increase in history, only to find out now that they are to be the only ones who voted for the massive Btu tax.

It appears as though as this moves through the process that the Btu tax may be eliminated or at least scaled back, and the only Members who will have voted for this massive tax increase that will destroy business, destroy jobs, and do all kinds of bad things to the economy, will be some of the Democrats who were told that if they voted for it here, it certainly would not be changed as it moved on.

□ 1240

Well, now, we know different. It is going to be changed, and only they will be left holding the bag.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken later today.

ADJUSTING STATUS OF EXISTING POSITION ON CAPITOL POLICE FOR DUTY WITH RESPECT TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 167) adjusting the status of an existing position on the Capitol Police for duty with respect to the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 167

Resolved, That there is established one additional position of lieutenant on the Capitol Police for duty with respect to the House of Representatives, to serve as agency training representative for the Capitol Police. Each appointment to the position shall be made—

(1) by the Capitol Police Board from among members and officers of the Capitol Police, with prior approval of the Committee on House Administration; and

(2) without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) The position of agency training representative, as established by the first section of House Resolution 320, is abolished.

(2) The former position of an officer or member serving as agency training representative, as referred to in section 2 of the House Resolution 320, is abolished.

(b) The resolution referred to in subsection (a) is House Resolution 320, Ninety-ninth Congress, agreed to November 14, 1985, as enacted into permanent law by section 102 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1987 (as incorporated by reference in section 101(j) of Public Law 99-500 and section 101(j) of Public Law 99-591 (40 U.S.C. 206 note)).

SEC. 3. Until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such sums as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 167 will permanently adjust the status of an existing lieutenant position on the Capitol Police to be used as the Capitol Police's representative at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, GA.

In 1984, former Capitol Police Chief James Carvino recommended that the U.S. Capitol Police training representative assigned at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, carry the rank of lieutenant to ensure parity and stature with other agency representatives at the center. This recommendation resulted in the enactment of House Resolution 320 in November 1985.

In accordance with House Resolution 320, the sergeant who was then assigned as the training representative, was subsequently appointed to a lieutenant position. That individual entered Civil Service retirement on March 1, 1993, necessitating a replacement in the vacated training representative's position.

This position requires an individual with the stature and knowledge of a lieutenant. The police board desires to limit assignment to the position to those who have attained the rank of lieutenant through a competitive, promotional process, and the adoption of

House Resolution 167 will accomplish this objective.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is uncontroversial and would simply elevate the status of the U.S. Capitol Police liaison so as to be comparable to those from other Federal agencies. Since the officer currently holding this position is already being paid as a lieutenant, there are no additional costs associated with this measure. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. THURMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 167.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 167, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 204(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3015(f)), I hereby transmit the Annual Report for 1992 of the Federal Council on the Aging. The report reflects the Council's views in its role of examining programs serving older Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 1993.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair de-

clares a recess until approximately 1:50 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1350

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 144, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—240

Ackerman	Deal	Hilliard
Andrews (ME)	DeLauro	Hinchey
Andrews (NJ)	Dellums	Hoagland
Andrews (TX)	Derrick	Hochbrueckner
Applegate	Deutsch	Hoke
Archer	Dicks	Holden
Bacchus (FL)	Dingell	Houghton
Baesler	Dixon	Hoyer
Barcia	Dooley	Hughes
Barlow	Durbin	Hutto
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (CA)	Inslee
Bateman	Edwards (TX)	Jefferson
Becerra	English (AZ)	Johnson (GA)
Bellenson	English (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Berman	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Bevill	Evans	Johnston
Bilbray	Fazio	Kanjorski
Blackwell	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Bonior	Filner	Kasich
Borski	Fish	Kennelly
Boucher	Flake	Kildee
Brewster	Ford (MI)	Klecza
Brooks	Frank (MA)	Klein
Brown (OH)	Frost	Klink
Bryant	Furse	Kreidler
Byrne	Gallo	Lambert
Cantwell	Gejdenson	Lancaster
Cardin	Gephardt	Lantos
Carr	Geren	LaRocco
Chapman	Gibbons	Laughlin
Clayton	Gillmor	Lazio
Clement	Gilman	Lehman
Clyburn	Glickman	Levin
Coleman	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Collins (IL)	Gordon	Lipinski
Collins (MI)	Green	Lloyd
Combest	Gutierrez	Long
Cooper	Hall (OH)	Lowey
Coppersmith	Hall (TX)	Maloney
Costello	Hamburg	Mann
Coyne	Hamilton	Manton
Cramer	Harman	Margolies-
Danner	Hastings	Mezvinsky
Darden	Hayes	Markey
de la Garza	Hefner	Martinez

Matsui	Pelosi	Spratt
Mazzoli	Peterson (FL)	Stark
McCloskey	Pickett	Stenholm
McCrery	Pickle	Stokes
McCurdy	Pombo	Strickland
McDermott	Pomeroy	Studds
McHale	Poshard	Stupak
McInnis	Rahall	Swett
McKinney	Reed	Swift
McNulty	Reynolds	Synar
Meehan	Richardson	Tauzin
Meek	Roemer	Tejeda
Mfume	Rohrabacher	Thompson
Miller (CA)	Rose	Thornton
Miller (FL)	Rostenkowski	Thurman
Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Minge	Rush	Torricelli
Moakley	Sabo	Towns
Montgomery	Sanders	Trafficant
Moran	Sangmeister	Unsold
Murtha	Sarpalius	Valentine
Myers	Sawyer	Velazquez
Nadler	Schenk	Vento
Natcher	Schumer	Visclosky
Neal (MA)	Scott	Washington
Neal (NC)	Serrano	Waters
Obey	Sharp	Watt
Oliver	Shepherd	Waxman
Ortiz	Sisisky	Wheat
Orton	Skaggs	Wilson
Packard	Skelton	Woolsey
Pallone	Slattery	Wyden
Parker	Slaughter	Wynn
Pastor	Smith (IA)	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Smith (NJ)	
Payne (VA)	Snowe	

NAYS—144

Allard	Goss	Oxley
Armey	Grams	Paxon
Bachus (AL)	Grandy	Petri
Baker (CA)	Greenwood	Porter
Baker (LA)	Gunderson	Portman
Ballenger	Hancock	Pryce (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Quillen
Barton	Hastert	Quinn
Bentley	Hefley	Ramstad
Bereuter	Herger	Ravenel
Bliley	Hobson	Regula
Blute	Hoekstra	Ridge
Boehert	Horn	Roberts
Boehner	Hunter	Rogers
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hyde	Roth
Burton	Istook	Royce
Buyer	Jacobs	Santorum
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Camp	Kim	Schiff
Canady	King	Schroeder
Castle	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Clay	Klug	Shaw
Coble	Knollenberg	Shays
Collins (GA)	Kolbe	Shuster
Cox	Kyl	Skeen
Crane	Leach	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Levy	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Stump
Dickey	Livingston	Sundquist
Dornan	Machtley	Talent
Dreier	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	McCandless	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Everett	McKeon	Torkildsen
Fawell	McMillan	Upton
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Vucanovich
Fingerhut	Mica	Walker
Franks (CT)	Michel	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	Molinaro	Weldon
Gallegly	Moorhead	Wolf
Gekas	Morella	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Murphy	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Nussle	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—47

Abercrombie	Browder	Condit
Bartlett	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Billrakis	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop	Clinger	Doolittle

Engel	LaFalce	Roukema
Foglietta	Lightfoot	Rowland
Ford (TN)	McCollum	Spence
Fowler	Menendez	Stearns
Gingrich	Mink	Tanner
Goodling	Mollohan	Tucker
Henry	Oberstar	Volkmer
Huffington	Owens	Whitten
Inglis	Penny	Williams
Inhofe	Peterson (MN)	Wise
Kennedy	Price (NC)	Zeliff
Kopetski	Rangel	

□ 1417

Mr. RICHARDSON changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, because of a family commitment off the Hill, I was not present for rollcall No. 200, on the approval of the Journal. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 200, I was on official business in Georgia regarding the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on this measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present on Tuesday, June 8, 1993, to vote on rollcall vote No. 200. I was attending to a family member who was preparing for surgery.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith the original copy of the official results received from the Secretary of State, State of Wisconsin, indicating that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on May 4, 1993 the Honorable Peter W. Barca was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District, State of Wisconsin.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

To the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives:

I, Kevin J. Kennedy, Executive Director of the Elections Board of the State of Wisconsin, certify that the following person was elected to the office of Representative in Congress by the qualified electors from the First Congressional District of the State of

Wisconsin, for the unexpired term of two years, beginning on January 3, 1993, and ending on January 3, 1995, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Les Aspin, as shown on the official canvas of the votes cast at the Special Election held on May 4, 1993. Congressional District: First District. Elected: Peter W. Barca. Done in the City of Madison, this 1st day of June, 1993.

KEVIN J. KENNEDY,
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE PETER W. BARCA OF WISCONSIN AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from the First District of Wisconsin, the Honorable PETER W. BARCA, come forward escorted by members of the Wisconsin delegation?

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

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

□ 1420

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the House of Representatives.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE PETER W. BARCA

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to introduce to the House the gentleman who has just been sworn in, Mr. PETER BARCA, who is the new Representative from Wisconsin's First Congressional District, succeeding our good friend, now Secretary of Defense Les Aspin.

PETER BARCA was first elected to the State assembly in 1984 and served as chair of the Democratic caucus in the State assembly.

He served as chair of the employment and training committee.

During his service in the legislature he was also cochair of the joint committee on audit.

He also served as a member of the assembly rules committee.

Before being elected to the State assembly in 1984, PETER BARCA taught emotionally disturbed children, and was an employment specialist for people with disabilities.

He attended the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, earning a bachelor of science degree in education in 1977, and a joint master of arts in edu-

cational administration and public policy administration from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1982.

He also attended the graduate school at Harvard University where he studied at the Kennedy School of Government.

He is a native of Kenosha, born on August 7, 1955.

He is married and he and his wife, Kathleen, have two children. She is the coordinator of special education for the department of special education for the Kenosha Unified School District No. 1.

It gives the Wisconsin delegation great pleasure to welcome PETER to this House for what we are sure will be a long career of distinguished service.

IN APPRECIATION TO FRIENDS AND CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. BARCA. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be joining the U.S. Congress where so many distinguished Members, both past and present, have served our country.

First of all, I would like to thank the citizens of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin for giving me this tremendous opportunity to serve my district and to serve our great country.

I would especially like to thank so many friends and family members who have flown in to be a part of this ceremony; my wife, Kathleen, and my children, Peter Joseph, and my daughter, Abrianna, are here, as well as my parents, Peter and Joyce Barca and many family members and friends. They have given a great deal of their own time and talents in order to make it possible for me to serve in this distinguished body.

I also believe that I am fortunate to be joining as a Member of the Wisconsin delegation, which I know is very respected in the House, and especially proud to succeed Secretary Les Aspin, who I know served with distinction in this body for over 20 years.

I also feel an enormous sense of responsibility to be from Wisconsin and be true to our State's progressive principles, our pioneering spirit, and our reputation for clean and open government.

Finally, while I know it is a time of great challenges and serious problems, I also think it is one of enormous opportunity.

I want to join Speaker FOLEY and Minority Leader MICHEL and all the Members to work for President Clinton, to seize this period in history to secure a bright future for generations to come and be true to the principles of this great country, the greatest Nation ever known on Earth as the United States of America.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE
PETER W. BARCA

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming our newest Member of the House of Representatives, PETER BARCA, from Wisconsin's First District. PETER BARCA is a man of compassion and conviction, and he brings a fresh voice for the progress we need to make as a Nation—to cut the deficit, make health care affordable, and promote welfare to work programs. PETER will provide an energy and vision for what we can and must accomplish for our schools, our cities, and our economy. He brings from Wisconsin a history of promoting innovative job creation and economic development.

I also welcome PETER as a friend and former colleague from the Wisconsin State Assembly, where we worked together to serve the families, businesses, and communities of Wisconsin. As I look forward to working with him in Congress, I am reminded of his previous efforts in Wisconsin. I shared his frustration with a welfare system that drained our economy and failed to help our poor and unemployed get back on their feet. I witnessed his unwillingness to let it continue down such a path and his efforts toward effective welfare reform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as Wisconsin's former newest Congressman, I welcome PETER to the Wisconsin delegation. I congratulate him and wish him well as he begins, what I am confident will be, a distinguished career representing the people of the First District of Wisconsin.

AMERICANS WANT COOPERATION
IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I was back in my home district during the recent work period, and I hope that all of my colleagues also went home. During that week one message came through to me very clearly: People are mad at Government and at Washington, DC.

This fact is confirmed by a USA Today poll published this morning which shows that a third of the people are more pessimistic now about the direction of this country than they were when President Clinton took office. It is my feeling that the people are mad at both Democrats and Republicans and they are fed up with Government. People are mad about new taxes, people are mad about Government spending and waste, people are mad about over-regulation by the Federal Government, and the Texas election confirms this.

We need to start working together on the economy, on the deficit, and on crime and health care. All the people should be working together or we will be sent packing, and if we do not hear the message, the voters will have every right to do it.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article from USA Today to which I referred:

POST-ELECTION EUPHORIA FADES AS MANY
VOTERS PERCEIVE FEW CHANGES

(By Richard Benedetto)

The public's mood, which was becoming more upbeat after Bill Clinton was elected, is showing signs of heading back to the doldrums just 4½ months into his presidency.

A third of people are more pessimistic now about the direction the nation is heading than when President Clinton took office, according to a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll.

Analysts say mixed signals on the economic recovery and Clinton's battles with Congress over his economic plans have many wondering what, if anything, has changed.

"The voters are very performance-oriented and are still waiting for results," says Emory University political scientist Merle Black.

Among those most gloomy in their outlook are Ross Perot supporters, conservatives and Republicans.

"He hasn't done anything yet," said Republican Vincent Ryan, 75, a retired engineer in Wethersfield, Conn.

Only one person in five is more optimistic. Those most likely to be more optimistic are blacks, liberals and Democrats.

"I feel good about the people in there now," says Democrat Anita Stephens, 38, a pharmacist in Dayton, Ohio. "We can't judge them yet. They've got to get their chance."

Even Clinton's approval among people 18-29—which was at 52% two weeks ago, stronger than any other age group—has plummeted to 39%.

First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton also has seen her favorability rating drop 11 percentage points since late April. And Perot, despite a spate of paid and unpaid TV appearances, saw his support dip by five points since late April.

"Hillary's political identity is still tied to perceptions of her husband's administration, and Perot may have peaked," says Republican pollster William McInturff.

McInturff says the problems Clinton is having getting his economic plan through a Congress controlled by his own Democratic Party are largely a product of his low approval ratings.

If Clinton was at 60% approval, he says, "Congress, which is basically a bully, would cave in."

Perhaps more worrisome to Clinton, confidence in his toughness and ability to the job has slipped badly. Respondents are split 47%-47% on whether Clinton is tough enough. In late April, 65% found him up to the task. Also, 51% now say he can't get things done—up from 40% six weeks ago.

But Democratic pollster Alan Secrest cautions that Democrats up for re-election next year should think long and hard before kicking their president while he's down.

"To some degree the president's failures can become their own," he says. "When you start banging away at a Democratic president, you pay a price in the mood of the electorate."

IN HONOR OF JACK ROBIN, AN
URBAN VISIONARY

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

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize Jack Robin, of Pittsburgh, PA, who is being honored by the city of Pittsburgh for his outstanding contributions to the quality of life in our community.

The city of Pittsburgh will celebrate Jack Robin Day on June 17, 1993, the recognition of Jack Robin's devotion to making Pittsburgh one of America's most livable cities. A native of Pittsburgh, Jack Robin grew up in an industrial city which was all too often hidden behind a cloud of smog. Jack Robin saw beyond the blackened air rising from the area's smoke-stack industries, and envisioned a community of clean air, great tree-filled parks, and pristine views of a sparkling skyline rising along the banks of the three rivers. Jack Robin championed a future for Pittsburgh based on a diversity of pursuits in business, industry, and culture.

The people of Pittsburgh owe a great debt of gratitude to Jack Robin for the outstanding work he did marshaling broad public support for the "Renaissance One" period of Pittsburgh's recent history. Jack Robin orchestrated local negotiations among public officials, business leaders, civic organizations, and interested private citizens, and worked successfully to pass legislation that changed the face of the city.

Pittsburgh is proud of the fact that a native son has been able to make such a significant contribution to the quality of life in our community. We are also proud of the role Jack Robin has played across the country and around the world in promoting urban revitalization. His work in Pittsburgh clearly shows his love of the city and western Pennsylvania, but Jack Robin is also a man of the world. His interests and career has taken him to India and Africa. As Jack Robin has noted, "the broader your knowledge and the broader your outlook, the more rational you become."

Jack Robin is known far beyond Pittsburgh for his ability to approach a challenge with logic and gentle persuasion. He is a person whose advice and leadership have been in constant demand. His extraordinary record of accomplishments include establishing the State of Pennsylvania's first industrial development program and the Regional Industrial Development Corp.; developing the Society Hill and Independence Mall redevelopment projects in Philadelphia; developing the city of Calcutta's plan to improve housing, water supply, and transportation; and negotiating the first interstate Federal compact for the Delaware Basin.

Jack Robin is an individual who has been able to push past obstacles to get great things done. He is a rare individual whose ambition has been to solve problems rather than to secure personal gain. He has shown the he understands that the key to being a great leader is possessing an ability to be both a careful listener as well as a skillful advocate. Jack Robin is such a leader.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Robin has said, "One of the cardinal sins is to have the opportunity

and power to affect things you would like to see happening, then not to do it. If, it is in my power, I act." I believe that each Member of Congress can find inspiration in these words. It is this philosophy of action that has won Jack Robin the gratitude of the city of Pittsburgh. I am grateful that Jack Robin continues to act as a civic leader of great vision, and I look forward to joining with the people of Pittsburgh in celebrating Jack Robin Day on June 17, 1993.

BROTHERS TO THE RESCUE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, ask yourself this question: Is there any prize worth winning, against which you would bet your life and the lives of your wife, your husband, and your children? Add to that bet, the fact that you have a 50-50 chance of losing everything. What could be worth that sort of gamble?

□ 1430

Freedom is the answer given by thousands of Cubans. It is for freedom that they gather up anything that floats. It is for freedom that they lash together innertubes and scraps of wood—with one eye looking for informants ready to betray them. It is for freedom that they push these floating junkpiles into the uncertain sea. It is for freedom that they try to slip past the gunboats; knowing that capture means prison. It is for freedom that they endure days of blistering sun and risk dehydration, madness, and death.

It is estimated that 50 percent of the rafters who push off from the shores of Cuba do not make it. But freedom matters so much to them—the chance to live as free men and women—for their children to grow up free—that they roll the dice with their own lives on the line. Last month Congressmen LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, ROBERT MENENDEZ, BOB DORNAN, CHRIS SMITH, PORTER GOSS, and I talked about the tragic story of the young mother who gave up her own drinking water to save the life of her 9-year-old son and she died as a result of the sacrifice.

To change these odds, a group of heroic pilots take to the skies over the Florida Straits. Since the start of these humanitarian missions, the Brothers to the Rescue have saved over 650 lives.

Their efforts have apparently caught the attention of the Castro dictatorship. Recently a Cuban Mig buzzed a Cessna being flown by the Brothers over international waters. The Mig reportedly circled the small plane some 20 times, at one point coming within 50 feet of the unarmed plane. The Mig then followed the rescue plane back to U.S. airspace.

The number of rafters has been increasing over the past several years.

Thus far this year the U.S. Coast Guard reports more than 600 rafters have arrived this year. This represents a 40-percent increase over the same time last year. At the end of last year, a record 2,553 rafters made it to the United States. With this increase in activity, the resources of the Brothers to the Rescue group are stretched even further.

In one recent mission, the pilots spotted five empty rafts. Two of these rafts were upside down in the water. The pilots persevered and eventually found a raft with four people still alive.

The Brothers are in need of aircraft. Congressmen LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, PETER DEUTSCH, CLAY SHAW, and I are working with the Department of Defense to get surplus aircraft for these volunteer pilots. Specifically, we are asking for four FAO/O-2 Cessna planes. As a private search-and-rescue operation, Brothers to the Rescue rely on the dedication of their pilots and the generosity of private citizens.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, in an event at the White House, I will have the opportunity to hand to President Clinton a letter that I would like to read into the RECORD written by Jose J. Basulto, president of Brothers to the Rescue, Hermanos al Rescate, and it reads as follows:

JUNE 7, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We take this opportunity to address you through Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a close friend and supporter of Brothers to the Rescue, to request your help for a noble human cause.

Our organization operates a small fleet of private planes that are flown by a group of young volunteer international pilots, which includes Cubans and Americans. We fly search missions in the Straits of Florida to locate and report to the U.S. Coast Guard the exact position of the Cuban "balseros" or rafters. Those young men, women and children who are daily fleeing Cuba's climate of oppression in rafts and other unseaworthy crafts are searching for freedom in the United States and by doing so, many are also losing their lives. The available statistical data indicates that three of every four do not succeed in the attempt.

The U.S. Coast Guard has provided in the past, after receiving our call, the means to the rafters' rescue with their boats and helicopters. The Coast Guard's own gallant and personal human commitment has left a lasting image to the Cuban people of what America really is and stands for.

Mr. President, today's front line of U.S. foreign policy to Cuba lies in the Straits of Florida. The Cuban people and the world are now measuring U.S. attitude towards the value of human life at a distance so close to its own shores.

We, the founders of Brothers to the Rescue, former member participants of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs Invasion to Cuba in 1961, are still personally involved in dealing with the consequences of that historic U.S. foreign policy failure. The disastrous results of this policy consolidated Castro in power for all these years. Brothers to the Rescue is doing its share to help the Cuban people during these desperate hours of need.

We respectfully request from you as Commander in Chief, a clear mandate to the U.S. Coast Guard to continue the good work they have done in the past in safeguarding the lives of the Cuban "balseros". A commitment from your office backing up the Coast Guard in its efforts to save lives, and in any actions that it may undertake in assisting our mission, is vital as an assurance of proper compliance of U.S. foreign policy.

We also request your assistance in having the U.S. Coast Guard allocate sufficient resources to the U.S. Coast Guard District Seven, and in particular to their bases in Key West, Marathon and Isla Morada. The added resources will assure that Brothers to the Rescue will not have to spend its own resources in duplicating the tasks that the Coast Guard has proven to do so well.

Thirty two years ago the Cuban people placed their hopes for freedom in the hands of a young American president like yourself. We now entrust you with their lives.

Sincerely,

BROTHERS TO THE RESCUE,
JOSE J. BASULTO,

President.

Madam Speaker, I will hand that to President Clinton and to other key officials tonight at the White House, this letter, and I will also show them the same photos that I would like to show my colleagues here this afternoon, and these are very dramatic photos showing the brave mission of Brothers to the Rescue, and this is some of the operations that they have been involved with.

As my colleagues can see, these are some of the people that they pick up. Sometimes they are on a lonely innertube with no one on board, and these photos tell the tragic story of what might have been for someone who tried this, a desperate search for freedom, to make it to the shores of this great country. But they did not make it. Sometimes, like in this photo, there are almost a dozen people in a makeshift raft.

Madam Speaker, Brothers to the Rescue operates with volunteer planes, with volunteer gasoline, and they are very hard-pressed for equipment, and I will leave these photos with the President this afternoon so he can see the human tragedy that is unfolding in our Florida Straits every day. Thank goodness we have an organization like Brothers to the Rescue that can receive these desperate people as they search for freedom in this great country.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE BARRINGTON PARKER

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I come here today to venerate the life, works and memory of Judge Barrington Parker who died Wednesday, June 2, 1993, at the age of 77. We, as a people, have lost a leader and the legal community a true gentleman committed to justice.

Born and raised in the Washington area his father instilled in him that this is a society where an individual can rise as far and as high as their ability will take them. Judge Parker is a living testament to this. Being born African-American, in 1915, to a man who went from being a bricklayer to an attorney—ignoble ease was not an option for Judge Parker.

As a lifelong Republican appointed by President Nixon to the bench he also established himself as an independent thinker barring the Nixon administration from establishing price controls. He also presided over the trial of John Hinckley and former CIA Director Richard Helms.

It is said that God grants liberty to those that love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it. I hope that after a lifetime of guarding and defending fundamental rights against those that would take them for granted—that in this his hour of rest he has found true liberty.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in order to sum up to this point where we are with respect to the House of Representatives' Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs on the two prime issues. I say prime because they are the ones that have received the publicity through the real, real vital issues go unnoticed even though I have been speaking out on them for several years and, particularly the last 2 years. But I want to strictly speak forth on the case of the BNL Bank, the Italian agency bank in Atlanta, of Banca Nazionale del Lavoro, which I will remind my colleagues again was and has been an Italian Government-owned facility, and that brings to mind something that I want to refer to by way of parentheses which seems to me has escaped not just the general American public's notice or knowledge, but even that of our leaders and our regulators and the banking industry in general.

□ 1440

Most of the banking systems in other countries, whether they are European, German, French, Italian, or even British, are basically Government operated and principally owned and directed. So when we have foreign banking institutions doing business in the United States, we tend to think that they are under the same operational laws as the domestic banks.

Now, on the other hand our megabanks, the biggest banks in our country and up until some 8 years ago the leading or largest banks in the

world, but not so today, when they did go transnational beginning in the late fifties and particularly in the sixties, they then became very much involved in competing in these countries in a way that they could produce as of today, some of them, as much as 48 percent of their profits, not from banking in America, but from the proceeds of their profits in other countries, European countries mainly.

But with the emergence of the European Community and with the European monetary system and its currency known as the ECU, the European currency unit which is pretty much in place now, and which I have forewarned about since 1979, exactly in the month of August in 1979, with that in place now, the American banks are going to have to more and more do what our principal banks and some of those right underneath the level of principal banks are doing, and that is not banking, but speculating.

They are really gambling. In fact, I would have more confidence in Las Vegas professionals than I would in these, and I will refer to that a little bit later.

But when we see the close to \$1 trillion, if not \$1 trillion by now, of this kind of foreign money, if you want to call it that, in our country, circulating through the arterial system of our financial, banking, and other systems, and do not have our main regulators, and in the case of international banking it would have to be the Federal Reserve Board, actually knowing exactly what is going on, because we are the only country in the industrialized world that does not have such things as a screening board or regulatory control of the activities of this huge amount of money.

This is why our committee has recently held and resumed hearings, very important ones, on this so-called, to use a popular word, drug money laundering business.

Just from official gatherings from our law enforcement agencies and other agencies, the official estimate would be that there is more than \$300 billion of this drug money laundering activity. But it is far more than that. I still say and repeat today that it is closer to \$1 trillion, because if you take into account the offshore activities that impact back on our domestic activities, then you have to make allowance for another equally huge amount of money that will circulate through this arterial system known as the American banking and financial system.

Now, given that we also have the most unique deposit insurance system in the world, in fact one that is so corrupt today that I would not call it an insurance system, not when you have about 4 trillion dollars' worth of insured deposits, for which Uncle Sam, my colleagues, you and I and the Gov-

ernment, with the full faith and credit of the Government, guarantee a depositor up to \$100,000 the safety of his deposit.

What was intended as a system that would protect the little homeowner from foreclosure by the bank with his little \$2,000 deposit, that would save that home from being lost because of the negligence and the irresponsibility of the bankers in the twenties, and particularly after the crash in 1929, has turned out to be a corrupted system where the regulators, the Federal Reserve, for instance, at first announced what I call an illegal license to pay out uninsured depositors, depositors that had not \$100,000, but millions of dollars.

Who would they be? The average deposit in our American depository system is not even \$10,000. That is the bulk of them. That is over 92 or 93 percent.

So who are these that would be paid out on their over \$1, \$2, \$3, or \$4 million deposits?

But try to reform it, as I have tried. Even before I became chairman of the committee, and as late as in the last Congress when I had the joinder of the ranking minority leader, who could not get his side to support him in reforming this corrupted deposit insurance system. How can you say that you have a deposit insurance system if you have about \$4 trillion, and maybe more now, of insured deposits just in the commercial banks of this country? And you have a broke, an insolvent, insurance fund?

But is anybody writing about it? Do you see any front page newspaper stories about it? Of course not.

As a matter of fact, to the surprise of my then colleague, the ranking minority member, we had an onslaught of attacks, from the vested interests and the associations, the national banking organizations, like the IBAA and the like, saying how dare we think of trying to reform a deposit insurance system that certainly has not been in keeping with the congressional intent? The Congress has never passed a law saying that it is all right for a regulator or an agency like the Federal Reserve Board to pay out, or the FDIC, more than \$100,000 to depositors.

Where did that come from? It was a decree of fiat announced by the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in 1984 when you had the collapse of the Continental Illinois, which cost the Treasury, or the Fed, whatever you want to call it, \$6 billion. Then it was placed on relief for years.

I could never have convinced my predecessor chairman to have a hearing on the illegality of the regulator insisting on paying out to the uninsured, to those that had in excess of the insured amount set forth by the Congress.

□ 1450

So that is one thing. The BNL, oh, that gets attraction because it hap-

pened to blow up, and it showed the bankrupt policies of our country and our Government, where it would, through the use of these banking facilities known as agency banks, like in Atlanta, able to issue 2, 3, 4, or 5 billion dollars' worth of, what, of bills of credit to foreign countries like Iraq, while those foreign countries, including the Iraqis, know more about the crevices and the holes and the loopholes in our system than our own regulators seem to know or that our Congress has been willing to want to acknowledge in the past.

Now, try to get reform. We have had countless hearings. And unless you have something that blows up like BNL or BCCI, another big stinkaroo, and I wanted to report today to my colleagues that we are still on it. We have not closed it out. In fact, we have not written what I would insist, as chairman, that we have a report.

In fact, I myself do not consider that I, as chairman, feel that the committee has closed out on the S&L debacle of 3 and 4 years ago. We have yet to write wrapup reports, which I think we owe and should give and I intend to give, even if I do it as an individual.

But on BNL, we are still finding out things. We are still getting documentations.

On BCCI, fortunately, in both cases, we did not do what other countries did, such as England, where they gave BCCI, for instance, full banking privileges so you have thousands of Britishers storming the gates of the government in London, demanding that they get their deposits back that they lost with the BCCI.

In the United States, these banks, thank goodness, and it was just a stroke of luck they did not, accepted BCCI through its ownership, whether direct or indirect, of American institutions and banks which were able to do the equivalent except not as bad as in England, where through Maggie Thatcher's deregulations, like our President Reagan's deregulation, you know, the United States and England came together on that. And we had the same results, the scandals and the degradation and the threat to the stability of our system, as in England, where they are still shaking in their boots.

And any time you have these financial institutions that are headquartered in areas in which there is no accountability, no regulation, like Luxembourg or the Cayman Islands or the Bahamas or over in the Indian Ocean or, the first one, the Island of Man near Ireland, that started back in the late 1960's and 1970's. That was the father of them all, where you have these offshore facilities that all they have is a nameplate on the door. And then through this miracle of electronic instantaneous communication, they become corporations of great wealth, I say, malefactors of great wealth, be-

cause they are not interested in the public interests of our own country, where they are supposed to be headquartered.

They got greedy. It is greed at the bottom of all of this. And what happened is that they would use these facilities offshore to launder money, to keep from paying taxes.

I was the only one to report what I called the Latin dollar market when Panama started a more secret banking system than the Swiss famous banking system.

By 1972, I estimated that that Latin dollar market had gone up to over \$75 billion just in the Caribbean and the Panamanian areas because these corporations could use those facilities to keep from paying their taxes in America and also to launder money that perhaps, as it is today in Panama, obviously is connected with these huge drug cartels that have so victimized everybody.

But then we also have a domestic problem that is the basic cause. And as long as you have a demand, you are going to have this drug thing. But I do not think that it is right to imperil the safety and soundness of our banking system in order to let these greedy interests, these illegal interests, these modern-day robber barons, these malefactors of great wealth to undo the public interest of this country.

Now, the BCCI is being prosecuted by not the Federal Government, not our Attorney General of the last regime, a Justice Department that I say and repeat has been the most corrupt, unbelievably corrupt justice system that I have seen in the 32 years I have been in the Congress or even read about before I came to the Congress, but it is being prosecuted by the Manhattan district attorney. And we do not know where that will end.

And we still have to get the basic documentation we need in order for us to draft the legislation this country should have, and the quicker the better, to make sure that we, there is nobody knows if you have 100 or 1,000 BNL's or BCCI's right now that just did not happen to blow up. And that is why you do not read about it.

But should we sit here like a bunch of zombies and say, "Well, you know, we hear nothing, see nothing, and we do not want to hear nothing or even say anything." Or should we go on ahead, and we have done, and I know I have, and that is not hesitate to speak out.

Now, that brought the whole ferocity and animosity and attack of the Justice Department, the National Security Adviser of the last President, the Attorney General, and it reached such a pitch that they did not know how to get me other than to try to intimidate me.

And to the sorry, sorry tale in history, the minority decided they would

join that group in trying to make me a culprit in divulging national security information, as if I am a child that does not know the difference between what is secure and what is not, merely because what I put in the RECORD was what, under the rules governing the relations of the Intelligence Committees in the Senate, as well as the House, give us the right to do.

I cannot help it if some of my colleagues in the past and present, who had similar experiences in other circumstances, did not want to make use of those rules because they feared something.

I made up my mind that as long as I knew I was right, I wrote the CIA Director and asked him to tell me where in I had violated security. I still have not had a reply.

I wrote the guy that was coordinating all of this, the lawyer at the National Security Council, the guy I called the gang leader, the Rostow Gang, who coordinated the lawyers in the State Department, in the White House, over in the Treasury Department, and even where those Departments wanted to let me have the information, they had the order from the Attorney General saying, "You shall not give that man that information."

Now, did I want it for myself? No. I wanted it because the committee had voted unanimously to subpoena that information.

□ 1500

My colleagues, let me state where we are now. When this administration that came into power on January 20 first came in, I addressed a letter and pointed out where we had still the need not to possess, we never have possessed secret or very secret, much less super-sensitive information. We do not need it. As a matter of fact, when I requested the information from the Federal Reserve Board, the chairman replied and said, "Well, we are under orders from the Attorney General not to give this."

In the meanwhile I was contacted by a very distinguished group of Italian senators who had formed an investigating committee. They contacted me and they came here and met with me. They wanted information from us. We gave them what we had. I asked them about this and they said, "We will give them to you," so we got some of the information our own American Government was denying from these very, very illustrious members of the Roman Senate. I will have another visit with them tomorrow, because they have a new investigating committee.

Contrary to what our superior attitude sometimes is, Italy is a great country. It has great leaders and it has great financial leaders and experts, and has had all through history. It has had great members of its own Parliament.

The same thing in England with the BCCI. We had British officials, par-

liamentarians meeting with us, and I will meet with a group of British parliamentarians in about a week or two again. In their case BCCI and also the interrelated BNL, which still has not been brought out, so I just wanted to let my colleagues know that we are on it.

The fact is there are very responsible individuals and agencies in these countries that we can cooperate with, and we can do our job as people expect us to.

Our citizens are not sophisticated enough to know. They have to work all day and they have to involve all their six senses in order to eke out an existence nowadays, so they entrust as their agents that aspect of government to which we have sought office and have been given office, and assume that we are going to be honest and that we want to do the work and we want to be responsive and responsible and be accountable.

It seems that nowadays maybe perhaps people start thinking you are a hero because you do that. I do not see why in the world anybody, including myself, should be considered a hero for simply doing his sworn oath duty, that is all.

The big question right now is whether or not the United States is going to have another loss of about \$380 million, because the BNL, assured by letters it got from the previous Department of State and Attorney General under the last administration here in the United States, telling them that they were aware that the head bank officials in Rome were not aware of what these henchmen were doing in Atlanta, we brought out the evidence to show otherwise.

Now they are suing the United States on those guarantees, the Commodity Credit guarantees that cost the taxpayer, in the case of Iraq alone, over \$1 billion. In fact, it has cost the Italian Government about \$2 billion in another area of their activities in joinder with the bank and with Iraq.

We have evidence and we have brought it forth and I put it in the RECORD. That is the reason why that past Attorney General was so unhappy with me, because it showed clearly their corrupt, their corrupt activities to the point of being willing to expose the Nation's taxpayers to unnecessary sacrifice, and the lawsuit is right now in course in the Court of Claims.

In the near future, as I said, or more than in the near future, it will be tomorrow, I will be meeting with this Senate Commission of Italy and their investigation, and later with their counterparts in the United Kingdom. As a matter of fact, we even had documentation that we had not obtained domestically because it was considered sensitive, but we got it from an intelligence agency in Germany, so the whole folly of this is unbelievable.

I believe that we have had such, as we do in crime in America today, we have such a connection between the most sophisticated criminal elements in the world and business and government, how in the world will we ever manage to disentangle?

I spoke out on that issue alone in the case of the assassination of Federal Judge John W. Wood in San Antonio in 1978, 1979. I took the floor for over a year and kept attention centered on the then-faltering investigation of that assassination, the only assassination of a Federal judge in the history of the Federal judiciary, and that was because of this tremendous criminal sophisticated element in the very profitable drug business, illicit drugs, and their first attempt to kill the assistant Federal attorney for the western district, that same district that Judge Wood was presiding over, just a year before or less.

I spoke out on that one, on the attempt on James W. Kerr, the assistant Federal attorney. Who paid attention? In fact, I was ridiculed for taking special orders. At that time I was the only one that would take special orders, and what was I trying to do? I certainly was not trying to get publicity. I was not issuing any releases or anything. I was trying to get my colleagues to join me so we could get President Carter then to give \$3 million to the Justice Department or the FBI so we could have something to try to bring in if not the very top, which they never did get, but at least some of the sublevel leaders that we could flush out with the aid of \$1 million or so as reward money for flushing out not only the hit man, who is a hired hand anyway, but the mid-level and the sub-top level. I do not know that anybody ever got to the top level.

We have the same thing now, except that it is so intermeshed into the financial system. How in the world can we ever stop drug traffic if it pays to handsomely in enormous profits, and then in our culture, our subculture, in our areas such as in our depressed areas and our ghettos where a 15-year-old kid thinks it is crazy to talk about doing anything but helping the peddler with the drugs because he can make \$1,000 a week, where is he going to do that? Going to school, or going to work anywhere, shining shoes? Of course not.

It is all interlocked. It is all interlocked. We cannot have these malefactors of great wealth making \$5 million in salaries because they have succeeded in banking, without also mandating that we have a rat-infested tenement with these neglected brother Americans, for which we will all have to pay a price sooner or later. That is the lesson of all history, not what I am saying.

When we had such elements as some of the top leaders, the National Secu-

rity Advisor of the past administration, tied in with Henry Kissinger and Kissinger and Associates, and Henry Kissinger being on the board of advisers of the Italian Bank in Rome, and getting furious because I reported that in a special order, and then getting lawyers to write to me saying, "How dare you mention Henry Kissinger," and all I said was, was he or was he not on that board?

□ 1510

If he was on the board, was he being paid \$20,000 every time he sat down for a meeting in Rome just because of his looks or his fame? Was it not Henry Kissinger and Associates executive assistant who organized 80 of the leading corporations in America to go and do business in Baghdad in Iraq? It is all in the RECORD, my colleagues, if you ever want to look it up, and for which I have been more derided and pummeled than I have been thanked for, but I do not expect thanks. I do not expect gratitude because I do my duty, but I do expect enough support of understanding as long as I have not been proven wrong. Now if I am proven wrong, I am going to admit it, and I am going to say I was wrong. But I am not going to be beaten over the head, I am not going to be clubbed into submission just merely because the powerful and the mighty are angry with what I am saying.

I am now certain that more will come out in the near future expanding on every one of the points that I have made thus far this afternoon.

We recently had also what is described as a Chilean industrialist. His name is Carlos Cardoen, who obviously was working with the CIA in developing the cluster bomb facility, the manufacturing facility for Saddam Hussein. And then when it got hot, the CIA dumped him. Now he is under indictment and threatening, if he does get extradited and brought to trial in Miami, to bring out all of these facts.

Whether that is true or not, the fact is that Cardoen's Teledyne indictments are very definitely just one of several that should have been brought a long time ago, if at all. Teledyne informed the CIA of the activities in the early 1980's. Why was it not stopped?

Cardoen told us when I was trying to get him to come and testify to the committee, but he was down there in Chile, he wanted to know if the committee would give him some kind of amnesty, and why then he might come. And I said no. In the first place, the committee is not a judiciary committee, and I have never tried to exercise any kind of judicial aspect of a committee. It is not a persecutorial, it is a committee of the Congress, and we have made full use of rule X. And under rule X we have converted it into an investigative body and a hearing, and on that basis have issued subpoenas to

bring forth not only individuals but all documents and information pertaining to the issue on hand. Cardoen let us know that if somehow or other he could get that kind of assurance, but I said absolutely not.

He then brought forth that he was put out because he felt he had been doublecrossed by the CIA. But be that as it might be, just a few weeks ago an indictment was brought in Miami. So let us see what happens. That is proper. That is over in the judicial section. That is over in the law enforcement, which we are not. That is executive branch.

Now why were not others brought, as I pointed out, who were involved in the sale of technology that led to the very sophisticated, war-producing industry in Baghdad and near Baghdad? We brought out Matrix Churchill, International Signal and Control. I brought out Gerald Bull. We brought out Sarkis Sogalian, and of course BNL, and now here Carlos Cardoen. In each of the cases the CIA had information indicating illegal arms activity involving Iraq, yet that activity was never stopped because it supported the then-policy of the past two administrations.

Each time the Congress has failed to sanction the CIA for ignoring the illegal activities. The Congress created the CIA like it created the Federal Reserve Board in 1913, but once that was done it was like we had created a Frankenstein in the laboratory. They were not subject to control, and the CIA is not, not even subject to the control of knowledgeable Presidents, and woe to those who have tried it.

The Congress has decided this, even though the basic 1947 National Security Act, which gave rise to the CIA, clearly shows that they are acting outside of the parameters of their power, and Congress will not do anything. Why? It is a good question.

But up to now, each time any meager attempt has been made, it has failed. It appears that the CIA has a license, unrestrained, unrestricted, to allow the law to be broken at will if it serves their fancy, and if it includes executive action for the elimination of other foreign country leaders.

That is wrong, my colleagues and fellow Americans. It is wrong. Never in history has any country or government long endured with this kind of ambivalence and conflict. These are dangerous precedents, and they need a thorough review by the Congress. That is a matter for other committees that have direct jurisdiction.

In previous statements I referred to the so-called Scott Commission, the Royal Commission in Great Britain or the United Kingdom. It was formed to investigate illegal arms activities involving Iraq and Matrix Churchill. American Matrix Churchill is over here in Ohio. I brought out how the Iraqi interests came in and bought into the

corporation, a good chunk that gave it standing so that you had Iraqi intelligence agents working there in Ohio, being that Matrix Churchill of Ohio had a contract with the U.S. Army for the 135-millimeter casings, and they were able to get the blueprints, and then all they had to do was put them in the diplomatic pouch, because that is exempt from examination. Then back they were in Baghdad where they built the factory.

That still is going on in America, maybe not Iraq, but other interests. Remember that just within the last 8 years, since 1985, you had such a tremendous infusion of foreign capital making direct asset acquisition of everything from banks to factories, like Matrix Churchill Corporation, to shopping malls, and these are countries that ring the globe now, and with the loss of value of the dollar, which is what I was referring to at the outset as the real, real issue facing America.

Our dollar since 1985 when we became a debtor nation, when on September 16, 1985, the Department of Commerce revealed statistically that the United States was now a debtor, in fact not just a debtor but the largest debtor, and for the first time a debtor nation since 1914.

□ 1520

On that date, my colleagues, the up-to-then world financial center shifted from New York to Tokyo where it is there now.

Since 1985, the dollar has lost over 60 percent of its value. This is why. It pays.

We are about to enter into another catastrophe, the so-called North American Free-Trade Treaty. One of the most important sections of that so-called agreement is banking and finance, and yet you have not seen any voice but mine ask questions about what does this mean and what it means has been horrible. I brought it out on February 21 in a special order I made here.

So we have learned nothing. We are like they used to say of the Bourbon kings, "learned nothing and forgot nothing," and here we are a democracy. Well, for how long?

As long as these forces are rampant, unrestrained, and uncontrolled by the very bodies that our Constitution said should have the control, should have the direction, should have the policy-making power, and said in the Constitution in clear, unequivocal, limpid, clear language; if anybody wants to obfuscate that, that is because they want to.

What most people do not know is that several journalists, including the famous investigative journalist Seymour Hersh, reported over the last couple of years that the United States arms were shipped to Jordan and Kuwait in the 1980's and then were turned

over to Saddam Hussein as well. So it goes back. The State Department Inspector General did a critical report last year stating that the Reagan and Bush administrations failed to ensure that arms were not transferred through third countries, but nothing was done to get to the bottom of the arms shipments to Iraq or any attention to that Inspector General's report.

The committee will continue to pursue various angles of the BNL investigation until the entire truth about the U.S. Government role in the scandal is known, and if any is continuing now.

In our request to the new President, we said, "Look, we have had trouble. Could you ensure us that we will have at least the information we need in order to legislate?" Well, we had a response from two agencies that had previously said they could not. The Treasury: They said, "Here it is. In fact, all of those documents you asked for we are now declassifying them." This is what my colleagues on the minority side had a resolution to try to get me as if I had violated some rule, because it was supposed to be privileged or restricted, classified. Here it is, declassified.

But, however, we still have not received some documents, and only time will tell us whether we will have to report, and I would say with great sadness and distress, if we have any stonewalling or refusal of proper congressional requests under our system.

And I pride myself in not only knowing the rules but knowing the history and the antecedents of the rules, not only of my committee but of the House, and the privileges and the constitutional duties as well that are imposed, and limitations that are imposed on us. So that until the BNL investigation, BCCI, until the truth stands up forth, clear, plain, unvarnished, and I have said, and the words I used were quoting the great abolitionist, Garrison, I said, "I shall be as harsh as truth and a uncompromising as justice," and that is exactly what I intend to do and continue to do so that the U.S. Government's role in this scandal, in the arming of Iraq is fully revealed and, today, the arming of other entities that can tomorrow be just as dangerous to our destiny as Iraq was considered just 2 years ago.

Over the next several months, the committee will be reviewing White House, State Department, CIA, Justice Department, and other documents previously withheld. And as I said, now, if you will notice, I did not list Treasury, I did not list the others, because those departments came and said, "No problem. We do not see why they should have been classified. We are declassifying, and here they are."

We did not go and get them. We usually go and review. We do not have them. I do not want any kind of sen-

sitive documents. We do not have the means in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs to keep them, even if we wanted them, and I have never wanted them, and never asked for them, and never got them.

Over the next several months the committee will be reviewing the White House, which is still holding out, the State Department, still holding out, the CIA, still holding out, the Justice Department, still holding out, and other documents previously withheld by the Bush administration. These documents will help to round out our knowledge of the scandal so that we can ensure that our financial system is not abused at the cost of the helpless taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the summary of the U.S. Department of Justice expenses for the investigation by special counsel Frederick B. Lacey, as follows:

Summary of U.S. Department of Justice expenses for the investigation by Special Counsel Frederick B. Lacey of the conduct of the U.S. Department of Justice relating to the Banca Nazionale Del Lavoro

Travel and lodging ¹	\$54,924.50
Office supplies	1,644.69
Office equipment & furniture	1,957.00
Office build-out	819.12
Courier & overnight delivery services	364.86
Transcription services (court reporter)	23,861.40
Photocopier, telecopier, telephone, postage, and other miscellaneous expenses	14,115.22
Paralegal services (7 paralegals)	83,717.89
<hr/>	
Attorney services (16 attorneys) ²	190,987.32
<hr/>	
Hon. Frederick B. Lacy	20,682.00
Other attorneys	170,305.32
<hr/>	
Total	372,392.00

¹Includes *per diem* of \$34.00 per person on travel.

²The compensation of all sixteen attorneys (including Judge Lacey) was based either on an hourly rate of \$48.07, or on a daily rate of \$383.00 (i.e., \$48.00/hour).

Date: April 6, 1993.

A CRUCIAL ELECTION

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

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, I asked for this special order this evening to talk briefly about one of the most crucial elections that has occurred in this country this year that occurred this past Saturday in Texas to fill the unexpired term of Secretary of the Treasury Lloyd Bentsen.

The appointed Senator from Texas, Senator KRUEGER, was resoundingly defeated by KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON by a margin approaching 70 percent, and in fact taking counties in Texas that had

never gone Republican in centuries, by margins in excess of 60 percent.

What was the most amazing about this election was that none of my colleagues on the other side wanted to talk about it today, unlike what occurred in my State back in 1991 when the former Attorney General under the Bush administration, Dick Thornburgh, was running against HARRIS WOFFORD to fill the unexpired term of John Heinz.

I thought it might be appropriate to go back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and look at some of the comments made by my colleagues on the other side following what, in contrast to the Hutchison election, was a very close race between Dick Thornburgh and HARRIS WOFFORD. Our colleague from Oregon, in fact, quoted and said, "Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Pennsylvania sent a message to their national leaders." Our distinguished colleague from Connecticut said:

Mr. Speaker, for months now the American people have been calling out to its leaders in Washington, and for months the administration has turned a deaf ear. Well, make no mistake about it, yesterday the people of Pennsylvania delivered a powerful message to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. By defeating President Bush's Attorney General and the head of the Domestic Policy Council, the people have sent a message that they are tired of indifference in the face of growing economic bad times. They are saying it is time, to the President of the United States, to do something for Americans for a change. It is time to recognize that we have emergencies here at home, too. That is the message of Pennsylvania. The President should listen.

Madam Speaker, these were comments made by our colleagues following the defeat of Dick Thornburgh by HARRIS WOFFORD.

Our colleague from Florida said,

The bottom line is the people of Pennsylvania understood what the people of America understand: This administration has failed and is failing, and it looks like it will fail in the future to come to grips with the real problems that Pennsylvania and Americans face: unemployment, a lousy economy, losing jobs overseas, and a tax structure which favors the wealthy.

All of these comments were made by our colleagues, Madam Speaker, following the election between HARRIS WOFFORD and Dick Thornburgh.

In the other body we heard the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts say, "As Muhammad Ali used to say, his opponents can run, but they cannot hide. George Bush may still prefer to run from the issue, but the American people will no longer let him hide."

The Senator from South Dakota said that, "All across America, Americans have spoken. They have spoken in Pennsylvania. The people of Pennsylvania sent the White House a wake-up call last night. They said they wanted middle-class tax fairness."

□ 1530

The people of Pennsylvania rejected the handpicked candidate of the administration and instead returned HARRIS WOFFORD to the Senate.

"The American people want results, not campaign rhetoric and slogans."

But, Madam Speaker, I think the most telling comment actually came from that gentleman who is now being replaced by KAY HUTCHISON, and that is our current Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen, because he also rose on the floor of the other body, in commenting about the election where Dick Thornburgh was defeated by Senator WOFFORD, then-Senator Bentsen said that, and I quote, "There was another message, however, delivered by Senator WOFFORD in Pennsylvania: Middle-income taxpayers need a tax cut. And today I am introducing the Bentsen-Roth-Mikulski middle-income tax cut bill to address this issue."

How quickly things have changed from then-Senator Bentsen to today-Treasury Secretary Bentsen, who is supporting in lock step the plans and ideas of President Clinton.

Madam Speaker, the people of Texas spoke out this past Saturday as the people of Pennsylvania spoke out in November of 1991, against higher taxes, against a Government that is not working. And whether we have a Republican in the White House or a Democrat in the White House, this institution has got to understand that the American people are tired of business as usual.

What offended me so much 2 weeks ago was to see the strong-arm tactics used on this House floor to get passage of the President's economic plan. Many of my friends and colleagues on the other side did not want to vote for that package but were either cut deals or were strong-armed to support a package that they know is not what the American people are asking for.

I would hope that my colleagues in this body would heed the election of Saturday and oppose President Clinton's economic plan and oppose business as usual in this body.

THE MYTHS—AND TRUTH—ABOUT THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I point out to the listeners, although I guess I am about the only one in this Chamber as a Member, maybe two or three others that I do not see out in the back, that the purposes of these special orders are really to have extra time to bring important policy matters to light in the hope that the listeners—and we know there is a huge number at any given time through the vehicle of C-SPAN—will ask questions and have

an opportunity to have the information that is available to us as Members and will allow us to lay the foundation for further legislative activities down the road.

Madam Speaker, I am very interested in the subject of health care, as I think a number of other Americans are interested as well. This was to be, frankly, one of the key campaign planks of the Clinton administration, making health care more affordable for all.

I am very concerned about what I see going on as this debate rages; I see strawmen being set up, so to speak, in other words, false assertions being made which are then attacked. I think we ought to examine some of these representations, we ought to really examine in our own mind what is wrong with health care provided in America.

We have been told there is a health care crisis, and I think we need to ask ourselves, "Well, what is this crisis? Am I personally dissatisfied with the quality of health care that I am receiving?" Interestingly enough, surveys routinely show that about three-fourths of the people, when questioned, are personally satisfied with the quality of health care that they are receiving. And yet, well, almost that same number, 60 to 70 percent of the people, when asked about the health care system in this country, are dissatisfied with it. So that is a contradiction, and we need to ask ourselves, "Well, why is there this disparity? If people are personally satisfied with the quality of health care that they receive, how can it be that they are dissatisfied with the health delivery system?"

I think the answer to that question is what we need to get to today and, hopefully, in subsequent special orders. In other words, what misinformation are people getting, assuming it is misinformation. I must report, Madam Speaker, that the information available to me suggests that that belief on the part of Americans, that is, that they are satisfied with the quality of health care that they are receiving, that that is a well-founded belief, and indeed what seems to me erroneous is the representation or the feeling that something is wrong with the system.

That is not to say that the system is perfect. The system grew up over a number of years somewhat haphazardly and in response to historical forces in some cases. So there are certainly inefficiencies in this system that can be weeded out and things can be made better, but nevertheless I think we need to recognize what it is that we have got.

There is a publication called "Twenty Myths About National Health Care Insurance." This is by John C. Goodman and Gerald S. Musgrave, at least they were the authors of it, in writing for the National Center for Policy Analysis.

I would like to quote out of that, if I may, briefly:

Virtually every Government which has established a system of national health insurance has proclaimed health care to be a basic human right. Yet far from guaranteeing that right, most national health systems routinely deny care to those who need it. Not only do citizens have no enforceable right to any particular medical service, they don't even have a right to a place in line when health care is rationed.

I hope that Americans will focus on that as we hear the glories of Canada or Germany or Sweden. Most people are not so bold as to pretend Great Britain has any glories about it, but were those to be praised, it would be the same side, that this is the flip side of the coin.

We hear how wonderful those systems are, but most Americans really are not that aware of what life is like under those systems.

I would like to turn, Madam Speaker, to an article that was written by one of the senior editors of the National Republic, Fred Barnes, and it was written for the American Spectator in May 1993 issue. There we get a glimpse of what some of those systems are like.

He begins with the Canadian system. First of all, Mr. Barnes points out that, interestingly enough, politicians in the Canadian system get special health care privileges. That would go over big in the United States.

They get to move to the head of the waiting list. So you see you can have rationing, but if some of the privileged elite get to move to the head of the waiting list, then these very same people who make the laws that implemented the system obviously can live more comfortably with it.

Or if they choose not to move to the head of the waiting list for treatment at the medical facilities, they can then go to the elite National Defense Medical Center. And some find neither of those opportunities or privileges to be sufficient, such as the Premier of Quebec, who came to the National Cancer Institute in Bethesda, MD, for diagnosis and then returned to the United States for surgery. Interestingly enough, he did this all at his own expense.

□ 1540

Now, one would have to ask, if health care in Canada is so tremendously beneficial and indeed for politicians like this gentleman, if special privileges exist such as going to the head of a waiting list ahead of everybody else, all their constituents, or alternatively to go to the nation's most elite medical center and there receive treatment, and even those alternatives are not enough, and that individual would choose instead to leave behind all of that supposedly free health care, at least free to the individuals that time has provided, forsake all that and come to the United States and pay out of his own pocket, and we all know what a visit to the hospital costs, especially

for something like cancer. We are talking about thousands and thousands of dollars to get the best available treatment.

This individual chooses to do that at his own expense, rather than receive treatment in Canada. That is just one story, but I think it is an interesting anecdote.

I would like to share one other anecdote. This is written about in this article by Mr. Barnes in the American Spectator, May, 1993:

Ian R. Monroe, M.D., is a Canadian doctor who immigrated to the U.S. He wrote in the Reader's Digest last September of a young boy in Canada who needed open-heart surgery to free the blood flow to his lungs.

Open-heart surgery, I would interject, would be obviously a critical need.

Returning to this quotation now:

He was put on a waiting list. He got a surgery date only after news reports embarrassed health officials.

Now I will interject, having embarrassed the health officials through the mass media in Canada, they finally gave the boy the date for surgery. The date was 2 months thence.

Returning again to this quotation:

After waiting two months, he died, four hours before surgery.

OK. That is one story, but the fact of the matter is that waiting is common in Canada. It is very common and for extended periods of time, months or in some cases years.

Americans do not wait and we would never tolerate that kind of an inefficient system in this country, and certainly not for life-threatening surgeries—not life-threatening emergencies—demand medical attention and you are just stuck at the head or on some list, at the bottom of some list, just like any bureaucracy would treat you. It does not matter what the reason is. "Get in line, we have our procedures and they must be followed."

You know, somebody once said, and this is not to knock all the good work that in some cases these agencies do, but if you put the Government in charge of health care, you will have an agency with the efficiency of the Postal Service and the compassion of the IRS. I do not think that is something to be ignored, based on what we see in other countries. So that is Canada.

Now, keep in mind, Canada pays all costs, including set fees for the doctors.

There was a study done by the Frazier Institute in 1992 in Canada. That study found that 250,000 people are awaiting medical care at any given time.

It is not uncommon for patients to wait months or even years for treatment such as cataract operations, hip replacements, tonsillectomies, gall bladder surgery, hysterectomies, heart operations and major oral surgery, according to Edmund F. Hasselmeier, the Heritage Foundation's health care expert.

Canada has other problems. Health costs are rising faster than in the United States. Hospital beds and surgical rooms are dwindling and doctors are fleeing. There were 8,263 Canadian doctors practicing in the United States in 1990. So Canada would not seem to be the model that we would wish to follow here in the United States of America, not to mention, of course, that Canada has so many fewer people. I mean, they have what—less than one-tenth the people that we have in this country, and even their system is failing them in terms of holding the line on costs, which is supposed to be its great virtue, and certainly it is failing the people in terms of the quality of health care that is being delivered. It is bureaucratic health care, which is to say there is no quality.

The Japanese model. When Dr. Louis Sullivan, President Bush's Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Mr. Barnes pointed this out again, visited Japan, he was surprised to find that medical care in Japan matched that of the United States—United States in the 1950's, that is.

Yes, Japan has universal access and then emphasizes primary care clinics, financed mostly through quasi-public insurance companies, but the problem is price controls.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have heard that term, that concept being put forth by Clinton administration representatives.

People may recall, I know I have read it twice in the Washington Post in the last couple months, words to the effect, "As an interim measure price controls may be necessary until we can come up with a complete reformulation of the United States health care." So let us not kid ourselves. This is right out of the very mouths of the people who are looking at this health care situation on behalf of the administration.

They love to have price controls. They love government getting bigger by taking over the health care system, because they love government. They love what it can do.

Unfortunately, that means burdening the American people with enormous new tax increases, draining the economy as the result of the drag that it places through the added debt that is accumulated in this country. They seem to have a faith in government that is unrivaled. This concerns me and that is why today, Madam Speaker, I take the floor to have this special order to discuss what the realities are concerning our health care system vis-a-vis others.

We are going to revolutionize our health care system, according to many in the Clinton administration.

But let us just make sure, as so many revolutions have, they have always resulted in something worse, in many cases at least, after the revolution. We do not want to get to that point in the

United States, so we better be careful before we have too big a revolution without assessing what the consequences may be.

Now, in Japan they have a premium for doctors seeing patients, so much so that an interesting statistic here shows that in out-patient care a clinic physician in Japan sees an average of 49 patients per day. Imagine that, 49 patients per day are seen.

Do you know what the average time was for that? Twelve minutes. We have 30-minute visits on the average in the United States.

But what is interesting is, these figures I am giving you now or about to give you are for the elderly. For the elderly, a survey found the average number of doctor visits for a 6-month period in Japan was 17.3. So the elderly visited the doctor's office 17.3 times a month in Japan on the average.

In the United States, that same elderly patient visited the doctor 3.6 times per month. However, in Japan, the length of visit was 12 minutes, where here it was 30 minutes. Thus, in order to get the same type of medical care, they had to go a lot more often in order to get it, obviously at added expense and expenditure of energy and waiting in order to get in to see the doctor.

Well, I guess there is only one exception to all of these, and that is if you pay a bribe. If you pay a bribe at one of the teaching hospitals, which are not the technology of the 1950's but are state-of-the-art technology, you have got to pay a bribe of between \$1,000 and \$3,000, at least that is the information presented in this article, and then you get a private room and you are treated by a senior specialist and you get very fine care, but it certainly is not the type of care available to the average Japanese citizen.

□ 1550

OK; let us talk about Germany. I have a little personal experience here because my wife's brother is married to a German national and lives in Germany, and it is interesting they are coming to visit again this summer, and they have been here before, and each time they come to visit, and this is their vacation, they always plan to spend 2 to 3 days for their family members at the dentist's office, of all things.

Now I do not mind going to the dentist's office so much. A lot of people do. But it is not something I choose to do on my family vacation, and yet they come to the States to go to the dentist's office because this sort of care is not offered or available in Germany.

Oh, yes, they have a Government-prescribed health care system that does not happen to be on the list of acceptable items. So, they have to come here to have all the dental work done, all at their own expense. Anyone who has

paid out of his or her pocket for a gold crown or something like that knows that can run up to be quite expensive, and it would be nice to have the availability through health insurance of preventative care.

Well, Germany has strict fees for doctors, and they have, well, imaginable results, more doctors, visits. That is how the doctors make up for it if there is a limit on how much they can charge each patient, and, as you as the doctor have determined to maintain an income, then you will have the patients make more frequent visits so that you get the same amount of income as if you saw the one patient, but for a longer period of time and for a higher fee. It will work out the same except for greater inconvenience and delay, of course, to the citizen. That is not the same.

Well, Great Britain at least allows for private health insurance, and 6.6 million British have opted for that. The rest wait in long lines. The Government is trying to reduce the waiting period, but at least I should say they are trying to reduce the number of patients waiting more than 2 years for medical attention, and that has been successful. That has been in 1986, quoting from Mr. Barnes' article, the number is 90,000; in 1991, 50,000, so from 1987 to 1991 it dropped by 40,000. In April 1992 it was down to 1,600. Good progress under the Conservative government of Margaret Thatcher. But there is a catch. The number of patients waiting 6 months or less grew during that same time period by 10 percent. Now the overall drop in the waiting list, you know, throwing everybody in together and looking at it, was a 3-percent drop, so that is not very good.

Well; all right, if you look at other countries, and we have just looked in this article at Canada, and Japan, and Germany, and Great Britain very briefly. I have not read the whole article to my colleagues, but it is available, a very interesting article. I commend it to the individual who is interested in health care problems and in getting a kind of overview of what is wrong, and what are other countries doing, and what should we be doing.

And I think it becomes clear that we have some problems, and, hopefully, later on in this special order—I see several of my colleagues here—we will begin to get into those problems, particularly in the United States. But it helps to kind of put in context, how do other countries work, especially other countries that are being held up and praised to us for our example. My colleagues can see that they really do not have anything that we want to offer. It is basically, when one cuts through it all, it is basically rationing of one type or another.

Now we do not ration here in the United States, and, because of that, we are a prosperous country. We have the

greatest gross domestic product of anyone, by far, throughout the world, and so we spend more on health care. But this National Center for Policy Analysis also made this observation; at least I think it is the NCPA:

Let us see here. "Why We Spend too Much on Health Care" is what it is entitled, and they, in this study, pointed out that each 10-percent increase in per capita gross domestic product is associated with a 14-percent increase in per capita health spending. Well, what that really is saying is that, as countries become more prosperous, the citizens of those countries choose to spend more of the countries' resources on health care.

Well, I think that is important to understand, and I would like just to go back to this article by Mr. Barnes because he explains in here some of the advantages that we have. I do not think most people are aware of these. I might just reference them.

Now I am going to, if I have time, go back and talk about two assertions, but we are told that we are bad in this country. Our health care system is failing because our life expectancy is below the life expectancy of people in some other highly industrialized countries and because the infant mortality rate is higher in this country than some other highly industrialized countries. Now, those two facts, as far as they go, are true. However the conclusion from those facts, ergo the health care delivery system in the United States is failing, or is less desirable, is false. That conclusion is false, and in a minute, if we have time, we will go into that.

But I want to tell my colleagues now about specific types of problems that a person can have and compare them with the other countries because I do not think this is information that is generally available, and, thanks to Mr. Schwartz in this very excellent little article in the American Spectator, May 1993, my colleagues get some of this information.

An enlarged prostate; let us talk about that for a minute. A lot of older men have that problem. We probably all know at least one or two people that have undergone that type of a problem and have had it resolved. And listen to this, quoting from Mr. Barnes' article: "Your chances of survival are better if you're treated here," meaning in the United States. "The U.S. death rate from prostate trouble is one-seventh the rate in Sweden, one-fourth that of Great Britain, one-third that in Germany."

Now Sweden, Great Britain, and Germany may have higher instances of prostate illness, but not high enough to account for the wide disparity in death rates. We have effective ways of treating it.

Let us talk about ulcer of the stomach or intestines. We probably all know

someone who has that problem. The death rate per 1,000 persons is 2.7 in the United States compared to 2.8 in the Netherlands, 3.1 in Great Canada, 4.9 in Germany, 7.6 in Sweden, and 8 in Great Britain.

OK; let us talk about a hernia or intestinal obstructions. We probably all know someone who has had one of those problems. The American death rate is 1.7. It is 2 in Canada, it is 2.7 in Germany, 3 in the Netherlands, 3.1 in Great Britain, and 3.2 in Sweden.

Let us talk about the death rate from cancer. Now that is slightly higher in America than in Sweden or Germany, but it is lower than in Canada, the Netherlands, and Great Britain.

Specific cancers; let us talk about that. The United States has the lowest death rate from these specific cancers: stomach cancer, cervical cancer, and uterine cancer. It also includes, with the exception of Sweden, breast cancer. So, the United States has a lower death rate from breast cancer than in any other country in the world except Sweden.

OK; the United States also has the second lowest death rate from heart attack. No matter what the disease, epilepsy, hypertension, stroke, bronchitis, the United States compares well.

Now this is interesting: If we take life expectancy, and again I have not gone into my criticism of using—life expectancy from birth, I should have said—that is the criticism. Life expectancy from birth in the United States is lower than it is in several other major industrialized countries.

□ 1600

But for the person who survives to age 65, the age of officially becoming a senior citizen, life expectancy for American males at 65 is 14.7 years. In Canada, it is 15 years. In Sweden, it is 14.7 years. In Switzerland, it is 14.9 years.

Now, Canada, Sweden, and Switzerland are more homogeneous countries with far fewer social problems. When, and if, I get into the debunking of the two false tests by which our health care system is being evaluated, those social problems are what account for this disparity. I just wanted to point that out.

Now, what is right with our system? Choice, that is what is right with the system. Availability. Even for the Americans, we hear about, and perhaps the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] will get into this, but if he does not I will come back to it, even if we get into the issue of the supposed 37 million who have no health insurance, that does not mean they have no medical care, Madam Speaker. We must not equate those two, as some in the Clinton administration, including the President, have appeared to do. We must not equate those two.

In fact, anyone in this country by law can go into an emergency room

and get treatment at that emergency room. If the individual cannot afford it, the treatment will be provided.

What that means is that everybody else ends up paying for it in this country, which throws out of balance the health care delivery system and is one of the problems that needs to be focused upon, as to how we bring that more back into balance. But the fact of the matter is people who need the medical attention can get it now and they can get it without socialized medicine.

Let us talk about an advantage besides choice, which is obviously the principal advantage, and that is the proliferation of technology.

Dale A. Rubley, an expert in cross-national health policy, did an article which is referenced here in this article from the American Spectator, May 1993, by Fred Barnes.

This gentleman, Mr. Rubley, compared the availability of six technologies, open heart surgery, cardiac catheterization, organ transplants, radiation therapy, extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy, and magnetic resonance imaging.

Now, I am familiar with some of these, but not with all. But I think we are all familiar with, my word, it seems so many people have had the cardiac catheterization, and we are all aware of this magnetic resonance imaging, and we have all heard about the organ transplants, and certainly, unfortunately, we all know people who are afflicted, unfortunately, with cancer, and so many of whom have had this radiation therapy. So we are familiar with a lot of these things.

Anyway, these six technologies, and the availability thereof, were compared between Canada, the United States, and Germany for 1987. The other two countries, Germany and Canada, were selected because their overall health care resources are fairly comparable to those in the United States.

Now, the United States came out ahead in every category, and way ahead in several categories.

In MRI's, the United States had 3.69 per 1 million people. Germany had 0.94 per 1 million people. So we had four times what Germany has. Canada had 0.46, less than half of Germany. So we have eight times what Canada has per 1 million people.

For open heart surgery, the United States had 3.26 of these technologies available, of catheterization, I guess, available. Canada had 1.23. Germany had .74.

For radiation therapy the United States had 3.97; Germany, 3.13; Canada, .54.

Well, the fact of the matter is, as Mr. Rubley concluded in his report, reprinted here in this article by Mr. Barnes, "American physicians, with the universe of modern technology at their fingertips, are the envy of the world's physicians."

Now, Madam Speaker, yes, the United States spends more per capita, and, yes, we lead any other country in terms of capital expenditure and in terms of percentage of the gross domestic product being spent on health care.

But we also lead in some of the lowest death rates from these serious diseases that I mentioned to you. I mean, that is the direct result.

Sure, Canada has the so-called free health care to everybody. Universal access. No paperwork to fill out. But what is the price they pay for that?

They are a backwater, medically speaking. They do not have the latest available technologies. And if you are seriously ill in Canada, you had better just hope you can make it on the waiting list, and that you do not die before your number comes up. And if you think you are going to, then get on the train or take the airplane to the United States and fork out of your pocket expenses for everything, for the doctor and the hospital. Of course, you have to be wealthy to be able to do that, or you can never have that opportunity in Canada.

Do we really want to bring all the advantages and disadvantages that the Canadian system enjoys to afflict the people of the United States? I would submit that we do not.

By way of closing on this part, and then I am going to recognize the gentleman from Arkansas, quoting again Mr. Fred Barnes' article in the *American Spectator*, May 1993,

In 1991 an American official addressed Russian health experts in Moscow. He bemoaned that many Americans get care at emergency rooms, and occasionally wait six or eight hours. To the American's shock, the Russians erupted in laughter. In Russia, with twice as many doctors per capita as the United States, a wait of six to eight hours represented unusually fast service.

So, Madam Speaker, as we evaluate reforms to our health care system, let us just keep in mind what it is we really have. Sometimes we are so close to things that are familiar to us that we do not appreciate them. Now is the time to take stock, before we risk losing what we already have.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman for organizing this special order on health care. I think the gentleman has done an excellent job of outlining the situation that we face in this country and oftentimes the distortions that we have been presented concerning where we stand on health care.

I think those distortions that the gentleman has very well articulated were demonstrated in a recent poll that was conducted. It was a major poll, a national poll with a large sample in the United States, and it indicated that nearly 70 percent of all voters initially say that they would favor

the creation of a national health care system run by the Federal Government.

That is where many people stopped. They say 70 percent of the American people want to have some kind of national health care system. But when they pursue it a little further and ask them in more detail, their attitudes toward American health care, it becomes much more revealing.

When they are asked whether or not they would support a system that would cost an additional \$2,500 per year in taxes, 67 percent say no. That while they favor national health care, they do not favor a system that is going to cost them that much in additional taxes.

Perhaps more revealing, three out of four people who were surveyed said they would not support the system if they had to wait months for medical procedures.

So while surveys can reveal many things, it is wrong when we take a simple question and ask would you favor a national health care system, and 70 percent say they would, not to look a little deeper beneath that response and find that, in fact, if it is going to result in waiting lines, if it is going to result in rationing, then they would not favor a system that would decrease the kind of quality care that they have.

In all of the discussions that have been conducted concerning proposed health care changes, one of the things that keeps coming up is the possibility of price controls and the resulting attendant degenerative effects that we would see on our health care system, including some of the things the gentleman has mentioned.

□ 1610

Every time that we have price controls, any time we have experimented with that in our economy, we have found it disastrous, whether it was in the 1970's, under a Republican President who tried price controls, we saw long lines at gasoline pumps. It never works, and it will not work when it comes to health care either. So the price controls would result in a number of things: overregulation, shortages, waiting lines, cost shifting.

We have cost shifting now. Price controls will not, in fact, lower the cost of health care. It will simply result in a cost shifting process.

Someone recently said, when you look at the health care dilemma in our country, in some of the many, many proposals that we see coming forward, that health care reform is like a Rubik's cube in public policy. I think that is true. There are literally 10,000 different combinations, and every change that you have in one component of health care affects another. It is a very complex and it is a very complicated public policy issue that we face.

What we are talking about in health care reform in the United States is some of the most dramatic, radical, even comprehensive kinds of changes in the way we deliver health care services that this country, that our country has ever seen.

Therefore, I think that the gentleman has done a tremendous job in presenting some of the various models around the world. He has spoken of the Canadian model, the Japanese model, the German, Great Britain, and all of these that we sometimes compare ourselves to, the Canadian model, which we are told that they do not spend as much on health care, but many of the costs in Canada are hidden. They really reveal themselves in the very exorbitant tax rate that Canadians pay. But really, no other model around this world, no other country is comparable to the United States. And we cannot assume that success or failure in another country will automatically result in success or failure, should it be applied in the United States.

And where we see some successes in national models in other countries, I think it is safe to assume that many of the degenerative effects of those nationalized systems only begin to appear a decade or 20 years down the road.

The Canadian model, we are only now beginning to see the very detrimental economic impacts as well as the health care impacts from that Canadian model. So I would suggest that when we look at health care reform in the United States, that rather than throwing out the entire system that has developed, recognizing need for changes in it, recognizing the need for reform in it, it would be a terrible mistake to throw that out and, on an experimental basis, reform that with a new system that may or may not have benefit.

It has been suggested, I think with merit, that we should attempt a regional system or even a State model in our reform efforts before we radically, dramatically, comprehensively throw out the system that we have in the United States. We have many States that are experimenting at health care reform. They are excellent laboratories for health care reform, and we should try that before we dramatically change the whole system in the United States.

I, last week, had the opportunity to sit on a panel in my home district and hear the concerns of my constituents regarding health care. And it was quite revealing. But one individual that was on the panel expressed concern, and it was a concern I had not previously thought about, but I think his concern had merit, that the task force that has been established by the administration to look at health care reform is primarily composed of theorists, academics, not those who are on the front lines, not those who are first-line providers of health care services. And, therefore, the concern that the pack-

age, that the reform packaging that will come out of the task force will not be that which will work on a practical basis day to day, from the consumer's standpoint, from the provider's standpoint, and, therefore, we take a big gamble in taking that, those recommendations, whatever they may be, when they come out in September, and applying them nationwide.

The National Federation of Independent Business recently estimated that federally mandated employer-provided health care will cost a loss, a loss of between 7½ to 18 million jobs in this country. So another factor that must be considered is the entire impact of health care reform on the economy as a whole. To have a nationalized health care system that provides universal coverage and to destroy jobs and to cause millions of unemployed is no answer to the health care reform needs that we have in our society.

This figure that has been bandied about so often, 37 million Americans who do not have health insurance, is in itself misleading, because the 37 million changes. It is not always the same people. As people change jobs, as they lose coverage, as they go back into that 37 million, as they leave that, as they find coverage. So it is deceptive from that standpoint.

It is also deceptive in that it implies that those 37 million Americans without insurance are going without health care, and that is simply not the case.

On our panel last week, we had the administrator of a clinic there in Fort Smith, AR, who flatly said that they have never turned anybody down who came in need without coverage, that ultimately and finally they are going to have that health care provided. And we do bear the cost of that, but it is misleading to imply that there are 37 million Americans out there without any kind of health care being provided them.

So as we look at health care, and I will yield, I know we have several who have joined us who want to speak on this subject, I believe we need to evaluate whatever proposals come out of this administration from the standpoint of several factors: The long-term issue, the long-term provision for our elderly, long-term health care must be dealt with; rural health care must be dealt with.

How we handle those rural areas that do not currently have a hospital or a clinic, what kind of incentive are we going to offer physicians who go into the rural areas and provide quality health care there. I think that the deficit is something that we have to take into consideration on health care. We cannot adopt a health care reform system in this country that is going to add to our national deficit and our national debt and that has to be a consideration, as we look at health care reform.

We cannot, in health care reform, add additional burdens to small business. Small business is the very backbone to our economy. It is the chief employer of our people. And to add additional burden to small business will, in the long term, hurt the health care of the American people.

So we must guard and protect the beleaguered small businessman in this country. I believe we must deal with the issue of defensive medicine and tort reform. We must look at how we can eliminate unnecessary tests and procedures that are now conducted in the health care system. And I think that as we address those in a positive way and a bipartisan way, we can make progress. But we cannot take the very deceptive shortcut of turning health care over to a Government bureaucracy, when, as we look at Government's historical role, they have always failed, they have miserably failed when it comes to providing health care services.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] for bringing those important pieces of information to light.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Madam Speaker, I am happy and honored to be here to talk about a need that is so pressing in America now, and that is the need for health care reform. But before we radically reform the health care system, I think we ought to consider what the system in the United States is all about and what some of the competing systems are offering our people.

We have a myth, and there are several, one is that there is 65 or 66 million uninsured Americans. In California, there are many uninsured Californians, but no one has denied service. When you get through with Medicare, Medicaid, MediCal, you are going to special programs like county hospitals and clinics.

Everyone receives care, but is it cost effective and is it right for the consumer as well as the taxpayer?

There are many uninsured, but the taxpayer is picking up the freight. And when we get through, here in Washington, redesigning the medical system, you are going to find the same thing is true.

Most of us will be insured. There will be some that will be supported totally by the Government.

We have another myth, and that is the myth of affordable health care, by providing a single payer or Government plan will somehow make it more cost effective. And let me just describe a few ways that the Government is planning to do that so that people can go into this health care reform with their eyes open.

Critics of U.S. health systems point to the success that other countries have had with national health insurance. They insist that Americans could have affordable health care, too, if only the U.S. Government would adopt national health insurance. However, the evidence clearly shows that countries with national health insurance have not actually made health care more affordable in the sense of providing services more efficiently.

Instead, doctors and hospitals provide less expensive services or fewer services in order to keep total costs within the limits set by not the marketplace or the need but set by the governments and government budgets.

□ 1620

Each year under the British national health care system 9,000 kidney patients are denied renal dialysis or a kidney transplant; 10,000 to 15,000 cancer patients are denied chemotherapy; 4,000 to 17,000 patients each year are denied coronary artery surgery, creating more problems and more severe problems later on.

Four hundred and fifty to one thousand children are denied total perinatal nutritional therapy. Seven thousand elderly are denied hip replacements, mainly because of their age. While 1 million people wait for surgery, 1 in 4 hospital beds is empty while another bed is being used by a chronically ill patient in lieu of a nursing home.

As this table indicates, both Canada and Germany lag behind the United States in the availability of modern medical technology. Open heart surgery in Canada, 1.25 persons per million are able to avail themselves of open heart surgery; in Germany, 0.74; in the United States, 3.26. Catheterization to open the veins, 1.5 in Canada; 2.64 in Germany; 5.06 per million in the United States.

In other words, if we restrict the availability of medical services we can save money, but if that is your mother or your child, do you think that is cost-effective? The answer is no. There are a whole list of services where the United States is on top.

The perpetrators of the fraud that we need a Government health care system have told us the reason we need it is because 16 percent of our gross domestic product is being used for medical services. That is true, and 20 years ago only 12 percent was used for medical services of gross domestic product. That is true. That also is true.

Why is that? Because today we are living to be 85 rather than 75, and most of the health care costs come in the last 5 years of our lives. What the Government is telling us is, "Be patriotic." The Governor put it simply, "Do your patriotic duty: die." That is not a compassionate view. That is not a view of quality medicine. That is not a view the Republicans want to offer as an al-

ternative to the existing health care system.

According to one report, because of physicians' adjustment to fee scales that have not kept pace with inflation, patients in Canada and Japan must make multiple visits to receive the same services previously provided in a single visit. In fact, they make 12 visits a year, 4 times the amount that the average American makes, because the doctors are limited in how much they can charge, so they have them coming back constantly. This is not efficiency, it is another way to milk the Government. I don't think it is a good way.

As another report notes, national health insurance works in other countries for three reasons: First, the wealthy, powerful, and sophisticated find ways to maneuver around the system and do not take advantage of it at all, and get around rationing; second, those pushed to the end of the line are generally unaware of medical technologies that they are being denied. Therefore, in Germany where they receive less, they do not know that it is available. Third, there are no or severely limited contingency fees, no generally recognized right of due process, no cadre of lawyers such as we have in the United States willing to represent those who are discriminated against.

Let me close by just giving the Members one last thought to chew on while the debate on national health insurance and the Government's role in that health insurance is being debated here. In 1960 Government subsidies accounted for 25 percent of total health care spending. By 1990 the Government's share was 53 percent.

We are still able to choose our doctors, we still have the finest health care system in the world. According to the last study, about 95 percent of all hospital bills and more than 80 percent of physicians' fees are paid by private and public third parties. On an average, every time a patient spends a dollar in the medical marketplace, 76 cents is paid by someone else.

What does that do to the demand if you do not know you are paying for it, or if you do not feel you are paying for it? You overuse the system. What happens when there are too many lawsuits and people are pressing for malpractice? The doctor defends himself by overtesting. We drive the cost up by Government involvement. We drive the cost up because of the legal system. We drive the cost up because insurance companies are oftentimes unwilling to insure because they might be sued. Doctors do not do charity work because they are afraid they will be sued.

Yes, we can make this system better, but let us do it through the marketplace. Let us expand on the 80 percent that are already happy with their insurance and are insured. Let us not throw the 80 percent out to chase the 20 percent.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for yielding me the time, and I look forward to working with him as we reform positively, not negatively, the health care system in America.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], and observe that we have around 5 minutes or so remaining.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, there is no way that I can make all the points I want to make in 5 minutes, so if the gentleman wants to sum up, I will be glad to leave him enough time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would say to the gentleman if he would just leave me a minute, that will be fine.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, let me just say that I really appreciate the gentleman from California coming to the floor of the House to discuss this issue. I think it has been going on for too long without rebuttal that the Clinton administration has mischaracterized the health care system in this country. The finest health care provided to anyone in this world is coming under attack by the Clinton administration, and, like their tax policy and their economic policy, they do not understand the problem. They just absolutely do not get it.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] so aptly laid out in his talk about the false numbers and the way they are manipulated, about access to care and the number of people that do not have access to care, the Clinton administration does not use true measures of what good quality health care is or how America's system compares with those of other industrialized democracies. They also lay out false measures of quality health care.

As the gentleman has been quoting from Fred Barnes' article entitled "What Health Care Crisis?" in the May issue of *American Spectator*, it is so well laid out, the true story about American health care and the quality of that health care.

In one section of his article he talks about judging the two most common measures of health by the Clinton administration, life expectancy at birth and the infant mortality rate. Health care in the United States, according to the Clinton administration, is not the best or even among the best.

The article shows how they manipulate the numbers to prove their case. In 1990 life expectancy in America was 72 years for males and 78.8 for women. This put the United States behind Canada and France and many other countries, and on infant mortality the United States fared even worse, ranking 19th in 1989 with a rate of 9.7.

What they failed to do was to tell us that this is a reflection of health, not the health care system; that life ex-

pectancy is determined by much more than the quality of a nation's health care. It is determined by social factors that affect life expectancy, and it is exacerbated by the way that Americans live today, whether it be homicides, injuries, by careless living, and AIDS is another factor that is brought into this.

Even at the age of 80 when most people are highly dependent on the health care system, Americans have the longest life expectancy. As far as infant mortality rate is concerned, it is reflective of the health and socioeconomic status, and not just health care. Many countries make no effort to save very low-birth-weight infants. They are not recorded as live born, and are not even counted.

There are social factors, such as when young people are having babies at a much earlier age. That creates a low-weight baby that has a much less propensity for living after it is born. There are many other issues pointed out by Fred Barnes in his article.

□ 1630

But the point he tries to make is that it is not our health care system that is creating these problems. It is the behavioral patterns of Americans. Behavioral problems become health problems, AIDS, drug abuse, assaults and violence, sexually transmitted diseases, and many other things. The problem is not the health care system. The problem is the people.

Every year the pool of pathology in this country is getting bigger and bigger, and we think that we can take care of everything by calling it a health problem. It is behavioral problems that ought to be addressed. Destroying our health care system by bringing more Government involvement into it is not going to solve the problem.

I hope the gentleman will hold more special orders so that we can get into the details and the numbers and put into the RECORD that the Clinton administration just does not understand the problem. If you do not understand the problem, the solution will be disastrous.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY]. He has encouraged us to delve into this health care matter, and I know he was delayed by a committee hearing today and most of the special order occurred before he arrived. But we do intend to hold, Madam Speaker, additional special orders examining different aspects of the so-called health care crisis and different aspects of our present health care delivery system, and examine a proposed solution thereto.

I should like to conclude by quoting again from this Fred Barnes article. He makes the following point:

In truth, the U.S. has little but painful lessons to learn from the health-care experi-

ence of other countries. There's practically nothing to emulate. On the contrary, foreign health officials, Germans especially, now look at the incentives in the American medical system as a way to remedy problems in their health care systems.

I will interject so now they are looking at us in order to copy some of our features rather than doing the reverse.

Hillary Clinton and health policy wonks should stop apologizing for our system.

They won't. The existence of a few health care problems, chiefly the lack of proper primary care for several million Americans, allows them to declare a crisis and go on wartime footing. Liberals love this. Hillary's task force meets in private, keeps the names of its members secret, obsesses over leaks, spurns the advice of outsiders (doctors, Republicans). The program that emerges is sure to dwarf the problem. If enacted, it will make the problem worse.

Madam Speaker, I include this article in its entirety for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Spectator, May 1993]

WHAT HEALTH-CARE CRISIS?

(By Fred Barnes)

Bill and Hillary Clinton have contributed heavily to a national myth. Mrs. Clinton, as boss of the administration task force plotting to overhaul America's health-care system, refers routinely to "the health-care crisis." Her husband used the same phrase ("Our government will never again be fully solvent until we tackle the health-care crisis," Clinton declared in his State of the Union address on February 17). And he goes one step further. "A lot of Americans don't have health insurance," he told a group of schoolkids February 20 during a nationally televised children's town meeting at the White House. "You know that, don't you? A lot of Americans don't have health care."

The press also trumpets the crisis theme. Parade, the popular Sunday supplement, emblazoned its February 28 cover with its headline: "The Growing Crisis in Health Care." The result is that the American people, despite their personal experience, now believe there actually is a health-care crisis. Most opinion polls show roughly three-quarters of Americans are satisfied with the availability and quality of the health care they receive. Yet, in most polls, 60 to 70 percent feel the health-care system is failing and needs significant, if not radical, reform.

There is no health-care crisis. It's a myth. If millions of seriously ill Americans were being denied medical care, that would be a crisis. But that's not happening. Everyone gets health care in this country—the poor, the uninsured, everyone. No, our health-care system isn't perfect. There isn't enough primary care—regular doctor's visits—for many Americans. Emergency rooms are often swamped. The way hospitals and doctors are financed is sometimes bizarre. Health care may (or may not) be too costly. But it's the best health care system in the world—not arguably the best, but the best. Its shortcomings can be remedied by tinkering, or at least by less-than-comprehensive changes. An overhaul of the sort Hillary Clinton envisions is not only unnecessary, it's certain to reduce, not expand, the amount of health care Americans receive (price controls always lead to less of the controlled commodity). Then we really will have a health-care crisis.

You don't have to take my word that there's no crisis now and that health care here is the world's best. There's solid evidence. Let's examine four key aspects of the health care debate: access, false measures of quality health care, true measures, and how America's system compares with those of other industrialized democracies (Canada, Germany, Japan, Great Britain).

ACCESS

Will someone please tell Bill Clinton that having no health insurance is not the same as having no health care? The uninsured get health care, only less of it than the insured. Being uninsured means "one is more likely to use emergency-room care and less likely to use office, clinic, or regular inpatient care," said Richard Darman, President Bush's budget director, in congressional testimony in 1991. "This is not to suggest that this is desirable. It is not." But it is high-quality health care.

Doctors in emergency rooms are specialists. In fact, they have a professional organization, the American College of Emergency Physicians. Its motto is: "Our specialty is devoted to treating everyone in need, no questions asked." Turning away patients isn't an option. Federal law (section 9121 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985) requires medical screening of everyone requesting care at a hospital emergency room. If treatment is needed, it must be provided. What this adds up to is "universal access" to health care in America, as one head of a hospital board told me.

It's no secret how much health care the uninsured get. The American Hospital Association estimated in 1991 that hospitals provide \$10 billion in uncompensated care annually. Another study found that the 16.6 percent of the nonelderly population who are uninsured—36.3 million people—accounted for 11 percent of the nation's personal health-care expenditures in 1988. They had 37 percent fewer sessions with doctors and 69 percent fewer days in the hospital. There's a reason the uninsured get less health care, beyond the fact most work in low-paying jobs without health insurance. The uninsured tend to be young, thus healthy. According to a new poll by Frederick/Schneiders, 39 percent are 18-29 years of age and another 25 percent are 30-39. By the way, the elderly (65 and up), who require more medical care, are covered. Ninety-nine percent are eligible for Medicare.

To make sure we really have universal access, I checked on how victims of the most recent epidemic, AIDS, are treated. These are the folks doctors are supposed to be leery of dealing with.

What if a penniless AIDS patient shows up at, say, the Whitman-Walker Clinic in Washington, DC? That patient, even if indigent, gets treatment. When the time comes (T-cell count below 500), the patient is started on AZT, which costs about \$5,000 a year. Later, the patient gets expensive experimental drugs: DDI, DDC, D-4T. The drugs are paid for mostly by federal funds. There's also doctor care, painkillers, laboratory work. To prevent infections or complications, the patient is treated with prophylaxis.

A friend of mine volunteered to help an indigent, bedridden AIDS patient. He was amazed at the level of care. "It was an endless supply of extremely sophisticated drugs, an elaborate IV system [to feed the patient], and eventually a five-day-a-week home help nurse," my friend said. "Sometimes we had so much medicine, we had to throw it away. There was never a sense we'd be left in the lurch." The patient had no insurance. He

lived with a boyfriend, but the boyfriend was not required to pay for any of the care. The federal and city governments—the taxpayers—footed the bill. The American Medical Association says "lifetime medical care" for a single AIDS patient costs \$102,000.

FALSE TESTS

Judging by the two most common measures of health, life expectancy at birth and the infant mortality rate, health care in the United States is not the best or even among the best. In 1990, life expectancy in America was 72 years for males, 78.8 for women. This put the U.S. behind Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Great Britain, among others. On infant mortality, the U.S. fared still worse, ranking nineteenth in 1989 with a rate of 9.7 (The infant mortality rate is the number of deaths of children under one year of age, divided by the number of births in a given year, multiplied by 1,000.) Finland, Spain, Ireland, East Germany, and Italy finished higher.

What's wrong with these measures? Just this: they're a reflection of health, not the health-care system. Life expectancy is determined by much more than the quality of a nation's health care. Social factors affect life expectancy, and this is where the U.S. runs into trouble. "Exacerbated social problems . . . adversely affect U.S. health outcomes," noted three Department of Health and Human Services officials in the fall 1992 issue of Health Care Financing Review. "The 20,000 annual U.S. homicides result in per capita homicide rates 10 times those of Great Britain and 4 times those of Canada. There are 100 assaults reported by U.S. emergency rooms for every homicide. About 25 percent of spinal cord injuries result from assaults." And so on. The incidence of AIDS is even more telling. Through June 1992, there were 230,179 reported AIDS cases here, two-thirds of whom have died. Japan, where life expectancy is four years longer for men than in the U.S. and three years longer for women, has had fewer than 300 AIDS cases. Once social factors have played out, the U.S. ranks at the top in life expectancy. At age 80, when most people are highly dependent on the health-care system, Americans have the longest life expectancy (7.1 years for men, 9.0 for women) in the world.

The infant mortality rate (IMR) is also "reflective of health and socioeconomic status and not just health care," wrote four Urban Institute scholars in the summer 1992 issue of Health Care Financing Review. And there are measurement problems. Many countries make no effort to save very-low-birth-weight infants. They aren't recorded as "live born" and aren't counted in infant mortality statistics. In contrast, American hospitals make heroic efforts in neonatal intensive care, saving some infants, losing others, and driving up the IMR. "The more resources a country's health-care system places on saving high-risk newborns, the more likely its registration will report a higher IMR," according to the Urban Institute scholars.

Social factors probably have a bigger impact. A poverty rate twice Canada's and Germany's, a rash of drug-exposed babies, a high incidence of unmarried teenage pregnancy—all lead to low-birth-weight infants and affect the IMR. "Infant mortality rates of babies born to unmarried mothers are about two times higher than the rates of babies born to married mothers," the scholars write. The point is not that America's high IMR is excusable, but that it's grown to abnormal levels in large part because of factors unrelated to the quality of health care.

Not only that. The entire medical system bears the brunt of social and behavioral

problems that are far worse in the U.S. than in other industrialized democracies. "We have a large number of people who indulge in high-risk behavior," says Leroy L. Schwartz, M.D., of Health Policy International, a non-profit research group in Princeton, New Jersey. Behavioral problems become health problems: AIDS, drug abuse, assaults and violence, sexually transmitted diseases, etc. "The problem is not the health-care system," says Dr. Schwartz. "The problem is the people. Every year the pool of pathology in this country is getting bigger and bigger. We think we can take care of everything by calling it a health problem." But we can't.

REAL TESTS

While primary and preventive care are important, the best measure of a health-care system is how well it treats the seriously ill. What if you've got an enlarged prostate? Your chances of survival are better if you're treated here. The U.S. death rate from prostate trouble is one-seventh the rate in Sweden, one-fourth that in Great Britain, one-third that in Germany. Sweden, Great Britain, and Germany may have higher incidences of prostate illness, but not high enough to account for the wide disparity in death rates.

An ulcer of the stomach or intestine? The death rate per 100,000 persons is 2.7 in the U.S. compared to 2.8 in the Netherlands, 3.1 in Canada, 4.9 in Germany, 7.6 in Sweden, and 8 in Great Britain. A hernia or intestinal obstruction? The American death rate is 1.7. It's 2 in Canada, 2.7 in Germany, 3 in the Netherlands, 3.1 in Great Britain, and 3.2 in Sweden. Can these be attributed solely to varying incidences of ulcers and obstructions? Nope.

I could go on, and I will. The overall death rate from cancer is slightly higher in America than in Sweden or Germany, but lower than in Canada, the Netherlands, and Great Britain. But for specific cancers, the U.S. has the lowest death rate: stomach cancer, cervical cancer, uterine cancer. Only Sweden has a lower death rate from breast cancer. The U.S. also has the second lowest death rate from heart attack. No matter what the disease—epilepsy, hypertension, stroke, bronchitis—the U.S. compares well. For a country with a heterogeneous population and large pockets of pathology, this is remarkable. Life expectancy for American males at 65 is 14.7 years, only a tad less than Canada (15), Sweden (14.9), and Switzerland (14.9), more homogeneous countries with fewer social problems. (I'm grateful to Dr. Schwartz for all these figures.)

Another measure that's important is the proliferation of new technology. "Major medical technology has had a profound impact on modern medicine and promises even greater impact in the future," wrote Dale A. Rublee, an expert in cross-national health policy comparisons for the AMA's Center for Health Policy Research, in Health Affairs. He compared the availability of six technologies—open-heart surgery, cardiac catheterization, organ transplantation, radiation therapy, extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy, and magnetic resonance imaging—in the U.S., Canada, and Germany in 1987. "Canada and Germany were selected because their overall health-care resources are fairly comparable to the United States," Rublee wrote. The U.S. came out ahead in every category, way ahead in several. In MRI's, the U.S. had 3.69 per one million people, Germany 0.94, Canada 0.46. For open-heart surgery, the U.S. had 3.26, Canada 1.23, Germany 0.74. For radiation therapy, the U.S. had 3.97, Germany 3.13, Canada 0.54.

Small wonder that, as Rublee put it, "American physicians, with a universe of modern technology at their fingertips, are the envy of the world's physicians."

RIVAL SYSTEMS

Canadian politicians get special health care privileges, moving to the head of waiting lists or getting treatment at the elite National Defense Medical Centre. But that wasn't sufficient for Robert Bourassa, the premier of Quebec. He came to the National Cancer Institute in Bethesda, Maryland, for diagnosis, then returned to the U.S. for surgery, all at his own expense.

The Canadian health-care system has many nice attributes, but speedy treatment isn't one of them. Ian R. Munro, M.D., a Canadian doctor who emigrated to the U.S. wrote in Reader's Digest last September of a young boy in Canada who needed open-heart surgery to free the blood flow to his lungs. He was put on a waiting list. He got a surgery date only after news reports embarrassed health officials. After waiting two months, he died four hours before surgery. This was an extreme case, but waiting is common in the Canadian system, in which the government pays all costs, including set fees for private doctors. A study by the Fraser Institute in 1992 found that 250,000 people are awaiting medical care at any given time. "It is not uncommon for patients to wait months or even years for treatments such as cataract operations, hip replacements, tonsillectomies, gallbladder surgery, hysterectomies, heart operations, and major oral surgery," according to Edmund F. Haislmaier, the Heritage Foundation's health-care expert. Canada has other problems: health costs are rising faster than in the U.S. hospital beds and surgical rooms are dwindling, and doctors are fleeing (8,263 were practicing in the U.S. in 1990).

The Japanese model isn't any better. When Louis Sullivan, M.D., President Bush's secretary of health and human services, visited Japan, he was surprised to find medical care matched that of the U.S.—the U.S. of the 1950s. Japan has universal access and emphasizes primary care at clinics, financed mostly through quasi-public insurance companies. The problem is price controls. "Providers seek to maximize their revenue by seeing more patients," wrote Naoki Ikegami, professor of health at Keio University in Tokyo. "This dilutes the services provided."

Patients receive assembly-line treatment. "In outpatient care, a clinic physician sees an average of 49 patients per day [and] 13 percent see more than 100," Ikegami said. For the elderly, a survey found, the average number of doctor's visits for a six-month period was 17.3 (3.6 here) and the length of visits was 12 minutes (30 in the U.S.). Like Canada's queues, this is an extraordinarily inefficient way to dispense care. Patients return repeatedly to get the same care that in the U.S. is given in a single visit.

Japanese doctors also prescribe and sell drugs. Not surprisingly, they sell plenty. Thirty percent of the country's health expenditures are for drugs (7 percent in the U.S.). In Japan, wrote Ikegami, "no real incentives exist to maintain quality." The one exception is specialists at Japan's teaching hospitals. To avoid queues, patients pay bribes of \$1,000 to \$3,000 to be admitted to a private room and treated by a senior specialist.

Germany also has strict fees for doctors, with predictable results. Annual doctor's visits per capita are 11.5 (5.3 here), a figure exceeded only by Japan (12.9). In other words, price controls are as inefficient in Germany

as in Japan. Hospitals face perverse incentives, too. The government pays a fixed rate per day, regardless of the patient's illness or length of stay. So hospitals pad their billings by keeping patients for unnecessarily long recuperations, which compensates for the losses they incur taking care of critically ill patients.

Then there's Great Britain, home of the National Health Service. Officials take great pride in having reduced the number of patients waiting more than two years for medical attention. In 1986, the number was 90,000; in 1991, 50,000. In April 1992, it was down to 1,600. Sounds great, but there's a catch. The number of patients waiting six months or less grew by 10 percent. The overall drop in waiting lists was only three percent. And this was achieved, a survey by the National Association of Health Authorities and Trusts found, chiefly because of a 13 percent hike in NHS spending in 1991, not increased efficiency. The good news in Great Britain is that private insurance is allowed and 6.6 million Brits have it. Insurance firms encourage beneficiaries to have an operation or other treatment in a private hospital. Sure, the company pays, but it knows that once a patient has experienced care in a private hospital, he'll never go back to the socialized medicine of NHS. And he'll keep buying health insurance. Private hospitals, anxious to fill empty beds, have their own come-on. At Christmas, they offer discount prices for operations.

In truth, the U.S. has little but painful lessons to learn from the health-care experience of other countries. There's practically nothing to emulate. On the contrary, foreign health officials, Germans especially, now look at the incentives in the American medical system as a way to remedy problems in their health care systems. Hillary Clinton and health policy wonks should stop apologizing for our system.

They won't. The existence of a few health care problems, chiefly the lack of proper primary care for several million Americans, allows them to declare a crisis and go on wartime footing. Liberals love this. Hillary's task force meets in private, keeps the names of its members secret, obsesses over leaks, spurns the advice of outsiders (doctors, Republicans). The program that emerges is sure to dwarf the problem. If enacted, it will make the problem worse. This is a common phenomenon in Washington. Some people never learn.

In 1991, an American official addressed Russian health experts in Moscow. He bemoaned that many Americans get care at emergency rooms and occasionally wait six or eight hours. To the American's shock, the Russians erupted in laughter. In Russia, with twice as many doctors per capita as the U.S., a wait of six to eight hours represented unusually fast service.

Madam Speaker, there is no question in my mind but what we need to improve our health care delivery system. However, we must not throw the baby out with the bathwater, as the proverb goes. We must be careful to understand and appreciate the advantages our present system offers us, and based upon that appreciation and understanding carefully craft reforms that improve the access of health care to Americans without destroying its quality or making it unaffordable.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROWLAND (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and June 9, on account of official business in Georgia;

Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and June 9, on account of official business in Georgia.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, 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. ROTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HERGER, for 60 minutes, on July 13.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 60 minutes, on June 10.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes each day, today and on June 9.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LAROCOCO, for 60 minutes, on June 9.

Mr. BECERRA, for 60 minutes, on June 16.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 60 minutes, on June 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. CALVERT in six instances.

Mr. GOODLING in two instances.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

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

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. ACKERMAN in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. MANN.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. KILDEE in two instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. LAMBERT.

Mr. SKELTON.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. CARDIN.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. GALLEGLY in two instances.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. MCDADE.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 50. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S. 183. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Richard "Red" Skelton, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to the public; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S. 216. An act to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S. 685. An act to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 779. An act to continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History, and for other purposes; to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to designate July 5, 1993, through July 12, 1993, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to designate July 1, 1993, as "National NYSP Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H.R. 1313. An act to amend the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 with respect to joint ventures entered into for the purpose of providing a product, process, or service;

H.R. 2128. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for refugee assistance for fiscal years 1993 and 1994;

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as "Emergency Medical Services Week"; and

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to designate the months of May 1993 and May 1994 as "National Trauma Awareness Month."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1993, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1318. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting six proposed rescissions of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 683(a)(1) (H. Doc. No. 103-93); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1319. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the fiscal year 1994 request for appropriations for the Agency for International Development, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1320. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Selected Acquisition Reports [SAR's] for the quarter ending December 31, 1992, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1321. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(3) (104 Stat. 1812); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1322. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Future Years Defense Program [FYDP] and associated procurement and RDT&E annexes for the fiscal year 1994 President's budget, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 221; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1323. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Malaysia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-15), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1324. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Notification of proposed licenses for the export of defense articles to Kuwait (Transmittal No. DCT-22-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1325. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for export of major defense equipment sold to Turkey (Transmittal No. OTC-30-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1326. 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.

1327. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in effect for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1) (H. Doc. No. 103-95); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his determination that Belgaría meets the emigration criteria of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b) and 2439(b) (H. Doc. No. 103-96); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1329. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1) (H. Doc. No. 103-97); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

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. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes (Rept. 103-116, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 5. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the

Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes (Rept. 103-116, Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FAZIO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2348. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-117). 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. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 2330. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2331. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the rights of veterans with regard to procedures for housing loans upon default, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 2332. A bill to amend the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 concerning continued use of State legalization impact assistance grants for services relating to naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 2333. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and related agencies, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 2334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the collection of employment taxes on domestic services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINK (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ):

H.R. 2335. A bill to amend certain education laws to provide for service-learning and to strengthen the skills of teachers and improve instruction in service-learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAMBERT:

H.R. 2336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore a 100 percent deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 2337. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to consider, in determining whether to approve or disapprove a project grant application submitted by an airport, whether the policymaking board of the airport includes at least 2 representatives of each State which is located within 5 miles of the airport; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MANTON:

H.R. 2338. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide emergency relief to the U.S. airline industry by facili-

tating financing for investment in new aircraft and by encouraging the retirement of older, noisier, and less efficient aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 2339. A bill to amend the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 to authorize appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1998; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 2340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the cleanup of certain contaminated industrial sites; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 2341. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2342. A bill to reinstate the eligibility of certain nonaccredited institutions of higher education for financial assistance under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Ms. DUNN, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 to permit States to adopt timber export programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 2344. A bill to amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act—the "Safe Drinking Water Act"—to redirect and extend Federal and State activities to protect public water supplies in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H.R. 2345. A bill to provide assistance to employees who are subject to a plant closing or mass layoff because their work is transferred to a foreign country that has low wages or unhealthy working conditions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 2346. A bill to ensure that consumer credit reports include information on any overdue child support obligations of the consumer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. APPELEGATE, and Mr. KING):

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 12 through 19, 1994, as "National Men's Health Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Unit-

ed States with respect to the proposal and the enactment of laws by popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YATES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KING, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. McNULTY):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress respecting the 80th anniversary of the Anti-Defamation League; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 189. Resolution honoring cultural achievements of the Voice of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLUTE introduced a bill (H.R. 2347) to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Mystique*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. MINGE.
 H.R. 26: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 27: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 107: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 127: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. SLATTERY.
 H.R. 136: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BALLENGER.
 H.R. 139: Mr. LANCASTER.
 H.R. 165: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 285: Mr. FISH.
 H.R. 349: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 357: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 388: Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 419: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 425: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 426: Mr. FISH, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 427: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 455: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 456: Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 462: Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. HUTTO.
 H.R. 684: Ms. MALONEY.
 H.R. 691: Mr. HAYES.
 H.R. 739: Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. BAKER of California.
 H.R. 789: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Flor-

ida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.R. 864: Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 894: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 921: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 982: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KING, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SARPALIS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 999: Mr. ROEMER and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1007: Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 1078: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 1080: Ms. MOLINARI and Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 1081: Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 1082: Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 1096: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 1164: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
 H.R. 1277: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1290: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1291: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1296: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. CLAY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. FURSE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.
 H.R. 1368: Mr. PAXON, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1406: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. WILSON.
 H.R. 1412: Mr. DICKS, Mr. YATES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. SWIFT.
 H.R. 1419: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 1420: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MINGE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. RAVENEL.
 H.R. 1489: Mr. FROST and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1529: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. EMERSON.
 H.R. 1583: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1586: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mrs. UNSOELD.
 H.R. 1604: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. KLUG.
 H.R. 1608: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SISISKY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1671: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1679: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 1680: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1724: Mr. WILSON and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1725: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DORNAN.
 H.R. 1726: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. HANCOCK.
 H.R. 1796: Ms. MALONEY and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1800: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1863: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HYDE, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 1872: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1945: Mr. EWING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KASICH, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. MCCURDY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. INSLER, and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 1981: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1986: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1996: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
 H.R. 1999: Mr. MCDADE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 2033: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2130: Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 2142: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2219: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FROST, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2253: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KYL, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2271: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING, Mr. KIM, Mr. KYL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2315: Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.J. Res. 86: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. BUNNING.
 H.J. Res. 139: Ms. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 162: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DARDEN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 173: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. COLEMAN.

