

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 14, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

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

You have promised to every person, O God, the possibilities of peace in our lives and in our world. We admit that because of a lack of vision we have not always sought harmony and unity and have turned to our own ways. We pray, O God, that Your Spirit will cause us to look beyond ourselves and see Your heavenly revelation, a time when the instruments of hatred and strife will be put aside and we will see anew the beauty and wonder and joy of people living in respect and appreciation. May Your peace, O God, that passes all understanding, be with us now and evermore. 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.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MANZULLO 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.

### IN SUPPORT OF VICTIMS' RIGHTS

(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, Donald Leroy Evans and two other prisoners overpowered a guard this past weekend in a Mississippi jail and escaped.

Donald Leroy Evans is in jail for kidnapping, raping, and murdering a 10-year-old girl.

In addition, Members, Donald Leroy Evans has now confessed to over 70 murders throughout America and Canada. In fact, at this very minute, as law enforcement officials are searching for Evans, they are searching for the remains of victims scattered throughout this entire continent.

My question to the Members of Congress is, What happens when we cap-

ture Evans? Do we give him a job in a prison laundry? Do we give him another life sentence so that he can rape and kill more people?

It is time for Congress to quit worrying about the rights of these murderers, start worrying about the rights of these victims, where tombstones are all over America emblazoned with these sad tales.

Congress' job is to enact the death penalty. Stop wasting taxpayers' dollars feeding these bums. I hope to God we catch them.

### UNSEEMLY DEVELOPMENTS

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, an exciting thing happened in my district last Friday. Bill Clinton and the First Lady sent out Hillary's brother, Tony Rodham, to tell some wild stories about me.

Mr. Rodham claimed to the press in Orange County, CA, that I said the young Bill Clinton studied in law school under Ho Chi Minh. What? I mean, get real. When did Ho Chi Minh die? When did he die? September 3, 1969.

At that time, Clinton was about to write all those sleazy letters and was also busy dodging the draft and suppressing his induction notice. And yet here comes Tony Rodham saying something about Ho Chi Minh walking around teaching at Yale Law School at the height of the Vietnam war. Some of the press even laughed at this impossible fiction.

Mr. Rodham is a field rep for the DNC, Mr. Speaker. Do my colleagues know this? I guess since those travel office opportunities did not open up at the White House, the DNC decided to sign up Tony Rodham at the Democratic National Committee, where he is getting paid.

Why doesn't the White House send people to California to help our aerospace workers, to attack crime, to close our porous borders and stop illegal immigration? Instead, he is out telling big lies about yours truly.

Unseemly, Mr. Speaker. Unseemly.

### KEEP NAVAL ORDNANCE STATION OPEN

(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, very unexpectedly, on May 21, Naval Ordnance Station in Louisville was put on the base closure list because a competitor, a corporation which wants to take all of Naval Ordnance's work, fed some erroneous information to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

June 1, in Louisville, we were honored to have Chairman Jim Courter and Mr. Alex Yellin, of the Base Closure Commission, tour Naval Ordnance and see the outstanding work we do in Louisville in behalf of the Navy and our national defense.

Later that same day, in Columbus, OH, before four members of the Commission, my mayor and my county judge, the Lieutenant Governor, the chairman of our Chamber of Commerce and a representative of the Machinists Union at Naval Ordnance made a presentation, a very persuasive presentation in behalf of Naval Ordnance.

On tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the unified Kentucky and Indiana congressional delegations will again present to the full Base Closure Commission the story of Naval Ordnance.

The story is: Naval Ordnance Station is the best of the breed. It does the best gun work for the Navy. It is also the last of the breed. It is the only plant left. We have to keep Naval Ordnance open.

### REVISITING THE RULE ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week we considered the legislative appropriations bill, and I went to the Committee on Rules, as did many of my colleagues, because we are concerned and are serious about the desire to cut spending first in this body.

I was not allowed to present on the floor of the House, even to be considered, the amendment that I wanted to cut in the legislative appropriations bill. And most of my colleagues were not allowed to present the amendments to even be considered on the floor of the House.

We were serious about wanting to cut, but somehow or other we were not allowed to even bring our ideas to the floor of the House.

I represent 600,000 people in the State of Colorado. My colleagues all represent about the same number of people, and when I was home this weekend, those people do not understand,

□ 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.

Mr. Speaker, why their Representative's voice, when he wants to cut spending in the House, is silenced, why I do not get an opportunity to present my ideas and why most of my colleagues do not either.

Mr. Speaker, maybe you could explain that to them and maybe you could explain whether or not that is going to be your policy as we consider the 12 remaining appropriations bills.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY, HARLEY!

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, there is something in Milwaukee's water.

This weekend, my hometown of Milwaukee hosted Harley Davidson's 90th anniversary celebration, and what a thrilling event it was. Over 100,000 Harley enthusiasts, known affectionately as hogs, roared into town to celebrate an American legend—the Harley Davidson motorcycle.

There was a time not so long ago when many doubted this great company would even see its 90th anniversary. With classic American know-how, the company defied the skeptics by recommitting itself to lean and smart management and to its dedicated, top quality work force.

These bikers ride the world's most prestigious and thoroughly American motorcycle, and they know it. They were model guests, and Milwaukeeans opened their hearts to the owners of this hometown iron.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this past weekend showed that there is something in Milwaukee's water. Whether you call it friendship, hospitality, or gratitude, we are the home of the Harley Davidson, and we are mighty proud of that.

Happy birthday, Harley.

#### HIV-INFECTED REFUGEES

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, recently a Federal judge ruled to admit the HIV-infected refugees being held in Guantanamo Bay into the United States.

Last week, the Washington Post reported that the White House will not appeal this ruling.

Mr. Speaker, has President Clinton already forgotten the NIH bill he signed that codified the ban against allowing people with deadly diseases into the United States? Doesn't he realize the cost to taxpayers for each person admitted with the deadly HIV infection? And most importantly, doesn't he realize that he is jeopardizing the health and well-being of American citizens?

I haven't forgotten that it was the intent of this Congress and the citizens of this Nation to ban anyone with deadly diseases from entering the United States. I haven't forgotten that it costs over \$100,000 to care for each HIV-infected individual. And, I haven't forgotten that HIV always leads to AIDS, which always leads to death.

Mr. Speaker, this country needs the President to look out for her best interests, not his own political interests. It is time for the President to stop trying to be on all sides of an issue. He should instruct his Attorney General to appeal this case, and block these AIDS-infected immigrants from crossing our borders.

#### □ 1210

#### AMERICANS SAY NO TO TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I received a petition from a man by the name of Robert Malinowsky in Orangeville, Stevenson County, the 16th District of Illinois. He had gathered over 2,000 signatures of people who signed on to the statement.

We, the people, have been taxed enough. Please vote no to any and all tax increases President Clinton may dream up. The taxpayers—us—are about ready to revolt. I think you all need a course in economics—raising taxes has never helped the economy. The money needs to stay in our pockets so we can spend, save, and dream. Our dreams are what creates new business, which provides jobs, which provide us with money to spend and save. Governmental spending is not the answer, it's the problem. Thirty years of a tax-and-spend Congress has created the multitrillion-dollar debt.

We do not want to make any more contributions.

That is from a man who lives in a small town in the middle of this country, who understands the economics more than the President and more than most of the Members of this Congress.

#### NOT RICH, JUST A LONG-TIME CONTRIBUTOR TO SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent in Walnut Creek, CA, that goes as follows:

I have paid into the Social Security program since I was a freshman in college (1938). I had to work in order to pay my tuition, buy books and maintain living quarters. I paid Social Security while I was in the military. After my retirement (30 years service) in August 1971, I continued to pay in my post-retirement employment period. I was employed by Golden Gate University for 12

years until my retirement from a regular teaching schedule. Subsequently, I took my Social Security at age 62. I continued with Golden Gate, part time, as an adjunct professor and continued to pay into the Social Security system.

Now the proposal is to increase my income tax because I make, in retirement, more than \$32,000 a year. This is a real "stab in the back."

Is this the rich our Government is attempting to soak? I do not know which of the kids at the White House dreamed up the tax Social Security scheme, but I am against it, and I advise, Mr. Speaker, all seniors should contact their elected Representatives to drop it from President Clinton's tax-and-spend scheme.

#### NAFTA WILL CREATE JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, NAFTA is about jobs—creating jobs in American businesses, big and small.

RJM International is an international management and environmental consulting firm located in Los Angeles. This Hispanic-owned company does a half-million dollars in business serving American and Mexican companies operating in our two countries. NAFTA will spur improved environmental management in Mexico, and many American environmental firms are certain to benefit.

Mentra Labs, based in Miami, FL, is a minority-owned medical, laboratory, and hospital supplies export company. They do over 15 percent of their business in Mexico alone. Juan Ortiz, their director for Latin American Marketing, says:

Mexico has advantages over our other export markets \*\*\* closeness, stability in the economy, and a strong identification with our products and industry. Mexico is more up to date than other Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of an American businessman who actually knows about doing business in Mexico. We should heed them, and remember that NAFTA will create American jobs.

#### TIME TO FREEZE SPENDING

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that, if we are really going to get down to deficit and debt reduction, we have got to declare war. We have got to have that same spirit that we had when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor. We need to have Democrats, Republicans, north, south, east, and west, rural and urban, everyone united behind addressing this deficit reduction problem.

This debt is going to kill us. It is a matter of mathematics. It is not a matter of partisan rhetoric. It is not a matter of Republican or Democrat sins. It is a matter of everyone in America has to go ahead and roll up his or her sleeves and get to work.

I support a balanced budget amendment. I think it would be a great idea. If it is good enough for every city and county in the entire State of Georgia and most all across the United States of America, then it is good enough for the U.S. Congress.

However, it will not do anything immediately. Immediately we have got to pass a budget that will freeze spending at current levels. We may have to increase it or decrease it for each department, but it is time to freeze our spending habits.

#### URGING MEMBERS TO VOTE FOR SPENDING CUTS, NOT MORE TAXES

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as the head of the task force to protect Social Security, I am very concerned about this \$29 billion tax that is being imposed on our Social Security recipients. I see in today's paper, and I say this in all fairness to my Democrat friends, Democrat pollsters are saying that the next election is going to be a bloodbath for the Democrat party.

Let me just suggest this. Rather than vote for all these tax increases, why do we not vote for less taxes? Why do we not vote against taxes and start voting for spending cuts?

For example, this coming week we have foreign aid before us. How can we spend billions of dollars in foreign aid when we are putting a \$29 billion tax on our senior citizens? Let us not worry about the special interest groups. Let us worry about the American people. I am asking the Democrats who have run this House for 40 years for less taxes, and let us cut spending first.

#### HIV-INFECTED HAITIANS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, last weeks ruling by a New York judge to admit 158 HIV-infected Haitians into the United States not only has serious health and financial implications, it sends disturbing signals about who is writing and implementing our immigration policy. The first group is scheduled to arrive shortly in south Florida, which is neither prepared nor able to safely and humanely provide for them.

The judge's decision effectively orders the executive branch to admit the

HIV-infected individuals held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, despite current United States law banning such immigration. In fact, just last week President Clinton signed legislation codifying the current ban. This body overwhelmingly voted to support that ban.

The White House could and should appeal this decision. I and many of my colleagues have urged them to do just that as our States face a financial and social burden they cannot handle.

By not immediately appealing this onerous decision, the White House has abdicated its responsibility to set and enforce America's immigration policy. We ask for better than that from President Clinton.

#### URGING OPPOSITION TO THE STRIKER REPLACEMENT BILL

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill.

Supporters of H.R. 5 believe that the bill would encourage fairness to workers and productivity in industry. However, the consequences of this legislation would be drastic and its effects detrimental to the rights of the American worker and the competitive strength of American businesses.

This bill would undermine collective bargaining between employers and workers. There would no longer be an incentive to negotiate. Labor bosses would not need to seriously negotiate when they could strike and still know that there was a guaranteed job once the strike ended.

H.R. 5 would disrupt the labor peace our Nation has largely enjoyed since the 1980's by making American industries less efficient and the business environment less stable. Once again we would be witness to labor violence as businesses and workers deal with loss of income and perceived injustices.

Furthermore, the very objective of this bill, to protect the American worker, would backfire under H.R. 5. Instead of empowering the worker, this bill would only empower union bosses. Union officials would have the weapon of blackmail over employers and the rank-and-file worker. Strikes could be threatened in an effort to make unionization a compulsory condition of employment. Union officials would also have the power to coerce workers to strike. Workers who refused to strike could be victimized by the very unions who are supposed to represent the workers' best interest.

Workers would also lose because some employers could not afford to meet the demands of the unions. Plants would be forced to close. Jobs would be lost. All because many employers could not weather the economic con-

sequences of trying to maintain production in a strike environment.

It is totally unproductive to disrupt our economy by passing this ill-conceived bill.

It is also the height of folly to return to a discredited labor policy which will only serve to make America a less efficient player in the world economy.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our economy, our businesses, and our workers, and their families, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5.

□ 1220

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken at the end of the legislative business day.

#### FOREST RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND SHORTAGE RELIEF AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2343) to amend the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 to permit States to adopt timber export programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2343

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993".

#### SEC. 2. RESTRICTION ON EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED TIMBER FROM STATE AND OTHER PUBLIC LANDS.

Section 491 of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 620c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—  
(A) by striking "(e)" and inserting "(g)"; and

(B) by striking "in the amounts specified" and inserting "as provided";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ", notwithstanding any other provision of law," after "prohibit"; and

(ii) by striking "not later than 21 days after the date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting ", effective June 1, 1993";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

"(A) The Secretary of Commerce shall issue an order referred to in subsection (a) to prohibit, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the export of unprocessed timber

originating from public lands, effective during the period beginning on June 1, 1993, and ending on December 31, 1995.”;

(I) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by redesignating such subparagraph as subparagraph (B); and

(II) by striking “total annual sales volume” and inserting “annual sales volume in that State of unprocessed timber originating from public lands”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (4); and

(ii) by striking “States pursuant to this title” and inserting “the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to this title and the effectiveness of State programs authorized under subsection (d)”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) PROHIBITION ON SUBSTITUTION.—

“(A) PROHIBITION.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each order of the Secretary of Commerce under paragraph (1) or (2) shall also prohibit, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person from purchasing, directly or indirectly, unprocessed timber originating from public lands in a State if—

“(i) such unprocessed timber would be used in substitution for exported unprocessed timber originating from private lands in that State; or

“(ii) such person has, during the preceding 24-month period, exported unprocessed timber originating from private lands in that State.

“(B) EXEMPTION.—The prohibitions referred to in subparagraph (A) shall not apply in a State on or after the date on which—

“(i) the Governor of that State provides the Secretary of Commerce with notification of a prior program under subparagraph (C) of subsection (d)(2);

“(ii) the Secretary of Commerce approves a program of that State under subparagraph (A) of subsection (d)(2); or

“(iii) regulations of the Secretary of Commerce issued under subsection (c) to carry out this section take effect, whichever occurs first.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (e) through (j) as subsections (g) through (l), respectively; and

(4) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) FEDERAL PROGRAM.—

“(1) ADMINISTRATION BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Commerce shall, as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993—

“(i) determine the species, grades, and geographic origin of unprocessed timber to be prohibited from export in each State that is subject to an order issued under subsection (a);

“(ii) administer the prohibitions consistent with this title;

“(iii) ensure that the species, grades, and geographic origin of unprocessed timber prohibited from export within each State is representative of the species, grades, and geographic origin of timber comprising the total timber sales program of the State; and

“(iv) issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

“(B) EXEMPTION.—The actions and regulations of the Secretary under subparagraph

(A) shall not apply with respect to a State that is administering and enforcing a program under subsection (d).

“(2) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies with appropriate jurisdiction to assist the Secretary in carrying out this title.

“(d) AUTHORIZED STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF NEW STATE PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Governor of any State may submit a program to the Secretary of Commerce for approval that—

“(A) implements, with respect to unprocessed timber originating from public lands in that State, the prohibition on exports set forth in the Secretary’s order under subsection (a); and

“(B) ensures that the species, grades, and geographic origin of unprocessed timber prohibited from export within the State is representative of the species, grades, and geographic origin of timber comprising the total timber sales program of the State.

“(2) APPROVAL OF STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(A) PROGRAM APPROVAL.—Not later than 30 days after the submission of a program under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Commerce shall approve the program unless the Secretary finds that the program will result in the export of unprocessed timber from public lands in violation of this title and publishes that finding in the Federal Register.

“(B) STATE PROGRAM IN LIEU OF FEDERAL PROGRAM.—If the Secretary of Commerce approves a program submitted under paragraph (1), the Governor of the State for which the program was submitted, or such other official of that State as the Governor may designate, may administer and enforce the program, which shall apply in that State in lieu of the regulations issued under subsection (c).

“(C) PRIOR STATE PROGRAMS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993, the Governor of any State that had, before May 4, 1993, issued regulations under this subsection as in effect before May 4, 1993, may provide the Secretary of Commerce with written notification that the State has a program that was in effect on May 3, 1993, and that meets the requirements of paragraph (1). Upon such notification, that State may administer and enforce that program in that State until the end of the 9-month period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Commerce issues regulations under subsection (c), and that program shall, during the period in which it is so administered and enforced, apply in that State in lieu of the regulations issued under subsection (c). Such Governor may submit, with such notification, the program for approval by the Secretary under paragraph (1).

“(e) PRIOR CONTRACTS.—Nothing in this section shall apply to—

“(1) any contract for the purchase of unprocessed timber originating from public lands that was entered into before—

“(A) September 10, 1990, with respect to States with annual sales volumes of 400,000,000 board feet or less; or

“(B) January 1, 1991, with respect to States with annual sales volumes greater than 400,000,000 board feet; or

“(2) any contract under which exports of unprocessed timber were permitted pursuant to an order of the Secretary of Commerce in effect under this section before October 23, 1992.

“(f) WESTERN RED CEDAR.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede section 7(i) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(i)).”

### SEC. 3. MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) MONITORING.—Section 492(a) of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 620d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end of the paragraph;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting a semicolon; and

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

“(3) each person who acquires, either directly or indirectly, unprocessed timber originating from public lands in a State that is subject to an order issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 491(a), other than a State that is administering and enforcing a program under section 491(d), shall report the receipt and disposition of the timber to the Secretary of Commerce, in such form as the Secretary may by rule prescribe, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to hold any person responsible for reporting the disposition of any timber held by subsequent persons; and

“(4) each person who transfers to another person unprocessed timber originating from public lands in a State that is subject to an order issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 491(a), other than a State that is administering and enforcing a program under section 491(d), shall, before completing the transfer—

“(A) provide to such other person a written notice, in such form as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, that shall identify the public lands from which the timber originated; and

“(B) receive from such other person—

“(i) a written acknowledgment of the notice; and

“(ii) a written agreement that the recipient of the timber will comply with the requirements of this title,

in such form as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe; and

“(C) provide to the Secretary of Commerce copies of all notices, acknowledgments, and agreements referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).”

(b) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 492(c) of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” before “If the Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), if the Secretary of Commerce finds, on the record and after an opportunity for a hearing, that a person, with willful disregard for the restrictions contained in an order of the Secretary under section 491(a) on exports of unprocessed timber from public lands, exported or caused to be exported unprocessed timber originating from public lands in violation of such order, the Secretary may assess against such person a civil penalty of not more than \$500,000 for each violation, or 3 times the gross value of the unprocessed timber involved in the violation, whichever amount is greater.

“(ii) Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to exports of unprocessed timber originating from public lands in a State that is administering and enforcing a program under section 491(d).”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(B) by inserting "(A)" before "If the Secretary"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), if the Secretary of Commerce finds, on the record and after an opportunity for a hearing, that a person has violated, on or after June 1, 1993, any provision of this title or any regulation issued under this title relating to the export of unprocessed timber originating from public lands (whether or not the violation caused the export of unprocessed timber from public lands in violation of this title), the Secretary may assess against such person a civil penalty to the same extent as the Secretary concerned may impose a penalty under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A).

"(ii) Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to unprocessed timber originating from public lands in a State that is administering and enforcing a program under section 491(d)."

#### SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL].

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today addresses a pressing matter for the Pacific Northwest. A recent Ninth District Court ruling has put thousands of jobs—approximately 6,100 jobs in Washington State—at risk.

Families in Washington's timber communities may face the prospect of mills closing down and unemployment if we do not take action quickly. The northwest congressional delegation has come together in a bipartisan, cooperative spirit to ensure that those jobs are preserved and that the log export ban from public lands is reinstated.

In 1990, Congress, responding to the tremendous need to protect the supply of logs to domestic mills and save American jobs, passed legislation banning the export of logs from State and public lands. As the biggest State-timberland owner in the country—almost 50 percent of all State-owned timberland in the Nation is owned by the State of Washington—and also the biggest exporter of raw logs we have been the State most affected by this legislation.

On May 4 of this year, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, while affirming Congress' authority to restrict the export of logs, ruled part of that law unconstitutional, based on the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The bill before us today is a constitutionally sound solution. The legislation includes a Federal restriction on State log exports, but gives States the option of establishing their own regulatory program to implement the ban.

This is a status quo fix to a crisis in Washington State. This bill only reinstates the law as it existed before the May 4 court decision. It does not introduce new ideas, does not attempt to go further than current law, nor will it affect the export of privately owned timber.

This legislation is broadly supported, in bipartisan fashion, throughout the Pacific Northwest. A wide range of interests were consulted throughout the drafting and markup stages.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for her immediate action in getting this legislation before us. I would also like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] for his expeditious help in getting this legislation passed.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2343 was reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee without objection on June 10.

This bill was considered by the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and the Environment on June 9, and similarly reported without objection.

During the subcommittee's consideration, Chairman GEJDENSON and I engaged in a colloquy to explain the bill. This measure is necessary to correct a constitutional problem with the log export legislation that Congress passed in 1990.

On May 4, a Federal appeals court overturned that legislation, on the grounds that it unconstitutionally compelled a Governor to regulate log exports on public lands. The bill we bring before you today vests the regulatory authority in the Secretary of Commerce.

He is given authority to redelegate this authority to a Governor, upon request. This meets the constitutional test. This legislation applies primarily in the Pacific Northwest, in particular the State of Washington.

It affects logging only on public lands, not private property, and most important to me, it is a consensus bill. It is supported by all members of the Washington State delegation.

It is supported by the timber industry. And it is supported by the Governor of the State of Washington, and Congresswoman Jennifer Dunn also is in support of this legislation and her statement of support will be included for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, without this legislation, there will not be a sound legal

basis for properly managing the timber resources on public land in Washington State.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, consensus bill.

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

Mr. ROTH. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure, the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993. Prompt consideration of this legislation is critical to keeping in place the ban on the export of unprocessed timber from State lands, a ban that could be terminated on Thursday, June 17.

This legislation was considered by the Economic Policy, Trade and Environment Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee on June 8, just 1 day after it was introduced by the gentlewoman from Washington, Congresswoman JOLENE UNSOELD. The full committee at the request of the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] considered it expeditiously on June 9 so that it could be placed on today's calendar.

Its immediate adoption is required to preserve the present policy of banning the export of unprocessed timber from State lands. It permits States to establish programs to administer timber export restrictions, but requires the Secretary of Commerce to establish such programs in the event that affected States do not act.

This is a noncontroversial measure with the backing of environmental and timber interests as well as the bipartisan support of our colleagues from the Pacific Northwest. Accordingly, I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York, for his excellent statement and his help on this particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, speedy enactment of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993 (H.R. 2343) is of vital importance to thousands of workers in the Northwest's wood processing industry whose jobs depend on this legislation.

As the House sponsor of the bill, I want to express my deep appreciation to all those who recognized this urgent need and pulled out the stops to move it through the House of Representatives.

I would especially like to thank the chairmen, Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. GEJDENSON, and ranking minority members,

Mr. GILMAN and Mr. ROTH, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this legislation with such extraordinary speed. My Washington State colleague who serves on the committee, MARIA CANTWELL, deserves special recognition for ably shepherding the measure through committee. Finally, I am grateful to the chairmen and ranking members of the House Agriculture and Natural Resources committees, as well as the Speaker, for helping to expedite the consideration of the legislation by the House.

Lest you wonder why we had to call on so many to assist us, I would now like to explain why we are in such a hurry to enact this legislation.

With the dramatic decline in timber harvested from Federal forests in the Pacific Northwest, it has become increasingly important to reserve a greater share of the region's timber for starving domestic, independent mills, rather than continue to allow subsidized and protected foreign log merchants almost unrestricted access to our scarce timber resources. For example, in Washington State in 1989, approximately 40 percent of the total harvest was exported as unprocessed logs, primarily to Japan, which was cited by the Commerce Department for egregious unfair trade practices in wood products.

Congress recognized this problem in 1990, and with the support of the entire Northwest congressional delegation, enacted the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage and Relief Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-382). The act, which was sponsored by Representative AL SWIFT and Senator SLADE GORTON, made permanent the ban on the export of Federal timber and, for the first time, restricted the export of unprocessed timber originating from State and other public lands. The act did this by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to restrict the export of unprocessed timber from State lands but required States to implement the restrictions.

Following the 1992 Supreme Court ruling in *New York versus United States*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on May 4, 1993—while affirming the power of Congress to restrict log exports—found that the part of the act which required States to implement a Federal regulatory program was a violation of the reserve powers clause of the 10th amendment. The ninth circuit's decision in *Board of Natural Resources versus Brown* became effective June 1, 1993, technically opening the way for hundreds of millions of board feet of State timber—and thousands of jobs—to be exported.

Faced with this prospect, the Northwest delegation has once again rallied to save this timber and the processing jobs that go with it for our workers and our mills. We can't afford to return to the days when State lands were used as tree farms for the Far East.

The legislation before us restores the 1990 restrictions on State and other public timber, but this time, instead of requiring States to implement the ban, it gives them a choice of either submitting a State implementation plan to the Secretary of Commerce for approval or accepting a Federal regulatory program for that State. This approach is employed in several environmental statutes and we are assured by constitutional experts that it is sound. To prevent a lapse in restrictions on unprocessed timber from State lands, the legislation has an effective date of June 1, 1993.

This measure is designed to restore, in a constitutionally sound manner, the State log export restrictions of the 1990 act. Nothing more; nothing less. We are confident the legislation does just that. It has the full support of our Governor Mike Lowry.

It should be noted that the legislation does not affect the export of logs from private lands.

By respecting the delicate balance of the original enactment, we have achieved a remarkable degree of consensus. It is cosponsored by every member of the Northwest congressional delegation—Republican and Democrat—and is supported by both industry and environmental groups.

At a time when timber is in short supply in the Northwest, it makes no sense to be exporting unprocessed timber from public lands, which should be managed for the public benefit. We need to get the greatest economic benefit and the greatest number of jobs from the timber we harvest. That means processing our timber in our mills.

I am greatly encouraged to see the broad support for this measure and how effective we can be at solving problems when we work together. I am proud to be a part of a delegation that has a reputation for problem solving and team work and hope that the rapid enactment of this legislation can be encouragement for us to tackle other problems facing our Nation in a similar manner.

□ 1230

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to the bill under suspension, H.R. 2343, the Forest Resource Conservation and Shortage Relief Amendments Act of 1993, which will reinstate the ban on the export of logs from State lands in Washington and Oregon.

H.R. 2343 is an important bill to Washington State and the Northwest region, and it serves as an important action in addressing the complex and divisive problems in the region related to timber supply. This bill corrects previously passed legislation addressing a

State ban, responding to a decision by the ninth circuit that the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 violated the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution in directing the Governors to issue regulations to carry out the ban.

The bill under suspension today, does not direct the Governors' actions on issuing regulations and carrying out enforcement. Rather, the Commerce Department issues orders to prohibit the export of unprocessed timber from State lands, and a vehicle is established for the Commerce Secretary to approve the plan for implementation submitted by the States, and allows for the affected States and Federal Government to work together and cooperatively to carry out statutory intent. If the States fail to submit their own regulatory plan for carrying out the ban, the regulations issued by the Commerce Department will serve as the vehicle for implementation.

H.R. 2343 does not affect the longstanding distinction that we have held in the Northwest between private and public lands.

This is a positive bill that demonstrates that we are capable of achieving solutions to our problems in the region. It shows that we in the Northwest can come together and find solutions to the conflicts facing our region relative to forest management conflicts. Both the Oregon and Washington delegations have come together in favor of this bill in a bipartisan fashion. In Washington, both our Governor and lands commissioner have joined our efforts and extended their support for this legislation.

The swift passage of this bill in both Chambers will send a reassuring message to the Northwest region, where there is a great anticipation over the upcoming plan to be unveiled by the Clinton administration to deal with all aspects of forest management problems in the region.

Most importantly, the ban on State log exports represents a key vehicle for saving jobs in the region. Reinstating the ban could mean saving as many as 6,000 jobs directly and indirectly related to the timber industry.

This bill is an important and positive means of providing hope to workers, while contributing to the stability of small businesses and timber-dependent communities. I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time in a spirit of bipartisan support for this bill.

I introduced the first legislation here in the House back in 1988 to ban exports of unprocessed timber taken from publicly owned lands. My bill passed the House, and eventually the legislation proceeded into law.

This legislation here today is necessary, because the provisions of that act which affected exports from State-owned lands have been invalidated by the courts, and I am confident and hopeful that the changes we are making today will restore our longstanding intent.

My colleagues, the Northwest timber industry and our workers are going through very difficult economic times. The industry has modernized and greatly reduced the number of jobs it takes to produce wood products. Many areas have been overcut, and the public is appropriately demanding increased sensitivity to the land.

But there are some things that we can do to help assure our domestic timber mills a source of raw materials. There are things that we can do to create timber jobs and keep timber jobs, and at a minimum, we should require that trees cut from publicly owned lands must be used by domestic manufacturers at home.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Northwest exported more than 2.5 billion, and that is with a "b," billion board feet, of unprocessed timber to mills in the Pacific Rim, particularly to the nation of Japan.

In Montana we now hear a sucking sound. There is no mistaking what that sucking sound is. As coastal mills bid up the prices for national forest timber sales, they are outcompeting Idaho mills and Idaho firms. In turn, Idaho mills are outcompeting Montana mills for sales from our forests. The evidence of that sucking sound is timber going west on Highway 2, Highway 12, and I-93, where raw whole Montana logs go west to replace supplies to whole logs that have been put on ships and sent to the Pacific rim.

We want to stop this jobs-sucking sound in Montana. This bill is very important to us. It will help our State's mills compete for publicly owned timber.

I commend my colleagues for working together in a bipartisan manner to create and keep jobs, and I urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for the time.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Mr. Speaker, last year in the practice of so-called free trade, the Pacific Northwest exported more than 1.5 billion board feet of raw logs to Japan. In Japan more than 15,000 sawmills were humming with activity; yet that nation harvested virtually no timber. In the Pacific Northwest, the region of greatest harvest in the world, 360 sawmills struggled to find adequate supplies of raw materials. To repeat, in

Japan, an insignificant amount of harvest, 15,000 sawmills operating, and in the Pacific Northwest, the area of greatest harvest, 350 sawmills struggling for adequate supply. Something is very wrong with that picture.

Now a Federal judge has threatened to make that situation worse by overturning our ban on the export of State logs.

With the legislation that we will hopefully pass today, we will restore the right of Oregon and Washington States to keep their logs and their jobs home from timber harvested on State lands.

I urge my colleagues to vote affirmatively for this legislation.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington for her patience and leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

For many of us in the House, the forestry crisis in the Pacific Northwest is an inherited crisis.

Before many of us got here, our last remaining old growth forests were put up for rapid liquidation at a scandalous rate. Before many of us got here, our ancient forests were so decimated that fish and wildlife habitat disappeared at a scandalous rate. And before many of us got here, the Bush administration was so at war with itself that its only forest policy was chaos and gridlock. And that, too, was a scandal.

So for many of us, this bill is our first opportunity to stake a position. And to say—never again.

This bill today, unfortunately, does not turn back the clock. It does not restore the health of our forests. It does not guarantee ecosystem protection.

But it does show that the Pacific Northwest, with bipartisan leadership, can take control of its own destiny and develop public resource policy that works.

And I just pray that all those administrative people downtown, most of whom are not from the Pacific Northwest, will give us the same opportunity when it comes time to deal with the No. 1 issue in our region: the future of a God-given resource that man has scandalously abused.

□ 1240

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House is passing legislation that restores the status quo to raw log exports from public lands, west of the 100th meridian. As the principal author of the 1990 law that was partially overturned on a technicality by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, I ask Members to support our efforts to reestablish this provision.

The debate over exporting raw logs was going on long before I was elected a Member. Both sides of the export issue had valid arguments. After 30-years debate on the matter, we are now determining if export restrictions are having the desired effects on domestic supply.

Since 1990, the Federal forests of the Pacific Northwest have been closed to harvesting due to Federal court decisions. Further, thousand of acres of privately held forest lands has been put off limits to harvesting to protect areas around pairs of northern spotted owl. This has caused a severe disruption in the amount of logs available for small, independent saw mills in the Pacific Northwest. Hundreds of these mills have gone bankrupt. This is part of the reason that we have seen a rise in lumber prices this winter and spring.

Congress passed the original legislation in August 1990 with full bipartisan support, to place strong restrictions on the export of unprocessed logs from all public lands in the Western United States. President Bush signed the law, and the restrictions took effect January 1, 1991. On March 4, 1993, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the State lands section of the law because it violated the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Working with other Members of Congress, Representative UNSOELD drafted new legislation that will pass Constitutional muster and restore the status quo.

Congress with the assistance of the U.S. Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior is making sure that this law is being carried out. It has proven to be the godsend of hundreds of mills, their workers, and the communities which are dependent on timber for their economic livelihood. Further, it has provided millions of board feet of lumber for the domestic housing market.

I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to join those of us in the Northwest who fully support this legislation in passing this bill to restore the status quo in the timber market in the Northwest.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation, and I too want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] for an excellent job on an important piece of legislation. This is a bill that can provide a measure of relief to families in timber-dependent communities that are hurting and feeling the dislocation of the timber shortages.

What this legislation is all about is that the public ought to have a right to choose how publicly owned resources are used. If a State chooses to demand that a domestic mill, and a domestic mill alone, process the logs from hundreds of thousands of acres of State

lands, it is time for the Federal Government and the Federal courts to get out of the way. That is what this important legislation does, and it comes at a key time in terms of our trading relationship with Japan.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Kantor recently pledged to me that he was going to push to lower all barriers to trade with Japan; he would pursue what is known as a zero-for-zero, zero barriers on our end and zero barriers on the Japanese end.

With the legislation that the gentlewoman from Washington brings to us today, giving the States the right to choose how their resources would be used, plus this new effort to open Japanese markets, additional relief can be sent to timber-dependent communities in the Northwest, and it is high time.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCO].

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me, and I want to express my congratulations to the gentlewoman from Washington, JOLENE UNSOELD, for bringing this legislation to the House floor today because, my colleagues, this issue is not about logs, this issue is about jobs—jobs that should stay in the Northwest and jobs that should stay in the United States.

When I first ran for the House of Representatives, mill workers in Lewiston, ID, told me that we should be looking for legislation that would stem the flow of raw logs to the Pacific rim. So I looked for legislation, and there it was with PETER DEFAZIO, from the House, sponsoring legislation that stopped the flow of raw logs off State lands. The courts have told us that we now must fix it. Although I do not believe that, if it ain't broke, don't fix it, in this case the gentlewoman from Washington has brought us good legislation. It shows the interrelationship of the States in the Northwest, and the Rocky Mountain region and the co-sponsors of this legislation, because jobs that are lost in Washington are jobs that are going to be lost in the State of Idaho.

Right now when I see raw logs going down the Columbia River system out of the port of Lewiston, I say to my mill workers and I say to myself, "Those are jobs that are being lost, jobs that are going down the river. We have to do something about this."

It has nothing to say about the flow of logs off of private lands, but this is our public lands, and I think it is most appropriate we are addressing that today. It is very appropriate that we look at the raw log export problem today, at a time when the President is so correctly focusing on the Northwest; when he has brought a conference to the Northwest to try to do something about the spotted owl and the timber supply issue in the ancient forests. The

President has kept his promise to those of us in the Northwest by bringing that conference to us.

But now this legislation also says that we should focus on that log export issue. We must focus on that because my people tell me in Idaho that there are 3 billion board feet of raw logs that are flowing out of the ports of Washington and the ports of Oregon every year. If we do not focus on the log export issue, then I do not think we are really dealing with the spotted owl and the ancient forest issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of it. I think it brings the focus of log exports at the right time in the history of the United States and right now when we are scrambling to get those logs to the mills and keep jobs in the Northwest.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I commend him for his expeditious efforts in getting this legislation before us today.

Mr. HAMILTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I would just like to point out to Members, since the House is often criticized for not moving things expeditiously, that we received this bill last week, on June 8, and the subcommittee passed it out on the next day, on Wednesday, and the full committee passed it out on Thursday.

So the House has met and acted with great dispatch on this bill. That could not have happened had it not been for the extraordinary cooperation of a number of people. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], for their full cooperation, and of course to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member, for his cooperation.

I think the person who really deserves the credit for moving this bill so quickly is the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], and I commend her for her leadership on this bill. It is an important piece of legislation, as my colleagues from the Northwest have indicated.

I strongly support it, and I urge Members to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in 1990, the Congress enacted the Forest Resources Conservations and Shortage Relief Act to relieve the shortage of Pacific Northwest unprocessed timber available for domestic milling operations.

At that time, domestic mills had been put at a distinct disadvantage when bidding for timber due to high overseas demand, particularly from the Japanese, which resulted in extremely high prices.

The Forest Resources Conservation, and Shortage Relief Act, however, was held un-

constitutional in May of this year by a U.S. circuit court of appeals.

The court ruled that the 10th amendment precludes Congress from requiring that States administer programs to restrict exports.

Therefore, this legislation would require the Federal Government or its agents to administer the export program, thereby removing the constitutional problem of the original act.

I urge Members to support this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this opportunity to thank my Republican colleagues, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. YOUNG for working with the Washington State delegation to bring to the floor today H.R. 2343, the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act.

This important step could not have been taken without the leadership, understanding, and accommodation of Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. YOUNG, and especially Mr. GILMAN who helped to expeditiously bring this matter before the House.

I am proud to be a part of the Washington State delegation which has once again demonstrated that we are able to rise above partisanship to retool this legislation to meet our region's resource needs.

This legislation has been the product of a bipartisan effort to maintain the export ban on unprocessed timber from State land which is so critical to the preservation of jobs in the Pacific Northwest. There are many families who would have undoubtedly been devastated had Congress dragged its feet on this issue.

It is on behalf of these families, and my fellow colleagues from Washington State, that I again thank you for your expeditious cooperation on this matter.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2343, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### HONORING CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the

resolution (H. Res. 189) honoring cultural achievements of the Voice of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 189

Whereas the Voice of America is the global radio network of the United States Government, seeking to promote understanding abroad for the United States, its people, culture, and policies;

Whereas the Voice of America's charter calls upon it to provide consistently reliable and authoritative news, balanced and comprehensive information about the United States, and official pronouncements of the United States Government;

Whereas the Voice of America broadcasts are not directed to audiences in the United States, so that most Americans have no first-hand knowledge of the professionalism and patriotism that are the hallmark of such broadcasts;

Whereas the Voice of America tells America's story to the world on a daily basis, not only in terms of news and politics and policy, but also by reflecting the complexity, diversity, and excellence of American art and culture;

Whereas chief among our Nation's indigenous art forms is jazz;

Whereas since 1955, Willis Conover of Voice of America has been broadcasting the best of American jazz to millions around the world;

Whereas during that time, the music of Duke Ellington, Charlie Parker, Ella Fitzgerald, Benny Goodman, Dizzy Gillespie, and other great American artists, broadcast by Mr. Conover, have come to symbolize the freedom and creativity of democracy for those denied freedom; and

Whereas Mr. Conover has said "Jazz is a liberating kind of music . . . every emotion—love, anger, joy, sadness—can be communicated with the vitality and spirit that characterizes our country at its best—which is of course the same freedom that people everywhere should enjoy." Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives applauds the Voice of America for disseminating the very best of American culture to those in other lands, exemplified in the work of Willis Conover who for thirty-eight years has made a unique and important contribution to the cause of international understanding and good will.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America seeks to promote understanding around the world for the United States, its people, culture, and policies. The charter of Voice of America requires it to provide balanced, comprehensive, and reliable information and news about the United States and actions of the U.S. Government, including American art and culture.

The Voice of America is also precluded from broadcasting or disseminating information within the United States.

This resolution focuses on Voice of America broadcasts of Willis Conover, who has been bringing the best of American jazz music to the world since 1955.

□ 1250

H. Res. 189 commends the Voice of America for the unique contribution of Mr. Conover to expanding the understanding of American culture around the world through his 38 years of jazz broadcast.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader, for bringing this resolution to the attention of the House, and a word of appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member who put it before the appropriate subcommittee and the full Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank the gentleman for his work in moving the bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support and passage of this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of House Resolution 189, which I introduced along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with our distinguished colleague, Mr. GILMAN, ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in paying tribute to the Voice of America or VOA, as it has been known over the years.

We also want to recognize a man whose work exemplifies the best of VOA: Willis Conover.

Mr. Conover brings to the Voice of America a combination of quiet patriotism and a deep love of jazz, which he calls America's classical music.

He knows the best way to communicate about American culture is to let American artists speak for themselves.

And so, for 38 years, throughout the darkest days of the cold war and beyond the voice of Willis Conover has been a unique voice of freedom to millions, all over the world.

On his programs he speaks with intimate knowledge and obvious love of the music of Duke Ellington and Count Basie, Gerry Mulligan and Benny Goodman, Louis Armstrong and Lester Young, Dizzy Gillespie and Charlie Parker, Ella Fitzgerald and Sarah Vaughan, and other great American artists—and he plays recordings of their music.

His programs communicate an idea of freedom by playing music he has called "the artistic form of free speech."

He has been so successful that Reader's Digest magazine called him the World's Favorite American.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in my remarks the text of "The World's Favorite American" from the Reader's Digest of July 1985.

THE WORLD'S FAVORITE AMERICAN

(By Lawrence Elliott)

When Willis Conover speaks, 100 million people listen. He touts nothing but music—jazz and popular standards—yet a Latin American diplomat once said he was America's best emissary of good will. He is not a musician, but he has presided over music festivals from Rio de Janeiro to Bombay. He has been credited with inspiring the revival of jazz in the post-Stalin U.S.S.R. Yet when some Soviet youths mentioned his name recently to a visitor from the United States, the response was, "Willis who?"

Only an American would need ask; to much of the world he is America. For some 30 years, Willis Clark Conover, Jr., an encyclopedia of 20th-century music, has been the incarnation of "Music USA," an eight-times-weekly Voice of America radio program with the largest audience of any continuing international broadcast in history. When his theme, a Duke Ellington recording of Billy Strayhorn's "Take the 'A' Train," comes over the airwaves, shops empty and streets fall silent as jazz buffs congregate around shortwave sets.

Because law forbids the Voice's broadcasting to the United States, only a tight circle of American jazz fans has heard of Conover. Yet two weeks after he invited listeners to form "Friends of Music USA" clubs, 1300 chapters had been organized around the world.

Nowhere does his star burn brighter—especially among young people—than in the nations of the Soviet bloc. For millions in the Communist world, "Music USA" is an integral part of daily life, and their letters to Conover are both touching and revealing. "You are a source of strength when I am overwhelmed by pessimism, my dear idol," wrote one young Russian.

When Conover began working for the voice he was the only link to jazz for most listeners and professional musicians across Eastern Europe. Many secretly recorded his program and mastered techniques from it. One exuberant Russian musician on whom Conover had never laid eyes charged up to him at an Eastern European jazz festival and cried, "Villis! You are my father!"

It is spring 1959, and Conover has just arrived in Poland for his first visit. Through the plane window he sees a cluster of dignitaries at the foot of the ramp, and beyond the police barriers and the airport fence, an immense crowd, obviously waiting for some VIP—maybe Khrushchev, he thinks. But when Conover steps through the open door of the plane, the crowd breaks into a sustained cheer, and it dawns on him: though there has been no official notice of his visit, nothing but some remarks he had made on the air about his itinerary, the crowd is waiting for him!

Last fall, on the 25th anniversary of that first trip, Conover returns to Warsaw. As is the case whenever he visits Poland, he is mobbed by fans, honored by ceremonies. An American diplomat cables Washington that Conover's reception can be described only as "incredible."

The stature of this 64-year-old urbane professional stems from the fact that he "knows the music," to use the jazz players' ultimate accolade. His formula for the program is to play the best and to confine his commentary to the subject at hand—without the happy-

talk patter associated with disc jockeys. He has never considered it his job to sell the world on America or even on jazz. "The music speaks for itself," he says.

Conover sees jazz as a reflection of the American way. Jazz musicians accept the fundamentals of tempo and key, but beyond that they are at liberty to express themselves, improvising as they go. What they play is a musical version of free speech. It mocks authoritarian impulses. For politically repressed listeners, jazz is a heady whiff of freedom, and Willis Conover is its herald.

"I am not trying to overthrow governments," he says. "I am just sending out something wonderfully creative and human. If it makes people living under repressive regimes stand up a little straighter, so be it."

The son of an army officer, Conover attended a dozen different schools before he was 14. In one of them, he acted the part of a radio announcer in a class play, and his life's course was set. In 1939 Conover, then 18, went to work for a small-town radio station, doing news bulletins, man-in-the-street interviews and disc-jockey shows. When he grew bored with the available records, he borrowed from a nearby music store. Before he even knew what jazz was, he selected records of Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington and Jimmie Lunceford—men whose music touched him in a special way. Moving on to stations in Washington, D.C., he continued to play that music.

After Army service in World War II, Conover began promoting jazz concerts in the Washington area. The city was segregated then, and most musicians were black. But color-blind enthusiasts came to the little clubs where Conover featured jazz giants, black and white—Charlie Parker, Thelonious Monk, Coleman Hawkins, Buddy Rich, Stan Getz. Conover was out to prove that jazz was America's greatest contribution to 20th-century music, and in the process he helped desegregate the nation's capital.

In 1954, Conover heard that the Voice of America was looking for someone to conduct a jazz program, and he applied. After the first broadcast of "Music USA" on January 6, 1955, there were critics. Some members of Congress cited constituents' complaints that exporting jazz was flaunting a deformation of American culture and was a waste of tax dollars. But Conover, who produces his programs under contract and has never become a government employee, had won a promise that no one was ever going to tell him not to play that kind of record. "If you don't like what I've done," he simply told his bosses, "don't renew my contract." Thirty renewals later, "Music USA" is the Voice's headline attraction, and Conover has received glowing tributes from U.S. Congressmen and Presidents.

It is April 29, 1969, Duke Ellington's 70th birthday, and Conover has arranged a glittering black-tie dinner for 140 at the White House. After Ellington is presented with the Presidential Medal of Freedom, America's highest civilian award, President Nixon asks emcee Conover, "What do we do now?" With so many of the world's most eminent jazzmen assembled, Conover says a jam session might be appropriate. "Mr. Conover says we're going to have a jam session," Nixon announces, then goes off to bed. But the wail of horns and the pounding of drums go on until 2:30 a.m.

The man who is better known abroad than the American Secretary of State likes his anonymity at home. He just shows up at

VOA every working day, often carrying a stack of tapes and records. Everything he plays on the air comes from his own collection—which numbers some 60,000 items.

To Conover, each jazz program is an entity that relates to the one before and the one following. And each has a central idea, mood and structure. "It's the same process a composer follows in developing a symphony," he says. "There has to be a theme, variations, movement toward a climax." He laughs at the apparent presumption. "Maybe it's more like a recipe—if the cook knows what he's doing, what comes out of the stove should taste better than any single ingredient."

His contribution is the difference between a disc jockey, a designation he despises, and a scholar of contemporary music, which is what he is. His remarks on the music and its performers of a man who has spent a lifetime studying music and being friends with the ranking jazz musicians of our time.

It is the summer of 1982, and Conover is in Moscow, accompanying touring jazz musicians. They bring the first live American music to the U.S.S.R. Since the onset of the East-West freeze more than three years before, and though their arrival goes unreported in the Soviet press, 500 people elbow their way into a 400-seat auditorium to hear them play.

Conover steps to the microphone to introduce the musicians. He gets as far as "Good evening" before the crowd erupts into cheers. One Muscovite reaches up to kiss his hand and says, "If there is a god of Jazz, it is you."

Conover is a complex personality with strong convictions. The more he travels abroad the more intensely American he feels. He believes, with Winston Churchill, that democracy is the worst possible form of government—except for all the others. Of communism he says succinctly, "I have seen it not work."

Asked if there will ever be rock music on "Music USA," he replies, "Right now rock is an adolescent fertility rite, a panting attempt to be honest. Music should express some feelings that go beyond lust and saving the whales." (Rock is featured on other VOA programs.)

Why, with his love of music, hasn't he learned to play an instrument? "I've heard too much good music," he says with a grin. "I couldn't stand to practice for years and years knowing I'd never be better than mediocre."

So for three decades now, the good music he has heard has been passed on, along with his mellifluous commentaries, penetrating the night around the world.

"The world changes," a listener once wrote. "Leaders die, governments fall, but every night you turn on the radio and there's Willis. Thank God!"

Mr. Conover has hosted three festivals of jazz at the White House under Presidents of both parties including the memorable celebration of Duke Ellington's 70th birthday. He will soon appear at President Clinton's salute to jazz.

Mr. Speaker, our national joy is great because of the collapse of Soviet communism. The American people have sacrificed so very much in lives and tax dollars to win that cold war struggle. Now it is over. We won, so now we move on to other challenges.

But, as we do, I hope we do not forget those long, dark nights of the human

spirit endured by the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, when it seemed as if tyranny would last forever. I hope we remember that amidst that gloom, small but penetrating rays of light pierced through the fog of totalitarian propaganda.

The Voice of America day in and day out, told those people something about American freedom about democracy about the things we take all too much for granted, and every night they would tune in—often at great risk.

Across the thousands of miles that separated them from freedom, transcending the stone walls and the barbed wire of communism came the voice of one America who wanted to share with them the best of an American art form.

But for those who were denied freedom that was enough.

Willis Conover's programs kept hope alive because the combination of order and freedom that lies at the heart of jazz reflects the order and freedom that is at the heart of American progress.

VOA and Mr. Conover have reminded us that sometimes the best political statement a nation can make has nothing to do with politics as such.

Sometimes the quiet, professional presentation of a country's artistic excellence serves to say more about the spirit of that country than can a thousand partisan speeches.

I believe the Voice of America, in presenting to the world for more than 50 years the best of our Nation's artistic and cultural heritage has made and continues to make a unique and invaluable contribution to the cause of freedom.

And for 38 of those years, Willis Conover has typified the very best of VOA.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with Mr. GILMAN in paying tribute to these two great American institutions; the Voice of America and Willis Conover.

Mr. Speaker, if the rules of the House would permit, I would point out that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Conover, is with us not only in spirit, but in person, and we are so happy to welcome him to the House of Representatives and pay this tribute to a well-deserved American for all that he means to America as a country, to our people and what his imagination has projected to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our distinguished minority leader, for his poignant remarks in giving proper recognition to a distinguished American.

I also want to thank our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], for moving this measure expeditiously out of our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution as the distinguished minority leader has pointed out, is to recognize the contributions the Voice of America has made to the cause of peace, freedom, and democracy throughout the world. VOA has ably carried out its unique task to communicate the diversity and excellence of American culture.

In particular, this resolution recognizes the work of Willis Conover, a man who exemplifies through his broadcasts the spirit of the Voice of America and of the American people themselves. His dedication and mastery of the broadcast art have won over audiences around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the Voice of America and a great American voice, Willis Conover, and in support of the passage of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 189.

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. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on House Resolution 189, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### INJURY PREVENTION AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2201) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the prevention and control of injuries.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2201

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Injury Prevention and Control Amendments of 1993".

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT.

Part K of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 393 and 394 as sections 394 and 394A, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 392 the following section:

#### "DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

"SEC. 393. With respect to activities that are authorized in sections 391 and 392, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall carry out such activities with respect to domestic violence and sexual assault. Activities authorized in the preceding sentence include—

"(1) collecting data relating to the incidence of such violence and assault;

"(2) making grants to public and nonprofit private entities for the evaluation of programs whose purpose is to prevent such violence and assault;

"(3) providing to the public information and education on such violence and assault;

"(4) training health care providers to identify individuals whose medical condition or statements indicate that the individuals are victims of such violence or assault, and to refer the individuals to entities that provide services regarding such violence and assault; and

"(5) making grants to public and nonprofit private entities for demonstration projects with respect to such violence and assault."

#### SEC 3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE; REPORTS.

Section 394 of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

#### "GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 394. (a) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish an advisory committee to advise the Secretary and such Director with respect to the prevention and control of injuries.

"(b) Not later than February 1 of 1994 and of every second year thereafter, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report describing the activities carried out under this part during the preceding 2 fiscal years. Such report shall include a description of such activities that were carried out with respect to domestic violence and sexual assault and with respect to rural areas."

#### SEC 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TERMINOLOGY.—Part K of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading for such part, by striking "INJURY CONTROL" and inserting "PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF INJURIES"; and

(2) in section 392—

(A) in the heading for such section, by inserting "PREVENTION AND" before "CONTROL ACTIVITIES";

(B) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "and control" after "prevention"; and

(C) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "injuries and injury control" and inserting "the prevention and control of injuries".

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PUBLIC LAW 102-531.—Part K of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b et seq.), as amended by section 301 of Public Law 102-531 (106 Stat. 3482), is amended—

(1) in section 392(b)(2), by striking "to promote injury control" and all that follows and inserting "to promote activities regarding the prevention and control of injuries; and"; and

(2) in section 391(b), by adding at the end the following sentence: "In carrying out the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall disseminate such information to the public, including through elementary and secondary schools."

#### SEC 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by section 2(1) of this Act, is amended by striking "To carry out" and all that follows and inserting the following: "For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2201, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman WAXMAN for his leadership on all of the health legislation before us today. I am pleased that the House is continuing a strong commitment to preventive health efforts in general, and to the special health needs of women in particular.

I am especially pleased that H.R. 2201 includes new provisions aimed at addressing the public health impact of violence against women. Earlier this year, my colleagues Representative McDERMOTT, Representative MORELLA, and I introduced legislation to help victims of violence receive appropriate medical treatment and support. I am pleased that the bill before us today incorporates a number of provisions from that legislation.

Many people do not yet know the serious consequences of violence on our public health system. For example, battering is the leading cause of injury to women. More than 1 million women each year seek medical attention because of domestic violence. Up to a third of hospital emergency room visits by women are due to battering. Domestic violence and sexual assault have severe health consequences for women—repeated injuries and trauma, stress-related disorders, and death. Many people do not know that pregnant women are

at special risk of injury, that more than one in six pregnant women are battered, and that this violence results in increased rates of miscarriage, stillbirths, and low-birthweight babies. Many people do not know that domestic violence and sexual assault place women at increased risk of substance abuse, traumatic stress disorder, and suicide. And many people do not know about the realities of abuses, for example, that some women are essentially prisoners of war in their own homes, and that a woman's risk of violence from her partner actually increases when she leaves.

Among the people who do not understand these connections between violence and public health are our health care professionals. For too long, the medical profession has ignored, denied, and minimized this problem. For too long, the medical profession has had its own "don't ask, don't tell" policy on violence against women. But it is time to break the silence surrounding these issues of victimization and get women the help they need. We cannot talk about many of our public health issues—AIDS prevention, teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, smoking, and depression—without talking about the role of physical and sexual abuse.

This legislation directs the Centers for Disease Control to educate health care professionals on identification and referral of victims of violence; to conduct epidemiological research and data collection on violent injury of women; to educate the general public on violence and how to stop it; and to conduct demonstration projects to intervene with victims of violence.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman WAXMAN for his attention to this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of this bill which reauthorizes the Center for Disease Control's Injury Control Program. Injury is the leading cause of premature death in this country and it is one that can often be prevented. During 1990, one in four Americans was injured seriously enough to require medical attention, over 150,000 Americans died from injuries. The total lifetime costs of injuries sustained in 1988 was estimated at \$180 billion, including \$24 billion in direct Federal outlays.

A national program of focused intervention to prevent injuries has the potential to save thousands of lives. For example, increasing the use of bike helmets from 10 percent to 80 percent would save almost 2,000 lives over a 5-year period.

The bill before us simply extends the current program and adds a number of

new activities designed to try to begin to address the problems of domestic violence, and we all know that domestic violence has become a very serious thing in the United States of America, one that has brought about the death and serious injuries to many women, and to some men, who have been victims of it.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to control the time for debate which is remaining on this side.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, while much of health care is viewed as a response to infectious and chronic disease, injury is, in fact, the leading cause of death for young people and the leading cause of premature death. The lifetime cost of injuries incurred is estimated to be over \$180 billion a year, including over \$24 billion in direct Federal outlays for medical care, disability, and death benefits.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] has embarked upon an innovative program of research, prevention, and intervention to help address these problems. In doing so, CDC has funded efforts to control intentional injury, childhood injury, and injury in health care settings. To further advance these and other related activities, CDC has also established a National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

H.R. 2201 is to revise and extend the CDC program for the prevention and control of injuries. In addition, the legislation is to establish a specific authority within the CDC program for the prevention and control of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Domestic violence has been increasing across the country for many years now. But recent surveys indicate that such violence has grown to epidemic proportions. In one such study, one out of three Americans reported that they had witnessed beatings and 14 percent of women acknowledged having been violently abused. The Public Health Service estimates that between 2 and 4 million American women are physically battered each year and that between 21 and 30 percent of all women in the United States have been beaten at least once. The consequences of such violence on the Nation's health care system are enormous: Each year, more than 1 million of these women seek medical treatment for injuries caused by battering.

A public health approach—which has proven successful in other areas of social behavior—in necessary to help

bring this new epidemic under control. We need to understand domestic violence better. We need to train health care workers about violence and to train law enforcement workers about injury. Most important, we need to find interventions that a community can use to end the cycle of abuse. CDC's study of the nature and control of injury, including domestic violence and sexual assault, can be usefully directed toward these goals.

I am pleased that this new effort to prevent and control domestic violence and sexual assault has received strong bipartisan support. Such support also extends to the basic injury control program that we seek to reauthorize today. I want to thank Mr. BLILEY, the ranking Republican of the Health Subcommittee, for his support and for his commitment to moving forward with this legislation quickly.

I want also to acknowledge the work of the author of H.R. 2201, Congressman KREIDLER of Washington. Congressman KREIDLER has been a leader in the Federal effort to address our national epidemic of domestic violence and I want to commend him for his work and for his contribution in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to H.R. 2201 and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2201, the Injury Prevention and Control Amendments of 1993.

This legislation includes important initiatives designed to end violence against women, which were originally proposed in H.R. 1829, legislation I introduced earlier this year with my colleagues the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

I would like to thank Chairman WAXMAN of the Environment and Health Subcommittee and Chairman DINGELL of the Energy and Commerce Committee for including those provisions in this important legislation and for bringing it to the floor today.

The incidence of violence against women has reached public health epidemic proportions in this country—4 million women are victims of domestic violence each year.

Public health care providers have a critical role to play in identifying victims of violence and sexual assault. Battering is the leading cause of injury to women and is responsible for nearly one-third of all emergency room visits made by women each year. Often, health care providers are the first to see victims of abuse and assault, providing a crucial link for victims to the counseling and services they need.

Provisions in H.R. 2201 authorize the Centers for Disease Control to train health care providers to identify, treat, and refer victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, ensuring that health care providers will become more actively involved in stopping violence against women.

This legislation also authorizes efforts to educate the public about domestic violence and abuse, and to conduct epidemiological data on the impact of such violence on the public health. We simply do not know enough about this problem, and we must begin to collect the data that will enable experts to design appropriate interventions and responses to end this violence.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2201 addresses the very serious problem of violence against women and recognizes that this epidemic of violence is a public health concern that can and must be prevented. This bill has my full support and deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is at epidemic levels in the United States. Domestic violence is not only a legal and criminal issue, but it is also a public health issue and one that we must begin to address.

Every 15 seconds a woman somewhere in this country is being beaten by her spouse or intimate partner. Her children may be watching or listening, learning how to solve life's problems through violent behavior.

Battering results in more injuries to women than rapes, car accidents, or muggings combined. Earlier this year, the American Medical Association reported that street and domestic violence account for \$5.3 billion in annual health care costs. As we seek reforms in our health care system, we must take a look at domestic violence and the terrible toll it takes on women's health.

Domestic violence has profound effects on women's health: 22 to 35 percent of women in our emergency rooms are there because of symptoms related to ongoing abuse; 60 to 70 percent of women in mental health units of hospitals are there because of ongoing abuse; 15 to 25 percent of all pregnant women are beaten and 25 to 45 percent of all battered women are beaten during pregnancy.

It is estimated that every year domestic violence causes 99,800 hospitalization days, 28,700 emergency room visits, and 39,900 physician visits.

There is the obvious trauma: broken bones, smashed jaws, and blackened eyes.

There is the subtle trauma peculiar to the battered woman: anxiety, depression, clinical dependency, chronic headaches, eating disorders, and suicidal tendencies.

Nurses, physicians, and other health care professionals, along with the police, are in the frontlines of domestic violence treatment and, most importantly, prevention. We need to help them do their jobs better.

We need clinical protocols to help doctors, nurses, and emergency room personnel to recognize the symptoms of battering and to develop the most effective treatments.

We need hard medical data—we now have data primarily from law enforcement agencies—to identify the extent and health care costs of domestic violence. Without this information, we won't know that methods of treatment and prevention work best.

H.R. 2201, which incorporates provisions of a bill I sponsored earlier this year with Congressmen MCDERMOTT and KREIDLER, will focus attention on the public health consequences of battering and will ensure that battered women get the medical treatment, counseling, and support they so desperately need.

The legislation, which amends the Public Health Service Act, will provide for hospital-based demonstration projects to identify and treat victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, public education projects about the health consequences of domestic violence, and epidemiological research by the Centers for Disease Control to determine the incidence, types, and effects of domestic violence nationwide.

Domestic violence is a disease that can be prevented and cured. The time has come to do just that.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for two bills which the House is now considering, H.R. 2201, the injury prevention and control amendments and H.R. 2202, the breast and cervical cancer amendments.

The Injury Prevention and Control Program under the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] provides funds for research, demonstration programs, and professional training initiatives related to the prevention and control of injuries. Specifically, this bill includes a provision that gives the CDC the authority to support efforts related to preventing domestic violence and sexual assault as part of the Injury Prevention and Control Program. The bill authorizes CDC to collect data, evaluate prevention efforts, provide information, train health professionals in diagnosing victims, and make demonstration project grants regarding domestic violence and sexual assault.

Mr. Speaker, I recently reintroduced the Sexual Assault Prevention Act, H.R. 688. H.R. 688 is a comprehensive legislative initiative designed to protect and empower the victims of sexual and domestic violence. Passage of H.R. 2201 and the support shown for the Sexual Assault Prevention Act demonstrate that Congress is finally beginning to focus on ending the tragic tide of violence against women. I will continue my efforts to focus the attention of the Congress on this critical issue, and enact H.R. 688.

The other bill before us today, H.R. 2202, reauthorizes the Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program which provides funds to States for breast and cervical cancer screening and education programs and I am very pleased to support this bill as well.

In my home State, the Arizona Department of Health Services has begun its efforts to implement a women's cancer control project. The State of Arizona has embarked on a 3-year capacity building and planning project to implement a statewide comprehensive breast and cervical cancer screening program. The primary objective of the project is to significantly reduce the number of deaths caused by breast and cervical cancer through screening,

early detection, and prevention education. The program will have a special focus on providing services to women who are low income and minorities.

As my colleagues are aware, on May 26 of this year Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON and I introduced H.R. 2293, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Information Act of 1993. This bill would require federally funded family planning clinics to provide information about breast and cervical cancer, including how to conduct a breast self-examination, and refer for screening or treatment when appropriate. Together, these two pieces of legislation would ensure that more women who might not otherwise have access to this information and services do.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, these two bills will not solve the epidemic of breast and cervical cancer which has claimed the lives of so many American women by themselves. Our Nation simply must continue to press forward on our breast and cervical cancer research efforts. It is only through advances in research that we will be able to truly defeat these killers. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we can prevent needless deaths by expanding access to screening and information. This legislation does just that.

I am pleased to support H.R. 2201 and H.R. 2202, and I hope my colleagues and the President will demonstrate their commitment to both of these important issues by enacting H.R. 688 and H.R. 2293 as well.

□ 1310

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2201.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

#### BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program of grants relating to preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancer as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2202

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Breast and Cervical Cancer Amendments of 1993".

**SEC. 2. REVISIONS IN PROGRAM OF STATE GRANTS REGARDING BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER.**

(a) LIMITED AUTHORITY REGARDING FOR-PROFIT ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1501(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300k(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking "STATES.—A State" and all that follows through "may expend" and inserting the following: "STATES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A State receiving a grant under subsection (a) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), expend"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following paragraphs:

"(2) LIMITED AUTHORITY REGARDING OTHER ENTITIES.—In addition to the authority established in paragraph (1) for a State with respect to grants and contracts, the State may provide for screenings under subsection (a)(1) through entering into contracts with private entities.

"(3) PAYMENTS FOR SCREENINGS.—The amount paid by a State to an entity under this subsection for a screening procedure under subsection (a)(1) may not exceed the amount that would be paid under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act if payment were made under such part for furnishing the procedure to a woman enrolled under such part."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1505(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300n-1(3)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: "(and additionally, in the case of services and activities under section 1501(a)(1), with any similar services or activities of private entities)".

(b) QUALITY ASSURANCE REGARDING SCREENING PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1503 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300m) is amended by striking subsections (c) through (e) and inserting the following:

"(c) QUALITY ASSURANCE REGARDING SCREENING PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may not make a grant under section 1501 unless the State involved agrees that the State will, in accordance with applicable law, assure the quality of screening procedures conducted pursuant to such section."

(2) TRANSITION RULE REGARDING MAMMOGRAPHIES.—With respect to the screening procedure for breast cancer known as a mammography, the requirements in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 1503(c) of the Public Health Service Act remain in effect (for an individual or facility conducting such procedures pursuant to a grant to a State under section 1501 of such Act) until there is in effect for the facility a certificate (or provisional certificate) issued under section 354 of such Act.

(c) STATEWIDE PROVISION OF SERVICES.—Section 1504(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300n(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(3) GRANTS TO TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

"(A) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may make grants to tribes and tribal organizations (as such terms are used in paragraph (1)) for the purpose of carrying out programs described in section 1501(a). This title applies to such a grant (in relation to the jurisdiction of the tribe or organization) to the same extent and in the same manner as such title ap-

plies to a grant to a State under section 1501 (in relation to the jurisdiction of the State).

"(B) If a tribe or tribal organization is receiving a grant under subparagraph (A) and the State in which the tribe or organization is located is receiving a grant under section 1501, the requirement established in paragraph (1) for the State regarding the tribe or organization is deemed to have been waived under paragraph (2)."

(d) EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.—Section 1508 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300n-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following sentence: "Such evaluations shall include evaluations of the extent to which States carrying out such programs are in compliance with section 1501(a)(2) and with section 1504(c)."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period the following: ", including recommendations regarding compliance by the States with section 1501(a)(2) and with section 1504(c)".

(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 1501 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300k) is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

"(c) COORDINATING COMMITTEE REGARDING YEAR 2000 HEALTH OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish a committee to coordinate the activities of the agencies of the Public Health Service (and other appropriate Federal agencies) that are carried out toward achieving the objectives established by the Secretary for reductions in the incidence of breast and cervical cancer in the United States by the year 2000. Such committee shall be comprised of Federal officers or employees designated by the heads of the agencies involved to serve on the committee as representatives of the agencies, and such representatives from other public or private entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate."

(f) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Title XV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300k et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1501(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "Control," and inserting "Control and Prevention,"; and

(2) in section 1505—  
(A) in paragraph (3), by striking "nonprivate" and inserting "nonprofit private"; and  
(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting "will" before "be used".

**SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR ADDITIONAL PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES FOR WOMEN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300k et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 1509 as section 1510; and

(2) by inserting after section 1508 the following section:

"SEC. 1509. SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR ADDITIONAL PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES.

"(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In the case of States receiving grants under section 1501, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may make grants to not more than 3 such States to carry out demonstration projects for the purpose of—

"(1) providing preventive health services in addition to the services authorized in such section, including screenings regarding blood pressure and cholesterol, and including health education;

"(2) providing appropriate referrals for medical treatment of women receiving services pursuant to paragraph (1) and ensuring, to the extent practicable, the provision of appropriate follow-up services; and

"(3) evaluating activities conducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) through appropriate surveillance or program-monitoring activities.

"(b) STATUS AS PARTICIPANT IN PROGRAM REGARDING BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER.—The Secretary may not make a grant under subsection (a) unless the State involved agrees that services under the grant will be provided only through entities that are screening women for breast or cervical cancer pursuant to a grant under section 1501.

"(c) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS OF GENERAL PROGRAM.—This title applies to a grant under subsection (a) to the same extent and in the same manner as such title applies to a grant under section 1501.

"(d) FUNDING.—  
(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), for the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

"(2) LIMITATION REGARDING FUNDING WITH RESPECT TO BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER.—The authorization of appropriations established in paragraph (1) is not effective for a fiscal year unless the amount appropriated under section 1510(a) for the fiscal year equals or exceeds the amount appropriated under such section for the preceding fiscal year."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1510(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended in the heading for the section by striking "FUNDING," and inserting "FUNDING FOR GENERAL PROGRAM."

**SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR GENERAL PROGRAM.**

Section 1510(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by section 3(a)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after "1991,"; and  
(2) by inserting before the period the following: ", \$135,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998".

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

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

**GENERAL LEAVE**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that in this decade, 2 million American women will learn that they have breast or cervical cancer and that more than half a million of these women are expected to lose their lives. A disproportionate number of these deaths will occur among women of low income.

The causes of both breast and cervical cancer remain unknown and, because their sources are not yet understood, these diseases cannot be prevented. As with many other life-threatening illnesses, early detection of

breast and cervical cancer is the key to their control. For example, the 5-year survival rate for women with localized breast cancer can be almost 100 percent. Similarly, cervical cancer is generally believed to be almost fully treatable if the disease is discovered at the beginning of its course. The screening technologies of choice—mammography for breast cancer and Pap smears for cervical cancer—are safe and clearly effective.

Unfortunately, all American women do not have a source of payment for such life-saving services. While Medicare pays for such screening, neither all State Medicaid programs nor all private insurance plans do so. And of course, a large number of American women have no third-party payment coverage at all.

In 1990, the Congress enacted legislation to create a grants program to allow States to provide screening services for breast and cervical cancer to women with no other source of payment for these services. In addition, States are to provide referrals for treatment, to provide both public and professional education, and to improve the quality for screening services.

Since that time, the program has become among the most popular and most productive public health initiatives supported by the Federal Government. Its funding has steadily and dramatically increased. And more and more States are applying for grants. In fiscal year 1991 alone, 31 States sought grants to support comprehensive screening programs; only 12 were able to be funded, however. And although the final applications have not yet been submitted, 41 States have indicated interest in participating in the program for the current fiscal year.

The purpose of H.R. 2202 is to revise and extend this important program for an additional 5 fiscal years. I am pleased that, as was the case in 1990, this legislation enjoys strong bipartisan support.

In addition, H.R. 2202 has the strong backing of the congressional caucus for women's issues, many of whose members made significant contributions to the bill. In particular, I want to acknowledge the work of Congresswoman SCHENK, Congresswoman MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Congresswoman DELAURO, all of whom sponsored proposals to make improvements in the basic program.

I want also to thank Congressman BLILEY, the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, for his continuing interest in, and support for, this important public health initiative. His efforts have enabled us to move forward with this legislation as quickly as we have.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this bill and I urge Members to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of this legislation. The breast and cervical cancer screening program was developed in the 101st Congress with strong bipartisan support and has proven to be a worthwhile program.

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women, and in this decade alone we expect 500,000 women to lose their lives to this disease. While much is unknown about both breast and cervical cancer, it is clear that when treated in their earliest stages, both types of cancer have a 90 to 100 percent 5-year survival rate. Since its inception in 1992, this program has provided breast cancer screening to over 31,000 women, of whom 2,700 have been referred for followup. It has also screened over 53,000 women for Pap smears and referred 8,000 of these women for followup.

The bill reauthorizes the program through fiscal year 1998 and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK], and I wish to take this time to acknowledge her important contribution to this legislation.

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2202, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Amendments of 1993.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the sad and terrible statistics about breast and cervical cancer:

Well over 50,000 American women died of breast or cervical cancer in 1992 alone; and

One in nine American women will contract breast cancer in her lifetime.

But Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on the hope for these women—the hope that a fully funded screening program can offer.

Breast and cervical cancer deaths are preventable. Studies have concluded that early detection and followup can prevent almost all cervical cancer deaths and more than 30 percent of breast cancer deaths.

But the success of a screening program hinges on the ability of at-risk women to have access to the system.

This authorization will allow eligible hospitals and clinics to increase outreach and public education among low and middle-income women about the importance of screenings and followup treatments.

This authorization will allow eligible hospitals and clinics to enlarge their pools for screening and to procure advanced equipment.

Finally, this authorization will help to save money in the long run, by preventing lengthy hospital stays and expensive treatments.

This bill also includes an amendment which I authored with the support and

contributions of the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. WAXMAN. This amendment authorizes the establishment of women's preventive health demonstration projects.

These projects would receive funds for the extension of a wide range of preventive health services in conjunction with cancer screenings. These services could include screenings for osteoporosis, cholesterol testings, or nutritional counseling.

In effect, these projects will become one-stop shopping networks for comprehensive women's health care.

This is a modest provision, but I believe that these projects will become models for preventive health care for all Americans.

To the distinguished subcommittee chair, and my friend Mr. WAXMAN, I want to say I applaud and thank you for your leadership on this issue. The women of America are in your debt. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

□ 1320

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2202, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Amendments Act of 1993.

As many of you know, breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among American women, ranking behind only lung cancer. In 1993, an estimated 46,000 women will die of the disease and 180,000 new cases will be diagnosed. All in all, about one in every nine American women is likely to develop the disease in her lifetime.

Although it does not claim as many lives, cervical cancer is just as serious, and prevention is just as important—13,500 cases will be diagnosed this year and an estimated 4,400 of our wives, mothers, friends, and family will die.

Statistics like these are alarming. And that is why I am supporting this bill and also sponsoring a breast cancer awareness Conference back in Wisconsin's Sixth District this afternoon.

As members of the Congressional Families for Cancer Awareness Campaign, many of my colleagues and I are working to alert the public to the vital importance of early cancer detection and prevention. I ask them and all of you to join me in supporting this measure—because without it, many women would go without proper breast cancer and cervical cancer screenings. And perhaps more of our wives, mothers, friends, and family would die.

Not only does this bill provide screenings for women who could otherwise not afford them, but it establishes a committee to coordinate Federal efforts aimed at reducing the incidence of these two deadly diseases.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great opportunity here to make cancer awareness and prevention a national priority.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY], the author of an important amendment to this bill to increase the funding that would be available for the States for screening.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 2202 and thank you for your leadership on this important matter.

Today, as we vote on the authorizing legislation for breast and cervical cancer mortality prevention amendments, nothing less than the lives of thousands of American women hang in the balance.

I wish that I were overstating the urgent need for prevention programs targeted to the early detection of breast and cervical cancer when I say that the lives of thousands of American women are at stake. Unfortunately, it is not an overstatement, it is a sad truth.

The statistics tell the story of how these diseases continue to take their toll among American women.

Breast and cervical cancer will kill more than one-half million women in this decade;

In 1992 alone, breast and cervical cancer took the lives of more than 50,000 women in the United States;

While the statistics speak to the clinical effects of breast and cervical cancer, numbers alone can never speak to the tragedy which these cancers cause to the women who are stricken and to their families. To say that these diseases are women's diseases is to understand their pathology but to ignore their pain. For the son who has lost a mother to breast cancer, for the father who has lost a daughter to cervical cancer, and for the brother who has lost a sister, these diseases do not delineate their pain along lines of gender—they are equal opportunity distributors of sorrow.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I have come to realize that voting for increased authorization levels for any program, no matter the benefit, is difficult. I submit, however, that there are few programs which can prove to a statistical certainty that they will both save lives and save money. Money spent to prevent breast and cervical cancer is one such program.

Fortunately, we possess the technology to detect and treat these diseases so that they will kill no more; unfortunately, we have not committed the resources needed to prevent these deaths. This legislation provides these much needed resources.

Our capacity to detect these diseases in their earliest stages does not mean very much to the woman who does not understand what detection means. This legislation provides education money. The best mammogram means precious

little to the woman who cannot afford it. This legislation provides grants for mammography screening and Pap smear screening. In the final analysis, our technological capacity continues to represent, for thousands of American women, little more than an opportunity lost, unless we seize this opportunity to save lives, families, and money by supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk all day about the opportunities which women have, or do not have, in today's society. But at the end of the day, the opportunity for women to save ourselves rests upon the commitment of this Congress to put the money on the line for our sisters, our daughters, and our wives. Before we rest tonight, another 500 cases of breast cancer will be detected and another 120 women will die. Do not let this opportunity to save these precious lives slip away.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today, we have the opportunity to pass legislation that will offer woman increased access to preventive health care. H.R. 2202 reauthorizes the successful program that provides screening for women for breast and cervical cancer. In addition, this bill will allow the Centers for Disease Control [CDC] to provide additional basic preventive health services along with breast and cervical cancer screening in up to three States. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Through the Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, States are given grants to support breast and cervical cancer screening and public education programs. States are also provided funds in order to develop comprehensive statewide programs. Currently, 12 States have comprehensive programs in place and another 18 States have been awarded planning grants.

Under the increased authorization in H.R. 2202, desperately needed funding would be made available in fiscal year 1994 to expand this program into several additional States. I believe all 50 States should have these resources because we cannot have a system in which women in one State get timely preventive care because they have access to Federal funds and another in which women die of preventable or treatable conditions because the same care is not available to them. As a cancer survivor, I know first-hand how critical it is to detect cancer as early as possible.

I also strongly support the provision in the bill that will allow the CDC to set up demonstration projects in up to three States to provide additional preventive health services for women who

come in for breast and cervical cancer screening. I want to express my deep gratitude to Representative WAXMAN, and Chairman DINGELL for incorporating this proposal, H.R. 2158, which I introduced along with Representative SNOWE, into the bill before us.

Preventive health care is basic health care—it does not require high-tech machines or costly procedures. Rather it is the practice of closely monitoring patients' health status and helping them to develop healthy lifestyles. Once women are brought in for breast and cervical cancer screening, they should be able to receive other preventive health services as well. This bill would establish more of the coordinated, one-stop shopping type of health care that is desperately needed to maximize the benefit women get and to maximize the cost-effectiveness of Federal public health dollars. Blood pressure and pulse monitoring, osteoporosis screening, and cholesterol screening are all basic, low-cost services that can help keep women healthy and could now be provided.

I am particularly optimistic about President Clinton's focus on preventive health care. As we continue to move toward the goal of comprehensive, universal and affordable health care in this country, we must realize the importance of preventive care. The investment we make in these types of programs today will pay off in large health care savings in the future and help us to control the health care cost spiral that is devastating American families and American businesses. And it will help us improve the lives and well-being of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Chairman DINGELL, Representative WAXMAN, Representative SNOWE, and all members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the congressional caucus for women's issues for their hard work in bringing this critical piece of legislation before the House.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of two bills that are of vital importance to American families because they deal with threats that all too often leave families emotionally and financially devastated: Cancer and serious injury. Breast and cervical cancer and serious injury are very different problems, but the havoc that they wreak on families is all too similar.

Breast cancer kills over 46,000 women each year and is the leading cause of death among women between the ages of 40 and 45. Breast cancer is not so much a women's disease as it is a family disease, because of the tragic frequency with which it strikes women of child-rearing age. Every time a woman is diagnosed with breast cancer, a family is shaken to its foundations.

Serious injuries, whether they are brought about by accident or violence, likewise can be devastating to families. Injury disproportionately impacts on our children, youth and young adults. It is the leading cause of death

for Americans, ages 1 to 44. Every day, 60 children die from injury, and each year injury claims the lives of over 150,000 Americans. According to the CDC, a substantial part of the injury problem is attributable to violence against women. In 1989, 5,212 women in this country were victims of homicide. Studies on sexual assault estimate that one in four women will suffer a violent sexual attack during her lifetime. If sexual assault were considered a disease, it would be an epidemic, one that is devastating American women and the people who love and depend on them.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering important legislation designed to strengthen our response to these threats. H.R. 2202, legislation to reauthorize the CDC's Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening Program, would expand funding available to States for breast and cervical cancer screening and education programs. The measure authorizes \$135 million for the program in fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

H.R. 2202 would strengthen and make more flexible the CDC's program by allowing States to contract with profitmaking entities to provide cancer screening services under this program. The bill also institutes an important demonstration program, under which projects conducting breast and cervical cancer screening could use funds for other preventive health services, such as screening for high blood pressure, cholesterol, or sexually transmitted diseases. Preventive medicine is essential to our efforts to control costs and improve quality of life. This legislation will enable us to test effectiveness and potential of expanding preventive health services.

This legislation comes at a critical time. Despite the effectiveness of early screening for breast and cervical cancers in preventing deaths, this program is underfunded, and as a result only 12 States have comprehensive programs. In fact, New York, which has one of the highest incidence rates in the country, does not have a comprehensive program. Reauthorization of this important program will provide the momentum needed to properly fund breast and cervical cancer screening efforts throughout the country. As a member of the appropriations committee, I am committed to seeing that this program receives the support it so richly deserves. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2202.

Mr. Speaker, we also have before us today H.R. 2201, legislation to reauthorize the CDC's Injury Prevention and Control Program. This measure would authorize \$50 million in fiscal year 1994, and such as may be necessary in fiscal years 1995 through 1998 for this valuable program which supports research on nonoccupational injury control and acute care and bolsters State and local injury prevention programs.

Of particular importance is the measure's provision which authorizes the CDC to support efforts related to preventing domestic violence and sexual assault as part of the Injury Prevention and Control Program. This bill would enable the CDC to build upon existing efforts and develop a comprehensive program to prevent violence against women. The CDC has indicated that, with adequate support, it could undertake a variety of useful initiatives aimed

at the problem of violence against women, such as: Demonstrating and evaluating promising methods for preventing violence against women; supporting worksite programs to increase awareness of violence against women; conducting community-based educational programs to prevent violence against women; improving data collection in order to better evaluate intervention strategies; setting up a network of private and public partnerships to provide the prevention services needed to carry out a national program; as well as other projects.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give the CDC the tools it needs to address in a serious fashion the crisis of violence against women in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

H.R. 2202 and H.R. 2201 will improve the Federal Government's response to problems that plague too many American women and too many families. The time to act on these problems is now.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to voice my strong support for passage of H.R. 2202, the breast and cervical cancer screening and education authorizations.

This legislation is critical and deserving of attention because it will help to improve the life of millions of women. It will help to meet one of our most important goals: preventing cancer. Simply put, this legislation would require health clinics which receive Federal funding to provide patients with information about breast and cervical cancer. As a breast cancer survivor myself, I cannot emphasize enough the benefits of early detection of breast and cervical cancer.

In 1993 alone, 182,000 women will be diagnosed with and 46,000 women will die of breast cancer. The epidemic proportions of this disease has been rising since the 1940's and no one knows why. There is no known cause or cure of breast cancer and unlike many other diseases, there is nothing women can do to prevent breast cancer. It remains an insidious threat and must be eradicated. Its almost a national shame that in this great country of ours, so full of ingenious talent and skill, that breast and cervical cancer research has been given so little priority until very recently.

While significant efforts are being made to make up for lost time, we must not be complacent if we are to reverse this trend. This bill helps to address this very personal crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support this improvement in of women's personal well-being.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. This program, administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, provides thousands of women with comprehensive screening services and public education programs on breast and cervical cancer.

Having lost two members of my family to breast cancer, I am all too aware of the extraordinarily high incidences of these diseases. Many of these deaths could be averted with simple screening and early detection. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 1993, breast and cervical cancers will affect 195,500 women, and will result in more than 50,000 deaths. With adequate education services and earlier diagnoses, however, many lives can be saved.

While I continue to believe that this program should be funded so that every State can provide detection services, I do believe that the bill's \$100 million request, a \$29 million increase from last year, is a very positive step toward a congressional commitment to the eradication of these long overlooked and underfunded diseases. Mr. Speaker, once again, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2202, the breast and cervical cancer screening and education authorizations.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2202, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Amendments of 1993. This legislation will reauthorize funding for the Centers for Disease Control as well as make it easier for women to get quality screenings for breast and cervical cancer.

The breast cancer epidemic has taken a toll on America's women. Today, there are 2.8 million women in the United States with breast cancer, 1 million of whom have yet to be diagnosed with the disease. Allowing States to reimburse private entities for providing cancer screenings is a step in the right direction. As many of my colleagues know, early detection is key to determining a woman's rate of surgical from these dreadful diseases.

Unfortunately, my constituents on Long Island are no strangers to the devastation wrought by breast cancer. Within New York State, Long Island has the highest mortality rates for breast cancer. From 1984 to 1988, the breast cancer mortality rate for one particular group in Nassau County was 16 percent higher than that of New York State and 36 percent higher than that of the Nation.

I am pleased that the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act, which was signed into law by the President last week, contains a provision to include Long Island in a National Cancer Institute study into the environmental contributors to breast cancer. This study is the first of its kind to take an in-depth look at the role the environment may play in causing breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, it is through continued public education, additional research, and greater opportunities for early detection that we can defeat this dreaded disease. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation.

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

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

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2202, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**SILVIO O. CONTE DISABILITIES PREVENTION ACT**

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2204) to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for the prevention of disabilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2204

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Silvio O. Conte Disabilities Prevention Act".

**SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SILVIO O. CONTE DISABILITIES PREVENTION PROGRAM.**

Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 314 the following new section:

**"SILVIO O. CONTE DISABILITIES PREVENTION PROGRAM**

"SEC. 315. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may make grants to and enter into contracts with public and nonprofit private entities for the purpose of carrying out programs for the prevention of disabilities and the prevention of secondary conditions resulting from disabilities.

"(b) CERTAIN AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—With respect to the prevention of disabilities and conditions described in subsection (a), activities for which the Secretary may provide financial assistance under such subsection include—

"(1) coordinating prevention activities;

"(2) conducting demonstrations and interventions;

"(3) conducting surveillances and studies;

"(4) educating the public; and

"(5) educating and training health professionals (including allied health professionals) and conducting activities to improve the clinical skills of such professionals.

"(c) PRIORITIES.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Council on Disabilities, shall establish priorities among the activities that are to be carried out under subsection (a).

"(d) REPORTS TO SECRETARY.—The Secretary may provide financial assistance under subsection (a) only if the applicant involved agrees to submit to the Secretary such reports as the Secretary may require with respect to such assistance.

"(e) APPLICATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide financial assistance under subsection (a) only if an application for such assistance is submitted to the Secretary and the application is in such form, is made in such manner, and contains such agreements, assurances, and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.

"(f) LIMITATION REGARDING EDUCATION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—In providing financial assistance under subsection (a), the Secretary may not, for activities described in subsection (b)(5), obligated more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under subsection (k) for any fiscal year.

"(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide training, technical assistance, and consultations with respect to the planning, development, and operation of any program for the prevention of disabilities or the prevention of secondary conditions resulting from disabilities.

"(h) PROVISION OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES IN LIEU OF FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of a recipient of financial assistance under subsection (a), the Secretary may, subject to paragraph (2), provide supplies, equipment, and services for the purpose of aiding the recipient in carrying out such subsection and, for such purpose, may detail to the recipient any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(2) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS.—With respect to a request by a recipient for purposes of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of payments under subsection (a) to the recipient by an amount equal to the costs of detailing personnel (including pay, allowances, and travel expenses) and the fair market value of any supplies, equipment, or services provided by the Secretary. The Secretary shall, for the payment of expenses incurred in complying with such request, expend the amounts withheld.

"(i) EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.—

"(1) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall, directly or through contracts with public or private entities, provide for evaluations of programs carried out pursuant to subsection (a).

"(2) REPORTS.—Not later than January 31 of 1995 and of every second year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report summarizing evaluations carried out pursuant to paragraph (1). The Secretary shall provide a copy of each such report to the National Council on Disability.

"(j) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'financial assistance' means a grant or contract.

"(2) the term 'prevention' means activities that address the causes of disabilities and secondary conditions resulting from disabilities, and activities that address the functional limitations involved and the exacerbation of such limitations, including activities that—

"(A) eliminate or reduce the factors that cause or predispose an individual to disabilities or that increase the prevalence of disabilities;

"(B) increase the early identification of existing problems to eliminate circumstances that create or increase functional limitations; and

"(C) mitigate against the effects of disabilities throughout the life of the individual.

"(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of providing financial assistance under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1997 and 1998."

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on

H.R. 2204, the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2204 would establish a new section within the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for the prevention of disabilities and for the prevention of secondary conditions resulting from disabilities. In brief, this legislation would establish priorities for activities for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] in the area of disability prevention. It would direct the use of funds for research and demonstration projects, for education of the public and training of health professionals, and for the provision of technical assistance for the implementation of those activities.

According to a 1991 Institute of Medicine [IOM] study, "Disability in America: Toward a National Agenda for Prevention," almost 15 percent of the population—or 35 million Americans—suffer from some kind of disability. Disabilities disproportionately affect minorities—including native Americans—the elderly, and those in lower socioeconomic groups. According to the IOM report, the national cost of caring for all of those with disabilities is approximately \$170 billion per year, including an estimated \$82 billion in Federal funds.

In response to a specific statutory mandate from Congress, the National Council on Disability conducted an assessment of Federal laws and programs serving people with disabilities, and made recommendations to the President and to the Congress on legislative proposals for increasing incentives and eliminating disincentives in such programs. The ensuing report, "Toward Independence," was released in 1986 and identified 10 national priorities, including a recommendation for implementation of a Federal initiative designed both to prevent disabilities and to coordinate disability prevention programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Our former colleague, Silvio Conte, pioneered efforts in the Congress to make these recommendations a reality. Beginning in 1988, he pressed for appropriations for demonstration activities in the area of disability prevention. In 1990, Congressman Conte introduced legislation to authorize such a program at CDC, legislation that was the prototype of the bill before us today. The Conte legislation passed the House in 1990, but Senate action was not completed.

H.R. 2204 and the program it authorizes have been named in Congressman Conte's honor. The committee has done so to recognize his dedication to these

efforts and his leadership in congressional support of them. I know of no more fitting tribute to our late colleague than to ensure that his proposal in this area becomes law and to ensure that millions of Americans who are now disabled, and millions more who might avoid disability, will benefit from his good works and his good heart.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation codifies in the Public Health Service Act the disability prevention program currently ongoing at the Centers for Disease Control.

Approximately 38 million Americans suffer from some kind of disability. These disabilities fall into three categories: Chronic disease, such as heart disease or Parkinson's; injury, such as spinal cord injury; and developmental disabilities, such as cerebral palsy.

The main goal of the disability prevention program is to prevent and reduce the incidence and severity of both primary and secondary disabilities.

Prevention of disabilities will not only save money but will enable people to continue to lead independent and productive lives.

This bill passed the House during both the 101st and the 102d Congresses. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Silvio Conte, who was a strong supporter of this program, and for whom the program is to be named.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2204.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TRAUMA CARE SYSTEMS AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2205), to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to trauma care.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2205

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trauma Care Systems Amendments of 1993".

#### SEC. 2. REVISIONS IN PROGRAMS RELATING TO TRAUMA CARE.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 1201(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting after "Secretary" the following: ", acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention."

(b) REPORTS BY STATES; EVALUATIONS BY COMPTROLLERS GENERAL.—Section 1216(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-16) is amended by striking "1993" and inserting "1994".

(c) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Section 1222 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-22) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "1992"; and inserting "1995"; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence: "Such report shall include an assessment of the extent to which Federal and State efforts to develop systems of trauma care and to designate trauma centers have reduced the incidence of mortality, and the incidence of permanent disability, resulting from trauma."

(d) WAIVER REGARDING PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—Section 1233 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-33) is repealed.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Title XII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1204(c), by inserting before the period the following: "determines to be necessary to carry out this section";

(2) in section 1212(a)(2)(A), by striking "1211(e)" and inserting "1211(b)";

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking "Act" and inserting "Act";

(B) in paragraphs (8) and (9), by striking "to provide" each place such term appears and inserting "provides for"; and

(C) in paragraph (10), by striking "conduct"; and inserting "conducts"; and

(4) in section 1231(3), by striking "Rico," and inserting "Rico."

#### SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1232(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-32(a)) is amended by striking "for the purpose" and all that follows and inserting the following: "For the purpose of carrying out parts A and B, there is authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1996."

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

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2205, the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2205 is to extend for 3 fiscal years the authorization of appropriations for the Trauma Care Systems Planning and

Development Act of 1990. The program is designed to assist States in the planning and development of trauma care systems and the designation of trauma care centers. Fifteen million dollars is authorized in each of fiscal years 1994-96.

In addition to necessary technical amendments to the statute, the legislation transfers administration of the trauma care program to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. The CDC currently administers the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Trauma care center development is a vital component of a national injury prevention strategy and therefore an appropriate responsibility of the CDC. The CDC's extensive experience in working with State health and emergency medical services officials makes it uniquely qualified to assume responsibility. In fact, the CDC is already actively involved in these activities through administration of the preventive health services block grant and the diverse injury control programs of the national center.

Mr. Speaker, trauma care centers have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing mortality and permanent disability due to trauma. Trauma centers represent valuable public resources to a community not unlike the local police or fire departments. Unfortunately few States or communities have taken the necessary steps to establish such systems. As a consequence, lives are lost which could otherwise be saved. Every American is at risk of trauma; automobile accidents or violence can strike at random.

Funding for the trauma system program first became available in fiscal year 1992. Unfortunately, only 23 States have had an opportunity to participate in the program due to funding limitations. Reauthorization for an additional 3 years will permit the remaining 27 States to participate and begin the process of regionalizing trauma care resources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who, as a member of the subcommittee, has been particularly helpful in developing the reauthorization. Through his efforts the committee has renewed its commitment to assuring that all States have an opportunity to participate in this program and that the benefits of trauma care systems accrue to every citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Each year an estimated 140,000 Americans die from trauma and an additional 80,000 suffer permanent disability due to severe head and spinal cord injuries. Trauma is the leading cause of death of Americans between the ages of 1 and 44, and is estimated to cost the Nation \$135 billion annually. The American College of Surgeons estimates that 20,000 injury victims die unnecessarily each year because they receive inappropriate medical treatment.

The goal of this legislation is to significantly reduce those numbers by creating regional trauma care centers with specialized equipment and personnel. Death and disability associated with trauma can be reduced if victims are treated promptly and accurately. It is in the interest of all of us that such centers be developed.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to see that the authorization levels in this bill have been reduced from \$60 million to a much more realistic \$15 million.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1340

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2205.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 193

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and Inspector General, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are waived.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded during consideration of this resolution is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 193 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2200, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The rule also makes in order the Science, Space, and Technology Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original text for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. The substitute will be considered by title, with each title considered as read.

In addition, the rule waives all points of order against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI pertaining to the 3-day layover requirement. Mr. Speaker, this waiver is necessary to enable the House to expeditiously move forward on its legislative agenda.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2200 provides authorizations for programs under the jurisdiction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] and related agencies for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. The bill also sets forth policy provisions and authorities in order to carry out the activities of the civil space program.

I want to commend my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for the excellent job they have done in bringing this bill to the House floor. In particular, I want to express my support for the funds included for the National Aerospace Plane Program.

The bill authorizes \$80 million in NASA funds for each year for the National Aerospace plane, a joint project with the Department of Defense. The National Aerospace Plane Program is developing technology to make possible the first flight of a hypersonic aircraft that can take off from a runway and fly into orbit in space.

I am proud to say that the office coordinating this project is located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in the Dayton, OH, area. Nearly 100 years ago, Dayton's Wright brothers ushered in the era of flight. Now, the national aerospace plane promises to be a leader in the development of the technology for the next century of flight.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2200 is the result of hearings and careful consultations. I am pleased that we have an open rule which received unanimous support in the House Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard it said that a long journey begins with single steps in the right direction. And today we are taking another step in our long and sometimes uphill journey toward greater fairness and openness in this House. Today we have the fifth open rule this year.

That is better than no open rules at all, but when you look at the 13 highly restrictive rules we have also seen this year on bills of much greater significance to average Americans, those 5 open rules lose some of their luster.

As we applaud today's open rule on the NASA authorization bill—which we should—let us hope that the Democrat majority has given up its insecurity about allowing the democratic process to work its will. We will have made great strides when we see more open rules than not on truly major bills.

Had we had an open rule on the Clinton tax bill, Members could have considered amendments replacing the onerous Btu energy tax with additional spending cuts. Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle might then have avoided the awkward position they are now in—having supported the President in passing a tax which appears to have lost the President's support. We keep saying that there is nothing to fear from democracy in this House. Broad debate that allows a wide range of amendments and opinions simply yields better legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the NASA authorization has been afforded the luxury of open debate. I think once the Members of this House have

worked their will, we will end up with a better product. The space program, and especially the space station *Freedom*, is always the subject of much debate.

Especially in these tough budgetary times, high-profile programs like this undergo intense scrutiny to ensure affordability and fiscal responsibility. And that is as it should be. I live in Florida, where we see direct evidence of the wonders and merits of the space program.

Yet I know that all programs—not just the bad ones—must take their share of budget cutbacks, and must be made to operate as efficiently as possible. That is why my package of budget cuts offered in March included a 15-percent cut in the space station budget over 5 years; 15 percent is a significant cut but one that could be achieved without crippling the program or breaking faith with our international partners. The bill before us today takes a bigger chunk, cutting \$3 billion in the space station, which is a full 25 percent.

But even that substantial a cut is being made without jeopardizing the fundamental soundness and future viability of this worthwhile program. This demonstrates that it is possible to make serious, real, and responsible cuts without killing good programs. And that is our mission: cutting spending.

I commend the chairmen and ranking member for their fine work with a very difficult challenge. And for those who believe they can build upon the solid foundation brought forward to us by the committee, this open rule provides the appropriate forum to consider their suggestions.

Today's open rule is not a giant leap for mankind, but it is a small step for the men and women in this House. I urge support of this rule.

□ 1350

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I join with the gentleman in commending the Committee on Rules for reporting out an open rule.

Our space program is very important, and I believe that it is entitled to the full and most extensive debate possible.

One key amendment that I am sure will be proposed, that I intend to support, is the amendment to delete funding for the space station program.

My colleague, the gentleman from Florida, has alluded to this program

and to the cuts that have been proposed in the spending. But the fact is we have come to a pivotal point in the history of our space program, particularly with respect to the space station. The space station, as it currently exists and in the iterations that have been proposed by NASA's redesign team, bears no resemblance to what was proposed in 1984 by Ronald Reagan.

The space station at that time was supposed to be a marvelous device that would scan the heavens and the Earth, that would be a staging point for deep-space missions, that would be a factory in space, and it would have a wide array of functions, none of which are going to be performed by this space station except the remaining two functions of microgravity research and life science research, neither of which are going to be performed as well by any of the redesigns as by the already inadequate space station *Freedom* design.

This is the time for us to seize the opportunity, cut our losses, and reallocate our resources to more cost-effective programs in space and on Earth. It is a timely debate, because the President is currently considering the report of the NASA redesign team and his blue-ribbon commission. The newspapers tell us that the President and congressional supporters of the space station are most likely to settle on the design that has been identified by the President's blue-ribbon commission as being the most costly and the most risky of all the designs proposed by NASA.

At the same time, our European partners, the people who we are being asked to keep faith with in continuing this program, despite perhaps our better judgment, are having second thoughts about this program as well. Germany and Italy, two of the major contributors to the space program European component, are recognizing that their budget constraints are driving them to the same conclusion that many enlightened people in this country have arrived at; namely, that we cannot afford to proceed with the space station program.

So the Europeans' \$3 billion complement to that program is in serious doubt. The time has come to give our European partners a face-saving exit from this program, to cut their losses as well as ours, and that is why this debate is so timely.

All of this comes at a time when the Senate is grappling with ways to come up with extra budget cuts to make up for the fact that the Btu tax has been eliminated from the President's budget program. There is no better time than now to grapple with this issue and to do the very difficult thing, which is to cut our losses.

I intend, during general debate, to explain some of the substantive reasons for that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make a couple of closing remarks on this.

We are talking about the rule here today, and this open rule, and I know that we have all heard a little bit of grumbling about the previous open rules, about how much time they take and how inconvenient it can be sometimes, with travel schedules and so forth. That is well and good, but I think the primary purpose of this function is to legislate deliberately.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the open rule helps us on that, and it may be a little bit disingenuous to say, "Gosh, the open rule we did on, say, the Competitiveness Act lasted for so many days." In fact, one of the reasons it lasted for so many days was as a convenience to Members who had some travel involved, and another reason it lasted so many days is there was, I think, some intentional filler-scheduling going on.

I would point out that the majority party properly controls the schedule, properly controls the Committee on Rules, and that really is not quite straightforward in my view to say that just because we have taken a long time on one particular open rule that we are going to take a long time on a lot of open rules. I do not think that is it at all.

I think the collective wisdom of this body understands our mission, and we have much legislation to get moving for the well-being of this Nation.

I believe that it is in that spirit that we view the open rule, and we hope that is true also on the other side, the meaningful debate will come forward.

I do not think that anybody is going to stand very long for any frivolous matter to be introduced. I certainly feel that that would be an abuse of the intent of the open rule and would be very upset to see that happen and would work against that happening.

So it is in that spirit that I want to suggest that perhaps the open rule, if we give it a chance to work on major legislation as well as on important legislation, which is not quite as major but nevertheless very important, will in fact serve us very well and serve our country very well, because I honestly think that is what the Founding Fathers had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to engage in a discussion about NASA and the space station without crossing the line from debate into poetry. The concepts of space exploration and man's role in this solar system and beyond compel us to consider the nature of our own and our children's dreams. They concern our fantasies, passions, and yearnings—and they touch on the core of our American identity as pioneering adventurers. These issues also bear directly on how

our future here, on Earth, in the United States, in our schools and hospitals, offices and factories will be shaped.

To take these enormous issues and reduce them to budgets and time lines, designs and line items, is exceedingly difficult and frustrating. So, I must commend the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking member, for their fine work on this bill and for the contribution they have made to all our futures.

I would like to take the next couple of minutes or so to address three fairly general issues that I think are critical to the current debate over the space station: First, the general role of Government; second, how we can best make concrete plans today for an unknowable future; and finally, how we can get past the Government gridlock to actually achieve the policy we pass.

In discussing the role of Government, which actually means the role of taxpayer dollars in space station, I am continually frustrated. How do you weigh the importance of any ongoing, future-oriented project like the space station next to the importance of issues like cutting Federal spending and lowering the deficit?

For me, and I think for most Americans, America's space program is one of the activities undertaken by our Government which is unquestionably legitimate. And the objectives are far too important to compromise. Forget the unparalleled knowledge about space itself, forget even the new heights of international cooperation and the building of inhabitable structures in space. What you are left with are medical advances, new techniques in air and water purification, improved crystals for electronics, new energy production research, better insight into global ecology and more than 30,000 other basic applications of science that will improve our productivity, our global competitiveness, our environment, and our everyday lives. These are objectives worth achieving.

Moreover, the reaching of these objectives through space research is exactly the type of activity that Americans expect their Government to undertake. This expectation is what separates space station funding from Federal spending on paintings and poetry, on museums, publishing, broadcasting, farm subsidies, loan guarantees, real estate development, and bank bailouts.

When we look for places to cut Federal spending, in other words, we should go first to the plethora of activities in which Government is involved but does not need to be. America's space program is one activity that absolutely requires Government involvement.

Once we accept the necessity for Federal leadership and financing of the program, we must address a second problem. Because of the timeframe we

are dealing with—the projected usefulness of space station *Freedom* is 30 years—we have only the vaguest idea of exactly how this resource will be used for most of its existence. The extraordinary pace of scientific and technological development guarantees, in fact, that many of the experiments and activities our children will need to conduct in space will be far different from any we can imagine today.

How then, should we build this space station to meet needs of which we cannot conceive. I believe the answer is self-evident. We must build a space station that is as flexible as possible, as sophisticated as possible, and as multi-operational as it can be.

Think of the space station as the foundation on which we will construct a building, the next generation of space science. We have only the barest of sketches of what the building will eventually look like—and those sketches may change. The smaller, more limited our foundation, the less likely it is to be useful as the plans for the building take shape. The larger, more expansive the foundation, on the other hand, the more efficiently we will be able to build whatever scientific structure is needed when we pass beyond what is today's technological horizon. More is not only better, given this model, it is cheaper in the long run, because it will allow less retrofitting and a longer useful life.

As with everything in life, however, to the space station, perfection is the arch enemy of accomplishment. In this Congress, we have taken plans that were already moving toward fruition and we sent them back to the drawing table. I'm not saying it was a bad idea totally, or that there were no problems, but each time we bring the debate back to ground zero—the very existence of space station *Freedom*—we add to the cost and we push back the ultimate date of deployment.

I believe that, as it has for the past several years, space station *Freedom* will garner the support of the majority of my colleagues. Let that be the end. I implore my colleagues, look at the progress, study the design, follow the budget—and where problems arise, by all means, let us fix them. But let us not return any more to this same place.

Let us stop with the redesigns and the attempts to gut the program. If you oppose *Freedom*, fight your hardest when the amendment to kill station comes up. And then, if you lose, accept the will of your country and help us move forward on this monumental project. Be a watchdog and keep us honest, but please, at the same time, let us move beyond this point so that we can stop stretching the timeline and the budget for a project that, as the upcoming vote on station will tell, America stands behind.

Space station *Freedom* is a crucial project that falls squarely in our lap to

provide direction and support. Most of us support it, and have for many years. Now, let us build it.

□ 1400

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and this bill. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], from the other side of the aisle.

This bill is a bipartisan bill. The space program has always had a bipartisan support. It must stay that way.

This bill includes a real space station, one we must build. Competitively, scientifically, technologically, this is a station well worth building, and we have structured this bill in a way that will save billions of dollars over the next decade in needless management inefficiencies and overhead while preserving the technology at the core of the space station program.

This station will fly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a balanced bill that includes spending for both the space station and other manned space endeavors and also the unmanned endeavors which are critical also to the space program.

I believe in a balanced space program, and this bill provides it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is within the spending allotted for NASA over the next 5 years in the President's budget. In fact, this bill is under the President's budget. It is conservative, it is fiscally sound, it is technologically exactly what we need.

There are more than 70,000 Americans who are looking to us to do what is right, and that is to pass this rule and pass this bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2200.

□ 1406

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development space

flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, with Mrs. UNSOELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues to this simple chart which we have in front of us, which represents the NASA budgets since 1960. I am following the tactic of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] who uses a similar simple chart to show how small the Department of Agriculture budget is. This is a similar illustration of the NASA budget, indicating that even today it is still, in constant dollars, about half of what it was at its peak during the 1960's.

I will comment later on that. But I thought we ought to have the chart up here as an illustration of the realities of what has happened to space budget spending over the last 30 years.

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor today H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. At the outset I want to commend my colleagues who have worked so hard on this bill. In particular, I want to recognize the efforts of Mr. HALL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER of the Subcommittee on Space, and Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. LEWIS of the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation who have developed their respective portions of the bill. I also want to thank Mr. WALKER, the ranking Republican of the committee, for his contributions and cooperation in moving this bill through the committee. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation and one which contains the thoughtful input of a great many Members on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2200 contains a great many meritorious provisions and initiatives which are intended to guide our space and aeronautics program into the next decade. I will not take the time to go through these in detail today but a summary of major provisions is included with my written statement.

The overall environment in which we are offering our bill today is one of tremendous change and opportunity. The space and aeronautics program has always meant something special to our Nation. To say that the space program

represents a search for new knowledge, or that it means jobs, or that it is just another input to our economic engine is a great disservice. It is, of course, all of these things, but more importantly it is a piece of our national heritage. The flights of Shepard and GLENN, the Apollo Moon landing, the Viking landing on Mars, and the wonderful Voyager pictures are moments of technological triumph that we will always treasure.

Today, we stand on the verge of transforming this investment we have made into a tremendous tangible return. We have now learned enough about how to live and operate in space that we can more clearly envision what we need to do to develop new alloys and life-saving drugs, how we can address our environmental concerns, and how we can improve the quality of life in thousands of innovative ways.

In the aeronautics area, we stand on the verge of developing next generation aircraft that are more energy efficient, more environmentally acceptable, and will begin to erase the technology barriers that separate air travel from space travel.

We are now no longer driven by cold-war motivations to demonstrate technological superiority over other nations. Indeed, many of the achievements we envision in the future will be cooperative with other nations. We will share not only the benefits but also the costs. This new direction that we envision in the space program reflects the broader new directions that seem evident for the entire world. In the space area, this will require a recognition of its significance and a consensus on its direction.

Madam Chairman, I would like to address, for a moment, the one central space issue that has dominated the attention of the committee, the administration, and the public over the past 6 months—the prospects for continuing the Space Station Program. H.R. 2200 contains a very significant decision on the space station that I am certain will be debated extensively during floor consideration.

Late last year, the new administration made a decision to review the cost and technical approach for the space station. Even though this program has undergone countless reviews over the past 8 years, it was important to the President that the Space Station Program be accommodated within the long range budget the administration envisioned for NASA and still leave room for other cutting edge technological activities.

H.R. 2200 contains a multiyear, flat level, budget for the space station of \$1.9 billion through the year 1999. This is our best effort at defining a compromise for a very difficult dilemma. Although many of us have strongly supported the Space Station Freedom Program over the past 8 years, we are mindful that the remaining funding

profile will be exceedingly difficult to accommodate within the limited budget that is projected for NASA.

Thus H.R. 2200 acknowledges that some cost reductions must be made. H.R. 2200 represents a reduction of almost \$3 billion in the station program over the next 5 years, or, nearly 25 percent of the projected costs. This will require a concerted effort to reduce management overhead, some possible elimination of hardware, and finally some slippage in schedule. Our view has been that such schedule slips are tolerable and need not be costly if they can be planned for in advance through the type of multiyear commitments we are recommending.

Equally important, the cost of operating the station in future years must be dramatically reduced. Here, we have joined with the President in directing NASA to set a goal of cutting the station annual operating budget in half.

Madam Chairman, the station program represents nothing less than a reinventing of Government that we have heard so much about. It is a tangible attempt to take a program with acknowledged cost and management problems and make it work. We will be cutting bureaucracy and overhead and we will be streamlining the management organization to do things more efficiently. We will also take a major step forward in establishing the type of international cooperative, cost sharing arrangement that will hopefully characterize all future major science efforts.

Madam Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the administration and NASA in carrying out this review process. This work has allowed us to structure a space station program that dramatically reduces its cost while maintaining the scientific potential and maintaining our commitments to our international partners. Moreover, it has identified some crucial and much needed management improvements that will increase NASA's efficiency and save the taxpayers money. In short, this redesign process has redesigned NASA far more than it has redesigned the space station.

Madam Chairman, throughout the development of H.R. 2200 we have kept in close contact with the administration and we will continue to do so as we move forward. We have deferred action on the space station portion of this bill until the administration announces their decision on the space station. We expect to receive their decision over the next several days.

Today, I would also like to take the opportunity to place this decision on the space station in a broader perspective—that of deficit reduction. Indeed, there has been some discussion of including the Space Station Program as part of an alternative deficit reduction package. This represents a very naive and misguided perception of the structure of our space program and a very

cynical view of how deficit reduction should work.

The space station is one of 77 programs included in the NASA request which totals \$15.265 billion. The total space station funding represents about 12 percent of NASA's request and an infinitesimal fraction of the deficit. Although a recommendation within the deficit reduction package to reduce discretionary spending or even reduce NASA spending would be understandable, a recommendation to change NASA's program structure to reduce the deficit is not.

Even if the station were eliminated, the microgravity science including the development of new materials and drugs, would still need to be carried out. Most other alternatives such as unmanned satellites, shuttle flights, or using the Russian space station are unsatisfactory from a technical standpoint or not cost effective. In addition, the dislocation of 55,000 workers now employed on the space station project would have a very adverse effect on other economic indicators.

The space station budget fits well within the long range NASA budget set out by the administration and by the committee. This long range budget represents inflation only and does not detract from veterans, housing, environment, or other spending areas. Although we can accept and adjust to overall spending limitations, we cannot accept decisions purporting to restructure the civil space program in a more cost effective way.

Thus I would call on those concerned with deficit reduction to identify the objectives first—how much can we afford to spend on the civil space program? The committees of jurisdiction

are well equipped to identify the means. H.R. 2200 has identified a reduction below the President's request of over \$200 million without disrupting jobs. We have included a very balanced science program and a healthy Space Station Program.

Madam Chairman, this concludes my statement. Once again I would like to thank all my colleagues who contributed to this bill and I ask for its speedy passage.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 2200—THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

The bill is composed of four titles. Title I contains funding provisions for all NASA space and aeronautics programs. Title II outlines provisions to carry out an Advanced Space Technology Investment program. Title III contains general provisions for NASA's administrative authority and also special policy matters. Title IV establishes a special Aeronautics Research and Technology program.

Major funding actions are outlined in the attached spread sheet. Some specific initiatives are as follows:

\$1.9 billion is authorized for the Space Station Freedom program for fiscal years 1994 through 1999 and \$1.3 billion thereafter.

Other associated activities that support the Space Station program are authorized separately. These include Space Shuttle/Space Station integration studied, microgravity and life science activities, and facility construction activities.

\$21 million is provided for an Expendable Launch Vehicle component technology program to develop special technologies to improve the competitiveness of the U.S. industry.

\$21.4 million is provided to fund the development of advanced launch technologies and components (including Single-Stage-To-Orbit technologies).

\$18 million is authorized for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN).

\$25 million is provided for the High Resolution Multispectral Stereo Imager (HRMSI) for Landsat 7.

\$20 million is provided to enhance the Mission Operations and Data Analysis activities within Physics and Astronomy.

\$65 million is provided to enhance the Mission Operations and Data Analysis activities and initiate development of the Mars Environmental Survey mission (MESUR) within Planetary Exploration.

\$80 million is provided for the National Aerospace Plane program.

\$10 million is provided for the initiation of a program to develop an Aluminum Lithium tank for the Space Shuttle.

The Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program is terminated. NASA is to transfer solid rocket motor case refurbishment and nozzle production activities into the Yellow Creek facility.

In addition to these funding provisions, the bill outlines several major policy initiatives to guide NASA, Department of Transportation, and Department of Commerce in carrying out the space and aeronautics program. Some of these are as follows:

The Commercial Space Launch Act is amended to extend the Secretary's authority to license reentry operations.

The Department of Commerce is given a broad coordinating role in commercial space policy.

The bill establishes an interagency Global Change Data Information System.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended to include as a purpose the development of new technology.

The bill requires a study of a University Innovative Research Program to strengthen the role of universities in generating new technology.

Title IV of the bill contains provisions requiring an independent performance review and an independent technology transfer review for NASA's aeronautics programs.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET SUMMARY

(In millions of dollars)

Activity	Fiscal year—						Comments for fiscal year 1994 authorization
	1993		1994		1995		
	Appropriation	Request	Authorization	Difference	Authorization	Difference	
Research & Development	7,098.3	7,712.3	7,631.7	.....	8,316.8	.....	
Space Station	2,122.5	2,300.0	1,900.0	-400	1,900.0	-400	Tech. Initiatives moved to new line; other efforts redistributed.
Technology Investment Initiatives	.....	.....	22.0	+22	40.0	+40	New budget line for Tech. Investment Initiatives.
Space Trans. Capability Development	649.2	649.2	751.6	+102.4	819.3	+176	+\$70 Shuttle/Station Integrate; +\$21 ELV upgrades; +\$21.4 Adv launch technology; -\$10 Adv Progs.
Physics and Astronomy	1,034.7	1,074.7	1,094.7	+20	1,162.3	+15	+\$20 MO&DA.
Planetary Exploration	473.7	557.2	622.2	+65	646.8	+85	+\$65 MO&DA and MESUR.
Life & Microgravity Science & Applications	407.5	351.0	426.0	+75	485.7	+165	+\$13 Centrifuge; +\$22 Station Life Sci and +\$40 Micro g payload; \$2 for breast/ovarian cancer.
Life Science	-140.6	-143.9	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Microgravity Science	-172.9	-89.4	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Spacelab Missions	-94.0	-117.7	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Mission to Planet Earth	949.0	1,074.9	1,109.9	+35	1,448.1	+329.1	+\$25 HRMSI; +\$10 CIESIN; \$8 CIESIN & \$5 RPA from avail funds.
Space Research & Technology	272.7	298.2	298.2	.....	333.1	.....	\$10 for SP—100 from avail funds.
Commercial Programs	165.4	172.0	172.0	.....	141.4	.....	
Aeronautical Research & Tech	865.6	1,020.7	1,020.7	.....	1,115.0	.....	\$5 Short-Haul A/C; \$11.5 TIREP; \$30.2 noise reduction.
Transatmospheric Research & Tech (NASP)	.....	80.0	80.0	.....	80.0	.....	
Safety, Reliability, & QA	32.7	35.3	35.3	.....	38.5	.....	
Academic Programs	92.9	74.5	74.5	.....	81.5	.....	
Tracking & Data Adv. Systems	23.3	24.6	24.6	.....	25.1	.....	
Space Flight, Control, & Data Communications	5,086.0	5,316.9	5,171.5	-145.4	5,067.2	-149.7	
Shuttle Production & Ops Capability	1,053.0	1,189.6	1,069.2	-120.4	978.5	-253.8	+\$10 AI—Lith ET; \$130.4 ASRM termination.
Shuttle Operations	3,016.0	3,006.5	3,006.5	.....	2,810.4	.....	
Space & Grnd Networks, Comm & Data Sys	836.2	820.5	795.5	-25	964.6	+169.1	-\$25 from TDRS procure due to schedule slip.
Launch Services	180.8	300.3	300.3	.....	313.7	.....	
Construction of Facilities	525.0	545.3	570.3	+25	422.2	-123.1	+\$25 for Station—related facilities.
Research & Program Management	1,615.0	1,675.0	1,650.0	-25	1,675.0	.....	-\$25 from reduction in force/travel.
Inspector General	15.1	15.5	15.5	.....	16.0	.....	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,330.4</b>	<b>15,265.0</b>	<b>15,039.0</b>	<b>-226</b>	<b>15,497.2</b>	<b>-215.8</b>	

□ 1420

In all likelihood, Madam Chairman, there will be even further adjustments made during the course of debate here today, and later in the week and during the course of debate over the appropriations bill. This is the proper way to address this problem, not through any arbitrary action to make a major change in the balance of the program.

Madam Chairman, this concludes my statement. Once again I would like to thank all of my colleagues who contributed to this bill, and I ask for its speedy passage.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. This is a fiscally responsible piece of legislation. This is why there are so many of my colleagues on the Republican side who are listed as cosponsors of the bill.

H.R. 2200 authorizes \$15.039 billion for NASA for fiscal year 1994. That is \$226 million under the request in the President's budget. For fiscal year 1995, the bill only authorizes a 3-percent increase, and H.R. 2200 terminates a major NASA project: The Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program which was estimated to cost between \$3.7 to \$3.9 billion to complete.

The Science Committee has done the responsible thing on space station by cutting its budget while still supporting completion of a real, functional facility. H.R. 2200 allows us to achieve essentially the current design of space station *Freedom* and place it in orbit by the end of the century. It authorizes a freeze of \$1.9 billion annually over the next 6 years. This represents a decrease from current funding of over \$222 million.

In fiscal year 2000, the \$1.9 billion is cut to \$1.3 billion. Ultimately, the bill cuts \$3 billion out of the overall station cost over the next 5 years. I would say to my colleagues that this is not an insignificant amount. In fact, it is a very significant amount in a program of this size, and \$3 billion over 5 years I think deserves the support of Members on both sides of the aisle in this House.

We have authorized a space station that we feel is the best for fulfilling our international commitments. Canada, Japan, the member nations of the European Space Agency, and the United States all signed the Intergovernmental Agreement which has a treaty status among all of our international partners. If we back away from that quasi-treaty, we will do great damage to our long-term international position and our chance of getting further commitments. I think this is something that the administration is going to want to focus on very heavily when

they decide what option to pick for space station.

The \$1.9 billion in H.R. 2200 is the bottomline requirement to do the station right. It allows us to achieve a permanent human presence by the year 2001 with full scientific capability, both in the life, health, and medical sciences and microgravity engineering research. The American people deserve real value for their investment, already totaling more than \$8.5 billion. It would not be fair to throw that away or spend more of the taxpayers dollars on a station that can't do the job.

When the amendments to H.R. 2200 are brought up, either later this week or next week, I urge Republican Members to follow the lead of their Republican colleagues on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and oppose the amendments to cut the station funding. The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology defeated the Roemer amendment to kill the station by a vote of 30 to 10, with Republicans voting 16 to 4 against the Roemer amendment.

Canceling the space station after we have already spent \$8.5 billion and are just now finishing up system critical design review is a waste of taxpayer money. Cancellation would also result in an additional \$1 billion in spending just for the termination liability costs, so we would end up spending an additional billion just to close down the program, getting absolutely nothing for it. The hidden costs that are not easy to measure include the elimination of about 75,000 high technology jobs that are directly connected to space station *Freedom*. At a time of defense downsizing we cannot afford to have 75,000 of our best engineers put out of work because we do something stupid like cancel the space station. And of long-range importance is not only the abandonment of America's leadership in space exploration, but the virtual certainty that America will no longer have a role in manned space flight.

Madam Chairman, for Americans to decide at the end of the 20th century that we are no longer going to be active in a manned space program would be tragic. We have led the world, and, as a result of that leadership, we have been a technological leader and will be in the next century. A decision to kill space station *Freedom* is a decision not to move aggressively, as H.R. 2200 envisions, on a space program. It would be detrimental to the long-term interests of this country.

Madam Chairman, we should support H.R. 2200, and I would ask particularly the colleagues on my side to give it firm support.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Sub-

committee on Space, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

This is, of course, a bipartisan piece of legislation that the Space Subcommittee has been working on I suppose ever since the subcommittee was organized for the work of this Congress this past February.

I think I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to thank the many members of the subcommittee who have contributed to this legislation. In particular I must acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], a man who I have said before, and I have heard others say, was born to the chairman of this great committee with his background and knowledge. Throughout the drafting of this important piece of legislation he has given us the leadership along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and it is a pleasure to work with Mr. WALKER, the ranking Republican member and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] in drafting this bill.

Actually, Madam Chairman, the explanations of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] afford me the opportunity to be a little more brief with my statement at this time.

It is clear that once again this year the main funding issue within the NASA budget is the space station, and there will be those who will argue that this project should be terminated, and of course I disagree with that. However, Madam Chairman, I do believe that we need to do all within our power to ensure that the research laboratory that I hope we are about to build in space is economical, affordable, and is useful as we can possibly make it.

I think it should be pointed out once again that we have cut back on space station *Freedom*, from \$2.2 billion to \$1.9 billion per year for the next 6 years. We have slipped schedules. We have deleted hardware. We have asked for management streamlining. We have deferred hardware.

In other words, Madam Chairman, I think it is prudent to cut back, but unwise to cut out, the entire project.

□ 1430

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2200, an important bill to keep America's preeminence in civil space explicit for the next 2 years.

Much has been said about the NASA budget and specifically about the space

station, but the NASA budget is really a very, very small part of the Federal budget.

I am holding up a \$1 bill, and if this \$1 bill represents the entire budget of the U.S. Government, NASA's part of that budget consists only of the smile on George Washington's face. Of that smile on George Washington's face, the space station budget represents one-seventh.

As we debate H.R. 2200 today, I believe it is important to keep two things in mind relative to the space station: First, if we cancel the space station, upon which the United States has rested most of its plans for manned space exploration well into the 21st century, our country will be out of that important area of scientific endeavor for at least this generation and perhaps the next generation as well. We have been a leader in civil space since 1957, and abdicating that leadership means that there will be other countries around the world that will fill that vacuum.

I want to see international scientific research being done on a U.S. space station rather than the United States renting space on a space station put up by a consortium of the Europeans, the Japanese, the Canadians, and the Russians. Our country has already spent \$8.5 billion on the design and development of space station *Freedom*. That has not been without difficulty, and certainly the space station design can be streamlined. This bill does that. As my able friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the chairman of the committee, has told this committee, this bill reduces the funding for space station *Freedom* by \$3 billion over the life of this station, for a 25-percent cut.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has assured us that the American taxpayers will get more money for their dollar in crafting this bill, and I think it is important that the House ratify the work that has been done by the committee.

Finally, I would like to say that if the United States unilaterally canceled the space station, as some will recommend to this House later on today and later on in the week and next week, we will be violating international agreements that have been made with the Canadians, the Japanese, and the Europeans' space agencies. The important nations of the ESA, as well as Japan and Canada, have spent about \$4 billion of their own money developing their part of space station *Freedom*, and if we as a nation stiff those countries, our close allies, with that huge amount of money, it will be a long time before the United States will be able to get international financial participation in anything related to science and perhaps many other facets where we seek to internationalize the cost of something that the world has got to do.

So I would ask my colleagues, Madam Chairman, to think very seriously about the consequences of canceling space station *Freedom*. For the sake of our credibility abroad, we cannot afford to be an unreliable partner, and if we are an unreliable partner, we will abdicate our leadership for a long, long time.

Madam Chairman, that is not the tradition of our country, and we ought to reject that opportunity when it comes up here.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I want to thank the chairman of our full committee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], who is our resident genius in matters that involve science. He has been my mentor in many ways, and I thank him for the contribution that he has made to the development of this legislation and for the opportunities which he has given to me as a member of the committee and as chairman of the subcommittee.

I would like to thank also the ranking member of our full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] an outstanding Member of this body and one with whom I often disagree. I am glad to have the opportunity to stand in the well of the House and speak words that are sweet to both of us.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I would like to use my time to point out an important section that is often overlooked in discussions about NASA—that is NASA's first A: aeronautics.

Since the skies were first pioneered in North Carolina, advances in the technologies for flight have revolutionized the way that we live. New aeronautical technologies have brought the communities of the world closer together, made our country more secure, and created high-quality jobs for Americans. The industry provides over 1 million jobs, and is America's largest exporting sector with \$28 billion in net exports last year.

Over the history of manned flight, NASA's aeronautics programs have without question been critical to the progress of both civil and defense aviation. NASA's aerodynamic data have been a bible for aircraft design, and virtually every U.S. aircraft has depended on NASA testing to verify its design flight capabilities.

However, today, like many of our other industries, the aerospace industry is losing market share to international competitors, many of which are directly subsidized by their governments. The European consortium, Airbus, for example, has gained more than

a third of world market share in the last decade.

If we do not adequately invest in the research and development needed to sustain a world-class technology base in aeronautics, we will further jeopardize the long-term health of the U.S. aerospace industry.

The act before us calls for a much needed enhancement in the NASA's modest aeronautics R&D program. The act calls for renewed emphasis on subsonic technologies—which are technologies that will still dominate air travel well into the next century. It calls for continued, strong support for the high-speed civil transport—making clear, however, that such a technology must meet strict environmental and cost goals to be successful. And third, the act calls for an aggressive effort in hypersonic flight, to allow us to explore flight speeds never achieved by a single-stage, air-breathing engine.

The portion of NASA's budget going to aeronautics is still only 8 percent of the total NASA program. However, it is an 8 percent with a very high and long-term pay-back to the Nation.

Madam Chairman, I urge the Members' support of this bill.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, a year ago, when I stood here in the well to argue against the funding of space station *Freedom*, I said that in the light of the inexorable diminishment of its capabilities over the years, freedom is just another word for nothing left to lose.

I have got to admit that I was wrong. The space station is being downsized one more time, and every one of the options under consideration, including the option that is being considered implicitly in this legislation, gives us even less capability but still at a cost we cannot afford. It is overpriced, and it is diverting funds from more cost effective programs in space and on Earth.

Instead of opening the doorway to space, the space station will slam the door shut by taking money away from other, more valuable programs, including manned space programs.

Three months ago, the President directed NASA to redesign the space station. He said it should come up with a \$5 billion option, a \$7 billion option, and a \$9 billion option.

□ 1440

Well, at nearly \$12 billion, the cheapest of the options designed by NASA is far more expensive than the high end of the range that the President proposed. The President gave NASA an impossible task, and it should not surprise us that NASA failed to perform that task. The simple fact is we cannot produce

an adequate space station for the amount we can afford to spend.

I hope the President sticks to his guns and pulls the plug on the space station before it sucks any more of the financial lifeblood from our space program. If he does not kill the space station, then we should. Redesigning the space station for the umpteenth time is not the answer. Giving up our Government's obsession with the space station is the only way to salvage the good parts of our space program.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] referred to the fact that, if a 1 dollar bill represented the entire Federal budget, then spending on the space station represents only the smile on George Washington's face. I urge you to pull out a dollar bill from your own pocket and look at George Washington. He is not smiling. I think he is as concerned as the rest of us are, with the size of our budget deficit and the inexorable growth of the national debt.

Finally, I think the most persuasive argument in favor of the space station has been that we owe an obligation to our international partners, not to stiff them when they have made a commitment to build the space station. But I would like to quote from today's Space News, which reports that the major partners in the European element of the space station, Germany and Italy, are losing their appetite for spending money to build the space station.

Germany clearly thinks Columbia is no longer valuable, says one ESA official. The tight budgets in Germany keep getting tighter. In Italy the space commissioner has apparently installed a new policy: he only wants to spend money he has, and Italy has no money.

Madam Chairman, we have no money either. We should drop the space station.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Chairman, it was not all that long ago, but I can still remember, it was a time when Buick still had those holes in the front of their fenders and when Louisiana State University had a back named Jimmy Taylor. I was playing at a schoolyard, and suddenly was terrified to hear that a country in another part of the globe, which I had been told was so different from ours in its makeup and government style, repressive to people with free thought, had suddenly developed a thing I did not know how to pronounce, but was going to forever change the course of science and technology.

There is no word other than fear, to believe that this country, which had taught me that going to school, that

working hard, that doing well, that had promised me an education, the opportunity to do anything so that my reach could indeed exceed the grasp, had been limited, limited by scientists on another part of a dark globe.

Then I remember as I went through high school looking at America's heroes, one of whom died today, seven in number, who turned the fear into the belief that indeed this country could match the comments of its young President. That we could not only overcome what had happened in the past, but we could reach out and put our feet on the Moon, and that the footprint that would be left there would not be by a Democrat or a Republican, but by a country working together.

We have as big a threat today as we did in the 1950's, only fortunately it is not military. It is, however, economic. And a country that cannot defend itself economically to advance the technology to be the leader of the future, will be doomed to follow those who are willing to make that investment.

I do not know whether it is possible, or not, to use the space station for its intended purpose, to reach out beyond and to return to this Earth the benefits of a cheap energy, to be able to reproduce the power of a nuclear facility that our children could walk through without any fear of radiation, but there are eminent scientists that tell you there is the chance.

I do not know whether we can succeed, as we did in the 1960's, with a program that brought you everything in your current kitchen and dramatically reduced construction costs. And, by the way, almost every advance in technology to improve pollution control and purify our environment was developed in the contained environment of the program in this budget.

What I am saying is, I cannot guarantee you that a successful path will lead to a successful future. But I can guarantee you this: No future is a distinct possibility with no funding, no technology outreach, and no effort to see tomorrow before others do, and tomorrow will belong to whomever makes that commitment.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill, particularly to give my support to space station *Freedom* and to thank the chairman of Science, Space, and Technology Committee, GEORGE BROWN, and the ranking member, BOB WALKER for all their hard work and continued support of the space station.

Some 25 years ago, America took one small step for mankind, made a national dream come true and we've never looked back. Since we began the race for space back in the late 1950's,

America has taken it upon herself to be a leader, not only in space exploration, but also in space-based research and we have openly shared with the world the breakthroughs in technology we take for granted today.

Our country has always had the right stuff when it came to making the tough decisions. We are a nation of forward thinkers, dreamers, visionaries, willing to take the risks that reap great rewards. I want us to keep that leadership role and not give it away to Russia or Japan or Canada or Europe or any other foreign power.

Madam Chairman, we are all very aware that we are faced today with a struggling economy, a huge deficit, and a fast-changing world, looking to America for guidance and stability.

Today, there are tough budget choices to make. But occasionally there are times we need to look beyond the day-to-day problems, to break free from the forest-for-the-trees attitude, and see a greater vision.

With space station *Freedom*, we have entered into unprecedented international partnerships. The international agreements we signed back in the mid-1980's with the European space agency, Japan, and Canada were a statement of our good faith as global partners. We will place the future of our manned space missions and future international partnerships in serious jeopardy if we do not honor our original commitments to our partners, and provide the multiyear funding necessary for space station *Freedom*.

Terminating the space station would paralyze the future of our manned space program. Without the research on long-term effects that space will have on our astronauts, we cannot participate in long-range exploration.

Not only will the space station be an international laboratory in space, but it will provide us with unprecedented research capabilities, spawn new industries, products, and jobs. It will also promote international cooperation and the peaceful exploration of space and will provide incentives to our math and science students who will only pursue such professions if they believe America is dedicated to preserving its research and industrial base.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2200 and space station *Freedom*. We must invoke our national will to meet the challenge to push the outside of the envelope, to keep the dream alive. The dream that Chuck Yeager believed in when he strapped himself into his X-15 *Glamorous Glenis* and broke Mach 2. The same dream that our *Mercury* and *Apollo* astronauts carried with them on their unequalled missions. The message is clear Madam Chairman, we need to light the fuse and let 'er fly.

□ 1450

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the

distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], a very thoughtful and hard-working member of our committee.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I would like to first start off by commending our very distinguished chairman for his leadership on our committee in a number of ways within the committee, how he promotes discussion and debate that is healthy for all bills and all policy, and he also accompanies each of his bills to the floor with an open rule, which I very much respect and salute as well, too.

I would also like to recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Space. It is my first term on the Subcommittee on Space, and I can tell my colleagues that even when we disagree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], he wants to hear all sides. He wants to have a thorough debate, and he wants to listen to all members as well, too.

The ranking minority members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], have worked very hard to get a bipartisan bill on the floor as well, too. And in order to do that, we have had many discussions and debates and amendments in our bill.

Some of the things that we have not all agreed on have been proposals, one of which I offered in the committee, which was a proposal to cut the ASRM, the advanced solid rocket motor program, and have 50 percent of the money go for deficit reduction and the other 50 percent go for good science that is being squeezed and cut and taken out of our NASA budget because of programs like a space station that we cannot afford and that does not work.

Things that we funded with the ASRM cancellation, with my amendment, continued to be good, strong support for commercial launch augment so that we do not have to continually see the French and the Russians and other countries take this area over from us, a very critical area for us in commercial, real commercial viability for satellites and for communications in the world. Physics augment, and also bigger, safer, quicker augment so that NASA can begin to do things differently.

Later this week, Madam Chairman, I will be offering an amendment to terminate space station *Freedom*. We have heard a great deal of debate, how it can be everything, it can cure health care problems for everybody. It will do things for science that we have never seen before.

We should cancel this program for three reasons. One, fiscal responsibility. On one side of the aisle we have Members saying we never need to raise any kind of taxes, and on the other side we often have Members say we do not need to cut any spending.

We can see what can happen with the reconciliation bill. We have to cut some programs. This is one of those cuts we need to make.

Second, in terms of good science, we are squeezing out many great science programs within the NASA budget, and we will talk about more of those.

Our entire funding for NIH [National Institutes of Health] is \$6.9 billion. One in four approved grants is funded. Let us concentrate on some of these problems here.

Third, we need to concentrate on what is the mission of NASA in the future. What is the balance for a manned program, and we need a manned program in science.

Finally, we also need to discuss the direction of this country. We all often hear of JFK's quote about putting a person on the Moon. He also said, "If not us, who; if not now, when?"

We need to do something about this budget. We need to make some of the choices here to reduce the budget deficit for future generations.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, today I rise in support of this bill and its rule. I thank the chairman for what I consider a job well done.

As everyone knows, on June 9, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology reported out and passed H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill, with bipartisan support. It was not just Democrats. In fact, 13 Republican committee members, including myself, cosponsored the bill.

The most important part of this bill is the \$1.9 billion authorized each year for the next 6 years to complete the space station. The bill funds the only real and viable option to come out of the space station redesign process, option B. Option B is a smaller version of space station *Freedom*, and the only one which keeps the original intent of our goal to develop a long-term workable space station. To choose another option would be throwing away over \$9 billion worth of research.

Do we want to scrap 9 years of hard work and progress? Do we want to put America's relationship with our international partners in serious jeopardy? I say no. The resounding answer is no. We must fully support this effort.

This bill authorizes \$226 million less than the President's request and cuts \$3 billion off the overall cost over 5 years. This is a real cut in spending.

The committee also overwhelmingly voted again to kill the advanced solid rocket motor project to save an additional \$1.5 billion. It is a responsible bill and gives NASA the guidance, direction, and dollars to complete space station *Freedom*.

Most importantly, this bill is fiscally responsible. Do not let the space sta-

tion and 75,000 jobs be part of political sabotage. A vote for this bill represents a vote for the future of America.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and the ranking members of the committee. I want to speak particularly to the new Members of this Congress.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200 and say that in supporting this bill, we are at a real crossroads with regard to human exploration of space.

Now, we are going to hear a lot during this debate. The debate started today. The debate will carry on as the various amendments are proposed.

Some have already had it that this is a deficit reduction opportunity, that a vote against the space station, a vote against this bill would cut billions of dollars from the deficit. And so we continue to have NASA's issues held hostage to that bigger political debate.

A lot of the arguments that our opponents raise with regard to the space station are the same arguments that were raised with regard to the ASRM program and were debated very aggressively and very healthily within the committee.

As was said by my colleague from Texas, this was a bipartisan bill that was forged here to the floor. We all gave up something in getting this bill here.

I think with regard to NASA's plan to redesign the space station, we have accomplished a lot with regard to coming up with a space station budget that fits the parameters of what we can afford this day and time. But particularly, when I said we are at a crossroads, if we now walk away from the space station program, we are walking away from the human exploration of space. We will be giving up on that aspect of NASA's programs from now on.

Our international partners are waiting and watching this political process that they do not necessarily understand. We hold NASA's projects hostage from year to year. They are looking at their partnership with us, and they are looking at the \$4 billion that they have spent on the space station. And they want to know what our commitment is to this program. So we owe them an obligation, and we owe ourselves an obligation.

The existing space station *Freedom* we have spent \$8 billion on. For us to walk away from this project or come up with a new space station would be one of the more irresponsible acts we in this Congress could commit.

In conclusion, I want to remind the Members of a couple of things. We complain from time to time, as a country, about our young people and science and mathematics particularly, in general.

Our young people are not excelling in science and mathematics.

I come from a district where we have the Space Camp and the Space and Rocket Center.

□ 1500

I get the opportunity from time to time to go out there and to see those young people that come there from all over the country, that come there because they are inspired by the human exploration of space. They are inspired by the space station program. They want to commit their careers. They turn around their educational lives because they get turned on by that kind of project.

To walk away from space station and to walk away from the human exploration of space would be to give up on that very young person's inspiration. I do not think we want to walk away from that.

I urge my colleagues, particularly the new colleagues, do not be lost in this debate. The issues that are being raised here today and that will be raised in the various amendments that are coming up with regard to a space station are the same tired issues that have been raised before. Let us vote for the space station and let us vote for NASA's reauthorization bill.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, the argument has been, how can we afford to continue space research when we have so many problems here in the United States that we have to deal with, not the least of which is our budget deficit.

My response is, it is a very good thing that 500 years ago nobody approached Queen Isabella of Spain and said, "Do not pawn your jewels to finance exploration into the unknown, by a foreigner no less, born in Italy, when there are problems here in Spain that need to be addressed."

The fact is that exploration produced results that were never foreseen at the time, and scientific exploration always produces positive results that cannot be foreseen at the time they are undertaken.

We have, in the years that we have done space exploration, seen positive and concrete results from that type of scientific endeavor. American companies produce now new products with new materials that were never envisioned before but have been the spinoff of space research.

It has already been pointed out how our allies have been asked to support this program and how our credibility with them will be jeopardized if we abandon it. I think we should continue space research, not only on that basis but on the effect it has on our own

young, people. How many scientists and engineers do we have now who have joined the scientific field, spurred on by the imaginary proposals by President Kennedy, who originally proposed putting a man on the Moon?

Madam Chairman, I submit that if we proceed with space research, we will produce a whole new generation of scientists and engineers who are stimulated and encouraged to proceed by the actions we take here this week.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise today as a freshman in strong support of this bill. I would like to first of all thank our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and also the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], for the excellent work they have done on this, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], whom I note is celebrating his 50th birthday today as well, so happy birthday to Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

I think one of the most positive aspects of this particular bill, H.R. 2200, is that it is truly an example of the kind of representation that the people who elected us want to see from their Representatives. We are not acting as Democrats, we are not acting as Republicans, but we are acting together as Americans to forge the best kind of bill that we possibly can to ensure future exploration of space, as well as to ensure those other initiatives that NASA is involved with on a regular basis, for our ability to be competitive in the global marketplace and to continue to be on the cutting edge of technology in space and aeronautics.

At the centerpiece of this is space station *Freedom*, \$1.9 billion a year for the next 2 years, which is what we can immediately authorize. I am a strong proponent. What I would say to all Members of this body, freshmen and otherwise, is that what it really boils down to with space station *Freedom* is either we do or we do not believe that our destiny includes the manned and womaned exploration of space. If we believe that that is part of the American destiny, then we will vote for this bill. If we do not, then we will vote against it.

However, if we think that our future lies in the stars and that we have a mandate to go to space with manned and womaned explorations, then this is the bill to vote for. Anyone who would tell the Members that in fact we are waiting for the future, that there is going to be another different design, is not telling the Members the facts. This is the design. This is the plan. This is

what we should be supporting now, because this is what is available.

Finally, I would like to point out that also in this NASA authorization bill is a very important piece of legislation that goes towards the aeronautics research that is carried on at different research facilities around the country, specifically Lewis Research in Ohio, where there is diligent work being performed to allow us to have an airplane that will go at mach 2.4, 60,000 feet above the Earth, that is quiet, efficient, and environmentally safe.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, we meet today to begin consideration of the fiscal year 1994 NASA authorization bill, H.R. 2200. The major issue once again is whether or not this Nation should build a space station—and which space station, exactly, we should build.

As a result of the recent much-touted space station redesign process, Madam Chairman, we in Congress—and in the Clinton administration—have been presented with three major design options for the space station. The redesign was mandated by the Clinton administration. The hope was for a much more inexpensive space station.

Madam Chairman, we now have the results of this redesign effort, and it turns out that the cost differences between the three options are slight, relative to the scope of the program. Of course, the capabilities of each of these three options differ widely; option B seems to offer the greatest flexibility, capability, and growth potential.

In which case, Madam Chairman, I pose the question: Why have we been involved in this redesign exercise? The answer, to me, Madam Chairman, is that this process really has brought down the cost of the space station program of the current design—option B. Perhaps now we can also bring in the capabilities of the newly democratic Russian Republic and their extensive space program. Bringing in our former enemies would make this truly international effort even more expansive than originally conceived. It would be even more inexpensive than envisioned with cost savings resulting from the redesign exercises and increased international cooperation.

Madam Chairman, I worked in the Reagan White House in 1984 when the space station program was initially approved. It was probably a mistake to have launched the space station program at that time, before we were really ready. But we did, and here we are in 1993, 9 years later and \$9 billion invested in the program. We now have verified designs and in many cases actual hardware.

In short, we have already made a major investment in this program. Real Government waste would be to

push the eject button just as this plane is ready to take off on its first flight. Let us keep the cost of this program down, let's make this an international effort. But now we are this far along, let us also keep moving forward, and keep our eyes on the stars above instead of the muck below.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I certainly agree with those who have said that NASA has done a great deal and that our scientists and others have certainly raised the level of quality of life in America with all the things that they have done.

However, I do have some reservations about this space station. As has already been stated during the debate, \$9 billion have already been spent on the space station. This is at a time when all Americans are being asked to have equal sacrifice, sacrifice in Medicare, sacrifice in summer youth jobs, sacrifice so we can reduce the budget.

The deficit budget is so large now that I believe that to put even more money into a space station that is going to need further money as we go along through the year 2000 is not in the best interests of reducing that budget. And that is what we are all supposedly doing at this point in time, as I understand it.

□ 1510

So I would say for those who are interested in NASA, as I am, and the job they have done, the students that have been trained, and for people like me who saw the man actually walk on the Moon, that they are interested in it, but they do not want us to take the time and the money at this time to redo a space station that is already there.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois has just raised the key question in all of this, and that is whether or not it is worth doing, given limited amounts of money. And I think the answer to that is clearly "yes."

The American people are benefiting really from these kinds of programs. For example, the space station will prove a lot of new robotic technology. That is technology that will drive the industry of the future in this country, and will produce the millions of new jobs that are necessary in order to see to it that we move people off welfare and into work sometime during the next decade. If we do not do space station, someone else will do those robotic experiments, someone else will be at the frontier and will figure out how to do these things, and we as a nation will be lesser.

As we go in today and insulate homes with all kinds of new materials, and thereby save poor people millions of dollars nationwide in heating costs, we do in fact do so because of things developed in the course of the space program.

When we send people to hospitals and are able to give them high-technology monitoring equipment, are able to put in heart pacemakers, are able to coat glasses with material so that they do not scratch any more, all Americans benefit from that, all things developed out of the Space Program.

To abandon the effort to move forward now would be a travesty. We are not talking about spending more money here. We are talking about doing all of this within the budget that NASA presently has.

As a matter of fact, we have dropped that budget back, and we still think that we are going to be able to do space station. Space station is the next logical step. Space station does give us capacity to do the things for the future that the manned space program has to get done.

If Members follow the logic of those who would cut the space station and cut out the project, we would never have done Project Mercury. All that taught us how to do was to get off Earth and get up into space. But in so learning, we developed all kinds of new technologies. Now we have the capacity to go to space and stay and learn much more as a result of that kind of a presence. If we do not do that, we will have done nothing. The investment of \$9 billion thus far will have been for nothing, and we will not produce a vehicle at the end that will give us a chance to move ahead. That would be a shame. That is the kind of waste that the American people have said clearly that they do not want any more of in Government.

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam Chairman, I would like to share with my colleagues two letters regarding H.R. 2200, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization, fiscal years 1994 and 1995. Both letters are in strong support of continuation of the Space Station Program. On June 14, 1993, the House heard general debate on this important legislation, and I would like to add these two letters to my remarks.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, June 11, 1993.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A strong and vibrant aerospace industry is critical to California's economic base, and a critical high-tech asset for the United States. I remain committed to the continuation of the Space Station program, and the thousands of cutting-edge jobs it supports in California and across the nation.

Yesterday, you received the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel on the three options presented by the NASA re-

design effort. You must keep the long-term success of this program paramount in your mind when reviewing these and other options, and deciding how to proceed. To this end, the legislation under consideration in the Congress provides an opportunity to meet the goals you articulated for the space station program, and to gain legislative approval.

Termination of the space station would be a severe hit to California and to the aerospace industry. Throughout the redesign, much debate has centered on the question of jobs. For California, this issue is extremely important. The Space Station program supports over 4,000 direct and 10,000 indirect jobs in our State. Regardless of which option might hold some marginal benefits, if it fails in the Congress it will hurt the entire nation, and deal a tremendous blow to the California economy and thousands of California workers.

Mr. President, in Putting People First, you recognized the importance of the space station and its mission to our long-term space program. You now have the opportunity to secure a viable space station program, and to reaffirm your earlier commitments. I urge you to do so by choosing a path that meets our economic, technological and political challenges. You can be sure I will continue my efforts to secure a program which survives these tests now and in the future, which is our mutual goal.

Sincerely,

PETE WILSON.

STATE OF TEXAS,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Austin TX, June 8, 1993.

HON. RALPH M. HALL,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HALL: I am writing to request your support on Wednesday in the Science Committee for the NASA authorization bill, H.R. 2200. The bill authorizes \$15.0 billion for NASA programs in FY 1994 and includes a \$1.9 billion place-maker for the space station, providing enough money to fund any of the three options proposed by the NASA redesign team.

This authorization bill supports, but does not mandate, Option B of the redesign team—the option that most closely resembles the current Space Station Freedom program. A vote in support of this bill, however, does not preclude another option being chosen by President Clinton. Passage of this bill will simply give Congress the option to continue the space station program—regardless of the design ultimately chosen or the appropriations level allowed for the program by Congress.

As you consider the future of America's space program, I urge you to vote for H.R. 2200. Continued support of the space station program is particularly crucial if we are to maintain America's leading role in space. Your vote on Wednesday in the Science Committee in support of this bill will send a strong signal on the future of humans in space to Congress as a whole, the President, and the country.

Sincerely,

ANN W. RICHARDS,  
Governor.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ) having assumed the chair, Mrs.

UNSOELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2201, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 2202, by the yeas and nays.

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

**INJURY PREVENTION AND CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1993**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2201.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2201, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 61, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie	Boucher	Deal
Ackerman	Brewster	DeFazio
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Derrick
Andrews (TX)	Brown (CA)	Deutsch
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Diaz-Balart
Bacchus (FL)	Buyer	Dickey
Baesler	Byrne	Dicks
Ballenger	Camp	Dixon
Barca	Canady	Dornan
Barcia	Cantwell	Dunn
Barlow	Cardin	Durbin
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Edwards (CA)
Barrett (WI)	Chapman	Edwards (TX)
Bateman	Clay	Emerson
Becerra	Clayton	English (AZ)
Beilenson	Clement	English (OK)
Bentley	Coble	Eshoo
Bereuter	Collins (IL)	Evans
Berman	Collins (MI)	Ewing
Bevill	Condit	Fawell
Bilbray	Cooper	Fazio
Bishop	Coppersmith	Fields (LA)
Blackwell	Cox	Fields (TX)
Billey	Coyne	Filner
Blute	Cramer	Fish
Boehlert	Danner	Ford (MI)
Bonilla	Darden	Fowler
Bonior	de la Garza	Frank (MA)

Franks (CT)	Linder	Roemer	Talent	Thomas (WY)	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Lloyd	Rogers	Taylor (MS)	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Frost	Long	Ros-Lehtinen			
Furse	Lowe	Rose			
Gallely	Machtley	Roukema			
Gallo	Maloney	Rowland			
Gejdenson	Mann	Roybal-Allard			
Gephardt	Manton	Rush			
Geren	Margolies-	Sabo			
Gibbons	Mezvinsky	Sanders			
Gilchrest	Martinez	Santorium			
Gillmor	Matsui	Sarpalius			
Gilman	Mazzoli	Sawyer			
Glickman	McCandless	Saxton			
Gonzalez	McCloskey	Schaefer			
Goodlatte	McCollum	Schenk			
Gordon	McCrery	Schiff			
Grandy	McDade	Schroeder			
Green	McDermott	Schumer			
Greenwood	McHale	Serrano			
Gunderson	McInnis	Sharp			
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Shaw			
Hall (TX)	McMillan	Shays			
Hamburg	McNulty	Shepherd			
Hamilton	Meehan	Siskiy			
Hastert	Meek	Skaggs			
Hastings	Menendez	Skelton			
Hayes	Meyers	Slattery			
Hefner	Mfume	Slaughter			
Hinchey	Michel	Smith (IA)			
Hoagland	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)			
Hobson	Mineta	Smith (TX)			
Hochbrueckner	Minge	Snowe			
Hoekstra	Mink	Spence			
Hoke	Moakley	Stark			
Holden	Mollinari	Stearns			
Horn	Montgomery	Stokes			
Houghton	Moorhead	Strickland			
Hoyer	Moran	Studds			
Hughes	Morella	Stupak			
Hutto	Murtha	Swett			
Hyde	Myers	Swift			
Inslee	Nadler	Synar			
Johnson (CT)	Natcher	Tanner			
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Tauzin			
Johnson (SD)	Neal (NC)	Tejeda			
Johnson, E. B.	Nussle	Thornton			
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thurman			
Kasich	Obey	Torkildsen			
Kennelly	Oliver	Torres			
Kildee	Ortiz	Torricelli			
Kim	Orton	Towns			
King	Pallone	Trafiacant			
Kingston	Parker	Tucker			
Klecza	Pastor	Unsoeld			
Klein	Paxon	Upton			
Klug	Payne (VA)	Valentine			
Knollenberg	Pelosi	Vento			
Kopetski	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky			
Kreidler	Petri	Walsh			
Kyl	Pickle	Watt			
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Waxman			
Lambert	Porter	Weldon			
Lantos	Poshard	Wheat			
LaRocco	Price (NC)	Williams			
Laughlin	Pryce (OH)	Wilson			
Lazio	Quinn	Wolf			
Leach	Rahall	Woolsey			
Lehman	Ravenel	Wyden			
Levin	Reed	Wynn			
Levy	Regula	Yates			
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Zeliff			
Lightfoot	Richardson	Zimmer			

NAYS—61

Allard	Gekas	Packard
Archer	Goodling	Penny
Armey	Goss	Pombo
Bachus (AL)	Grams	Quillen
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Ramstad
Bartlett	Hansen	Roberts
Boehner	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Burton	Herger	Roth
Callahan	Hunter	Royce
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Combust	Inglis	Shuster
Crane	Inhofe	Skeen
Crapo	Istook	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Solomon
DeLay	Kolbe	Stenholm
Dooley	Manzullo	Stump
Doollittle	Mica	Sundquist
Dreier	Miller (FL)	Oxley

Baker (LA)	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barton	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Billirakis	Henry	Pickett
Borski	Hilliard	Portman
Brown (FL)	Huffington	Rangel
Bryant	Jacobs	Ridge
Bunning	Jefferson	Rostenkowski
Calvert	Johnston	Sangmeister
Carr	Kapture	Scott
Clinger	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Clyburn	Klink	Spratt
Coleman	Lancaster	Taylor (NC)
Conyers	Lewis (CA)	Thomas (CA)
Costello	Lewis (FL)	Thompson
Dellums	Lipinski	Velazquez
Dingell	Livingston	Volkmer
Engel	Markey	Washington
Everett	McCurdy	Waters
Fingerhut	McHugh	Whitten
Flake	McKeon	Wise
Foglietta	Mollohan	Young (AK)
Ford (TN)	Murphy	
Gingrich	Owens	

NOT VOTING—67

□ 1538

Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, COMBEST, HEFLEY, and STENHOLM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. REYNOLDS, COBLE, ZELIFF, and COX changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

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

**BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER AMENDMENTS OF 1993**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2202, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2202, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 2, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie	Andrews (ME)	Applegate
Ackerman	Andrews (NJ)	Archer
Allard	Andrews (TX)	Armey

Bacchus (FL) Frank (MA)  
 Bacchus (AL) Franks (CT)  
 Baesler Franks (NJ)  
 Baker (CA) Frost  
 Ballenger Furse  
 Barca Gallegly  
 Barcia Gallo  
 Barlow Gajdenson  
 Barrett (NE) Gekas  
 Barrett (WI) Gephardt  
 Bartlett Geren  
 Bateman Gibbons  
 Becerra Gilchrest  
 Beilenson Gillmor  
 Bentley Gilman  
 Bereuter Glickman  
 Bertram Gonzalez  
 Bevil Goodlatte  
 Bilbray Goodling  
 Bishop Gordon  
 Blackwell Goss  
 Bliley Grams  
 Blute Grandy  
 Boehlert Green  
 Bohner Greenwood  
 Bonilla Gunderson  
 Bonior Hall (OH)  
 Boucher Hall (TX)  
 Brewster Hamburg  
 Brooks Hamilton  
 Browder Hancock  
 Brown (CA) Hansen  
 Brown (FL) Hastert  
 Brown (OH) Hastings  
 Burton Hayes  
 Buyer Hefley  
 Byrne Hefner  
 Callahan Herger  
 Camp Hinchey  
 Canady Hoagland  
 Cantwell Hobson  
 Cardin Hochbrueckner  
 Castle Hoekstra  
 Chapman Hoke  
 Clay Holden  
 Clayton Horn  
 Clement Hoyer  
 Coble Hughes  
 Collins (GA) Hunter  
 Collins (IL) Hutchinson  
 Collins (MI) Hutto  
 Combest Hyde  
 Condit Inglis  
 Cooper Inhofe  
 Coppersmith Insee  
 Cox Istook  
 Coyne Johnson (CT)  
 Cramer Johnson (GA)  
 Crapo Johnson (SD)  
 Cunningham Johnson, E.B.  
 Danner Johnson, Sam  
 Darden Kanjorski  
 de la Garza Kasich  
 Deal Kennelly  
 DeFazio Kildee  
 DeLauro Kim  
 DeLay King  
 Derrick Kingston  
 Deutsch Kleczka  
 Diaz-Balart Klein  
 Dickey Klug  
 Dicks Knollenberg  
 Dixon Kolbe  
 Dooley Kopetski  
 Doolittle Kreidler  
 Dornan Kyl  
 Dreier LaFalce  
 Duncan Lambert  
 Dunn Lantos  
 Durbin LaRocco  
 Edwards (CA) Laughlin  
 Edwards (TX) Lazio  
 Emerson Leach  
 English (AZ) Lehman  
 English (OK) Levin  
 Eshoo Levy  
 Evans Lewis (GA)  
 Ewing Lightfoot  
 Fawell Linder  
 Fazio Lloyd  
 Fields (LA) Long  
 Fields (TX) Lowey  
 Filner Machtley  
 Fish Maloney  
 Ford (MI) Mann  
 Fowler Manton

Manzullo  
 Margolies-  
 Mezvinsky  
 Martinez  
 Matsui  
 Mazzoli  
 McCandless  
 McCloskey  
 McCollum  
 McCrery  
 McDade  
 McDermott  
 McHale  
 McInnis  
 McKinney  
 McMillan  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek  
 Menendez  
 Meyers  
 Mfume  
 Mica  
 Michel  
 Miller (CA)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Mineta  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Molinari  
 Montgomery  
 Moorhead  
 Moran  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myers  
 Nadler  
 Natcher  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neal (NC)  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obeys  
 Engel  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Orton  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Pastor  
 Paxon  
 Payne (VA)  
 Pelosi  
 Penny  
 Peterson (FL)  
 Petri  
 Pickle  
 Pomo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Poshard  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Quillen  
 Quinn  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Ravenel  
 Reed  
 Regula  
 Reynolds  
 Richardson  
 Roberts  
 Roemer  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rose  
 Roth  
 Roukema  
 Rowland  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Sanders  
 Santorum  
 Sarpalis  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Schaefer  
 Schenk  
 Schiff  
 Schroeder  
 Schumer

Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sharp  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Shepherd  
 Shuster  
 Sisisky  
 Skaggs  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Slattery  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (IA)  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Snowe  
 Solomon  
 Spence  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Stokes  
 Strickland  
 Studds  
 Stupak  
 Sundquist  
 Sweet  
 Swift  
 Synar  
 Talent  
 Tanner  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Tejeda  
 Thomas (WY)  
 Thornton  
 Thurman  
 Torkildsen  
 Torres  
 Torricelli  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Tucker  
 Unsoeld  
 Upton  
 Valentine  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Vucanovich  
 Walker  
 Walsh  
 Washington  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weldon  
 Wheat  
 Whitten  
 Williams  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Yates  
 Young (FL)  
 Zeliff  
 Zimmer

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—66

Crane  
 Baker (LA)  
 Barton  
 Bilirakis  
 Borski  
 Bryant  
 Bunning  
 Calvert  
 Carr  
 Clinger  
 Clyburn  
 Coleman  
 Conyers  
 Costello  
 Dellums  
 Dingell  
 Engel  
 Everrett  
 Fingerhut  
 Flake  
 Foglietta  
 Ford (TN)  
 Gingrich  
 Gutierrez  
 Harman  
 Henry  
 Hilliard  
 Houghton  
 Huffington  
 Jacobs  
 Jefferson  
 Johnston  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Klink  
 Lancaster  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (FL)  
 Lipinski  
 Livingston  
 Markey  
 McCurdy  
 McHugh  
 McKeon  
 Mollohan  
 Murphy  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Payne (NJ)  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Pickett  
 Portman  
 Rangel  
 Ridge  
 Rostenkowski  
 Sangmeister  
 Scott  
 Smith (OR)  
 Spratt  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Thomas (CA)  
 Thompson  
 Velazquez  
 Volkmer  
 Waters  
 Wise  
 Young (AK)

□ 1553

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to a health care forum, I was unavoidably detained in North Carolina and unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 218 and 219. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 218 and "yea" on rollcall vote 219.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and was unable to be present during the consideration of H.R. 2201, the injury prevention and control amendments, and H.R. 2202, the breast and cervical cancer prevention amendments. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both bills. These measures contain the further authorization of the much needed breast and cervical cancer prevention program and the injury prevention and control program, both of which I strongly support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, due to personal business, I was not able to attend to-

day's session of the House. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 2202, the breast and cervical cancer prevention amendments of 1993, and "yes" on H.R. 2201, the injury prevention and control amendments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and missed two votes under suspension of the rules. If I were present, I would have voted "yea" on the Prevention and Control Amendments of 1993, H.R. 2201, rollcall No. 218, and "yea" on the Breast and Cervical Cancer Amendments of 1993, H.R. 2202, rollcall No. 219.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, due to commitments in my congressional district, I was unable to make a couple of votes. Please let the RECORD show how I would have cast my votes had I been present:

Vote No. 218, H.R. 2201. Injury prevention and control amendments to authorize the injury prevention and control program for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] in the amount of \$50 million for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 1995-98. Under the bill the CDC will be granted the authority to aid in the prevention of domestic violence, "yea".

Vote No. 219, H.R. 2202. Breast and cervical cancer screening and education authorizations to reauthorize the breast and cervical cancer early detection program for 5 years, "yea".

REPORT ON H.R. 2403, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1994

Mr. HOYER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-127) on the bill (H.R. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation which was read and without objection referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS  
AND TRANSPORTATION,  
Washington, DC, May 13, 1993.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted today by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. These resolutions authorize studies of potential water resources projects by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Act of March 4, 1913, and section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN Y. MINETA,  
Chairman.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF  
COMMISSION ON THE BICENTEN-  
NIAL OF THE UNITED STATES  
CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB MICHEL, Republican leader:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 324(b)(6) of Public Law 102-392, I hereby appoint the following Member of Congress to serve on the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Capitol:

Representative Steve Horn of California.  
Sincerely yours,

BOB MICHEL,  
Republican Leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to exchange positions with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on the list of special orders granted for tonight. He would be No. 3, and I would be No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LAMBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HIV-INFECTED HAITIAN ENTRY

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

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to inform the Congress and the American people of an impending dis-

aster. Last Thursday I was joined by more than 40 Members of Congress who asked our President to uphold the law of this land.

Current U.S. immigration law bans HIV-infected persons from entering this country. We asked the President to uphold this ban.

I want to make clear at the outset that I am the grandson of immigrants, and am proud of this country's legal immigrants. But my grandparents were required to meet certain health requirements. That was the law then, and that is the law now.

However, something alarming has happened this morning and will continue to happen until U.S. law is enforced: This morning the United States Government flew dozens of HIV-infected Haitians, who were held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Florida. Eight more flights are scheduled to take the remaining refugees to the United States.

This action threatens Florida with a financial disaster. This action threatens a medical disaster for this country.

I am especially outraged because Congress has spoken on this issue. The House and other body both voted overwhelmingly to codify the rule specifying that HIV infection is a public health concern that is a basis for excluding anyone from any country from entry into the United States. What is even more compelling is that President Clinton recently signed the bill that contained this ban.

How did we get to where we are today, flying these HIV-infected Haitians to our country? A Federal judge is deciding U.S. policy on an issue that has far-reaching public health and fiscal consequences for our Nation.

How can one judge so easily reverse the will of the Congress?

I dispute the notion that a Federal judge should make this kind of policy. There were over 40 other Members of this House that joined me in pleading with the President to prevent this catastrophe from occurring.

Our voices have not been heard. Apparently, the President is still debating whether or not to appeal this decision.

As I said, many of the HIV-infected Haitians are already here. The rest will follow. Once here, they will receive medical benefits and a host of other refugee program services.

I know that Florida cannot afford to bear the financial burden of these HIV-infected refugees.

Florida has already taken a large number of the Haitian immigrants. Specifically, between 82 and 93 percent of the 10,000 plus Guantanamo Haitians brought to the United States have remained or returned to Florida. This imposes huge costs on our State. We have also just survived Hurricane Andrew and are attempting to rebuild those communities in south Florida. We simply cannot afford these high-risk immigrants.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues and fellow Americans to let President Clinton know that it is his chief responsibility to enforce the laws of our country.

He should appeal this decision immediately, and avert the potential financial and medical disaster for Florida and the Nation.

□ 1600

REASONS FOR VOTING AGAINST  
LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION  
BILL

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

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying that I wish to associate myself with the remarks just given by my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA]. The President should appeal that decision.

Madam Speaker, last week I was one of just 21 Members of my party to vote against the legislative appropriations bill that was considered on the floor of this House.

Why did I do that? There were two reasons.

First, I do not believe that bill cuts spending nearly enough. Yes, it cuts some spending. It cuts some spending over in the GAO, and it cuts some spending in some special committees that no longer exist. But it did not cut into the real waste of the legislative branch, and that is the committee staff, which is far too large.

Two months ago, Madam Speaker, I was one of just three Members of my party who voted for a Republican proposal that would have cut committee staff by 25 percent across the board. That is what I think serious spending cuts should be.

The second reason I voted against that bill was simply this: We need to restore our credibility with the American people.

Now, even a 25-percent cut in congressional committee staff spending would not approach eliminating the Federal budget deficit, but it might help us eliminate some of the cynicism and some of the skepticism that are all too pervasive throughout America.

I know that every time I stand before my constituents in Florida, when they look at me, even though I have been here just 2 years and a few months, they see before them the personification of the Federal Government. They see before them all the lies and all the deception of all the recent years, Watergate, Vietnam, Iran Contra. Name your scandal, name your poison, name your excuse for not believing that the choices we face as a Nation truly are difficult.

We have been lied to and deceived for far too long. We have had politicians in

positions of public responsibility, Democrats and Republicans alike, tell the people that the hard choices are not really necessary.

They say we can eliminate the Federal budget deficit just by eliminating foreign aid, or maybe my salary, which, by the way, I voted to freeze a few months ago.

They say that the choices are really easy, they are not hard at all. They have been told there is some separate category of Federal spending called fraud and waste, that we could just cut that and eliminate the budget deficit, while not eliminating programs that people need and want and deserve.

Madam Speaker, that is not true. Hard choices must be made, and we are in fact beginning to make them, at long last.

But much more must be done to restore our credibility with the people, or they simply will not believe us when we tell them that the choices are hard and that they too will have to share the sacrifice. Of course, if we ask them to sacrifice, then we should sacrifice first by beginning to cut committee staff here in the Congress.

We should do much more. I am cosponsor of the bill that would impose upon the Congress the same laws that we impose on everyone else. I am a cosponsor in the House, along with my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], of the revolving door bill, which would keep us from using this Congress as a way station on the way to becoming lobbyists for domestic interests or foreign governments.

I am a cosponsor of the sunshine bill, the government in the sunshine bill, that would keep the Committee on Ways and Means and other committees from closing their doors on deliberations to the people and the press, which I think is grievously wrong.

Madam Speaker, I have introduced a bill that would demand full financial disclosure from all Members of this Congress, the same kind of disclosure that I have made voluntarily: Tax returns, net worth statements, down to the last penny, filed annually. I do it voluntarily. We should all have to do it.

But we should start first, if we are going to cut spending, by cutting spending here. That is why I voted as I did.

#### FLAG DAY, JUNE 14, 1993

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, the National Flag Day Foundation today once again celebrated June 14 with its annual luncheon in Baltimore.

In thinking about the speech, it crossed my mind the many claims that Maryland has to spreading the glory of

the flag from Francis Scott Key's naming the Stars and Stripes as a "Star Spangled Banner," to the brave Barbara Frietchie, reported by Whittier in his poem to have protected the flag from Southern troops at Frederick during the Civil War.

Because of Francis Scott Key's experience in the battle at the Port of Baltimore, every time the national anthem is sung, the vision of that flag—still flying over Ft. McHenry in the "dawn's early light"—is brought to every mind's eye. Still a hopeful sight after 179 years, never faded, ever bright.

That hope is just as real today, as it was on that long ago morning shared with us by Francis Scott Key so eloquently in his own words. The same Star Spangled Banner, flying in foreign countries, has carried the promise to millions of refugees—over two centuries—fleeing foreign tyrants—seeking asylum, seeking freedom.

I, personally, have been told by refugees from behind the old Iron Curtain, of how, when they finally reached an American Embassy, looking up at the Stars and Stripes, they fell to their knees, thanking God for all it represented to them.

The most awesome part of this representation is our responsibility, as citizens, to guarantee that the U.S. flag continues to represent a nation that is the "best and brightest hope of mankind," as President Ronald Reagan said.

It has always struck me that this oldest of all continuous democracies presented a greater threat to tyrants—by its very existence—than it did by all its weaponry. For a totalitarian government to succeed, it must first destroy all hope that the people have any other choice.

Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America leaping over Iron Curtains started the unraveling of the Soviet Union. Some commentators suggested, as Russia began to break up, that such a totalitarian stranglehold could not exist in the telecommunications age. Why? Because the oppressed can learn what freedom is—how free men and women live.

For this reason, I have sponsored legislation to create a Radio Free Asia to penetrate the Bamboo Curtain that now separates China, North Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia from the rest of the world.

And worldwide, what is the ultimate symbol of freedom? The Stars and Stripes. And, it is each of us who upholds that freedom. The flag is representative of our individual commitments to protecting this nation, its constitutional guarantees—what the world sees, as uniquely, the American way of life.

This evening at 7 p.m. one should pause to pledge allegiance to the flag. The "Pause for the Pledge," is an idea

that came out of Maryland and then, was passed by the Congress as a joint resolution.

The pledge to the flag is a spoken commitment to all that we as Americans hold dear: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. One nation, under God, with freedom and justice for all." It is a promise of hope, not only to ourselves, but to the world. It should never be said lightly, nor be disparaged. What it stands for is much too important.

□ 1610

#### PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL, 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

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

Mr. COYNE. Madam Speaker, I want to inform the House today that Presbyterian University Hospital at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center will celebrate on June 17, 1993, 100 years of service to the people of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania.

The centennial celebration of Presbyterian University Hospital offers a fitting time to reflect upon the development of medical science and the key role played by institutions like Presbyterian University Hospital. The American people often have their attention focused on the latest marvels of medical science, the remarkable technologies being used to save lives, and the skills and personal dedication of doctors, nurses, and other health care providers. It is less often that the average citizen reflects on the role of America's great teaching hospitals in advancing the quality of medical care.

Presbyterian University Hospital is an outstanding representative of America's tradition of teaching hospitals. This institution has maintained over the years a steadfast commitment to its three-tiered mission of patient care, education, and research. Presbyterian University Hospital has succeeded in establishing an environment in which patients can be assured of receiving the best care possible from a dedicated and skilled staff, while at the same time providing health care professionals and medical students access to the latest advances in medical research.

The success of Presbyterian University Hospital can be traced back to the inspiring legacy of its founder, Dr. Louise J. Wotring Lyle. Louise Lyle's medical services dated back to the Civil War when she and her husband, Rev. Joseph Lyle, a Presbyterian minister, cared for the sick and wounded. Following Reverend Lyle's death in 1884, Louise Lyle dedicated herself anew to serving others and was motivated eventually to work with other women to found the Women's Medical Center of Cincinnati, OH, from which she earned her medical degree. Doctor Lyle came to Pittsburgh in 1893 at the age of 50 shortly after having earned her medical degree.

In 1893, the Louise Lyle Hospital was established by Doctor Lyle in makeshift quarters in a three-story brick building on Pittsburgh's north side. When Doctor Lyle began operation

of her hospital, she had a budget of only \$5 to secure a building and staff her hospital. Still, after several fiscally tight months during which hospital rooms were rented to nurses until patients were available to fill them, the Louise Lyle Hospital soon found itself much in demand by the large immigrant steelworker population of Pittsburgh's north side.

Doctor Lyle changed the name of her hospital to Presbyterian Hospital in 1894, although it would not be until the end of that year that the Pittsburgh Presbytry would pledge its support and formally approve the use of the name "Presbyterian." On May 4, 1895, Presbyterian Hospital of Pittsburgh was legally incorporated.

Doctor Lyle labored for the remainder of her life to ensure that Presbyterian would continue to grow in its ability to care for the health needs of Pittsburgh. Although she ceased administrative control of the hospital in 1899, she lived to see the day in 1932 when ground would be broken for construction of the present day Presbyterian Hospital on the campus of the University of Pittsburgh in the Oakland section of Pittsburgh.

In 1938, the Presbyterian Hospital opened its doors in Oakland. This event was the culmination of efforts by the board of trustees of the University of Pittsburgh to establish a medical center. This campaign was focused in part on convincing an established Pittsburgh hospital to move to the university's campus in Oakland to provide a clinical setting for the school's medical students.

The relationship between the University of Pittsburgh and Presbyterian Hospital strengthened over the years as great advances were made jointly in various fields of medicine. Presbyterian Hospital became the site of pioneering work done by the university medical school staff in areas such as anesthesiology, respiratory therapy, critical care medicine, emergency medicine, cardiology and cardiothoracic surgery, and neurology and neurological surgery, among others.

In 1961, Presbyterian was incorporated as Presbyterian University Hospital. A new phase in the hospital history began as medicine began to apply ground breaking technological breakthroughs to the clinical environment. It was at Presbyterian University Hospital in 1968 that the first heart transplant was performed in Pennsylvania. The progress of integration between the hospital and the university continued at a steady pace. The culmination of this maturing relationship was the decision by the hospital's trustees in 1986 to adopt a shared management agreement with the university's medical and health care division, the forerunner of today's University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Today, Presbyterian University Hospital is recognized around the world as a preeminent center for advancements in a wide range of medical specialties. Presbyterian continues to rank among the world's leaders in the demanding field of transplant surgery. This outstanding medical institution succeeds in advancing daily its mission of providing quality health care to patients while also serving as a premier teaching and research hospital. It is in many ways the heart of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, the place where education and science take on a human face.

Madam Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh are right to be proud of Presbyterian University Hospital. This institution's history is inspiring and its future is bright. I am pleased to join with all the friends of Presbyterian in celebrating this hospital's centennial.

#### H.R. 5, STRIKER REPLACEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FAWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon on this special order to refer to what I feel is the destructiveness of the striker replacement legislation, H.R. 5, which I am assuming probably will come up tomorrow, the destruction that I think it will have in regard to the collective-bargaining system and also upon our economy.

For over 58 years, the National Labor Relations Act has served as the bedrock of our collective bargaining system, artfully balancing the rights of employers and employees and unions. And it is not easy.

The act provides a strong framework of incentives for all groups to complete negotiations and to come to agreement on very difficult economic issues. The National Labor Relations Act protects both the worker's right to strike, which is a last resort action, so far as the unions are concerned, and it also protects the employer's right to protect himself and herself and to continue their businesses, as a last resort, and that is not easy, by hiring permanent replacements for the striking workers, again, as a last resort.

Nobody, no employer wants to have to go out and replace their work force in order to be able to survive. So neither of these last resorts are especially attractive, and that, I think, is part of the real glory of what the National Labor Relations Act is all about.

H.R. 5, the antireplacement-workers bill, would significantly tilt the playing field in our collective bargaining system in favor of labor unions by creating simply two new unfair labor practices. In fact, there is more than that in this act.

First, the bill makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to promise or threaten to or actually hire permanent replacements for striking workers. Under current law, permanent replacement workers may be used during only an economic strike; that is, a strike that is in regard to issues such as wages and working conditions and fringe benefits, et cetera. But it cannot be used—one cannot hire permanent replacement workers during a strike called to protest unfair labor practices, such as unlawful bargaining tactics by the employer, or where the employer is not bargaining with sincerity.

Taking away the right of the employer, his last resort right to hire per-

manent replacement workers, would allow unions, I believe, to engage in what might be close to risk-free strikes.

Under the current balance between employer and union rights, each side has to assume the risk of their actions. Employers know they may face a strike if they do not reach agreement, and workers know and unions know that they may be, that the workers may be replaced, if they strike.

Without the threat of permanent replacement, unions will have less incentive to work out a compromise on their demands. And the number of strikes is likely, I think, to increase significantly.

Furthermore, losing the right to protect the continued operation of one's business will force employers to make one of three unappealing choices:

First, to capitulate to the union's economic demands; second, to attempt to operate the business during the strike with only temporary workers, which oftentimes is impossible to be able to do; and third, close the business, which is not a very pretty option at all.

All of these options would have a chilling effect upon the competitiveness of America's labor and businesses, and I believe would mean less jobs for Americans.

Second, H.R. 5 would also take away a worker's right not to strike. Under current law, just as workers have the right to strike, they also possess the right that we do not often think about, to remain on the job, to stick with the employer for any number of reasons, not the least of which may be that they need the money. They need the money coming in.

The Supreme Court has upheld the right of workers to choose not to strike and to permanently fill more senior positions vacated by striking workers.

When striking workers return to the job, they are able to fill and have a right to fill all available positions, which are vacant, on the basis of seniority. But they are not permitted to bump a nonstriker from his or her job in order to regain the job that they may have held prior to the strike or which otherwise might be due to them under seniority.

H.R. 5 would overturn this ruling and make it an unfair labor practice for employers not to permit returning strikers to bump nonstrikers or replacement workers from the jobs they held during the strike.

Obviously, this trivializes and penalizes the workers; trivializes the right not to strike and penalizes workers who chose to strike.

The role of Government is and should be to equally protect the rights of workers to strike or not to strike, and this bill certainly upsets that balance. Supporters of H.R. 5 ignore the fact that the strength of the current law is

indeed in the threat of the use of permanent replacement workers, just as obviously the threat of the strike is very real. Rather than either the strike taking place or permanent replacement workers having to be hired, it is this threat which balances the union's threat of a strike, brings both parties to the table to work on an agreement, and it keeps them there also.

A study by the General Accounting Office found that only 17 percent of strikes in 1985 and in 1989 involved replacement workers, with only 3 to 4 percent of the strikers being permanently replaced.

A lot of people try to tell us that employers are utilizing this so much more, but the records are not to that effect, that it has been roughly the same over all of the 50-some years of the right of the employers to hire permanent replacement workers.

□ 1620

Unions currently represent only 11.5 percent of the private sector work force, and they continue to lose ground. Because they are having difficulty in the marketplace, unions have come to Congress to achieve changes in labor law which I think would enable them to recoup the membership that they have not been able to keep on their own.

This quest for statutory assistance, coming to Congress to rescue them regarding dominance, is at the heart of another aspect of this bill. This little-known provision is tantamount to an organizing tool for labor unions also and accomplishes this in two ways.

First, the bill stops employers from hiring permanent replacement workers in a strike if the union has only a card check majority of the employees signed up for the union representation. That is to say, there has never been a secret ballot by which the union even has a right to act as a collective bargaining agent. That is the law right now. A union cannot act as a collective bargaining agent if there has not been a secret ballot, but under this bill for the first time in the history of labor law in this country, if the particular group of employees, a majority, have signed these cards, then under those circumstances the union can represent what basically are nonunion employees simply because they signed a petition.

I think a lot of us know that petitions are compilations of signatures of people who do not know how to say no. The way to collectively bargain now is to contact workers one by one, no longer big speeches in the union hall, but get them at home and so forth and so on. A lot of them cannot say no. There are examples where these cards have been signed, where everybody has signed them, and in the election there was only one person who voted for the strike.

This is something that unions have wanted to achieve for many, many

years, to be able to not have to go through a secret ballot in order to strike. Here it is, the camel's nose under the tent. If we are going to say, if we are foolish enough to say in this Congress that we are going to give in to big labor, which represents, as I say, only 11.5 percent of those in private enterprise, and indeed, in toto, for workers in both public and private enterprise, it is only about 17 percent, then I think we rightly deserve the wrath of the great majority of the workers of America who have chosen, for their own reasons, not be members of the unions.

If H.R. 5 passes, I think this very delicate balance, which has undergirded our collective bargaining system for the past 58 years, will be lost. The result will be an increase in strikes and a decline in American competitiveness, and a loss of American jobs.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], is here, and I yield to him and ask if he would like to add some words to this special order.

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for taking this time to discuss in detail the impact that H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill, will have on jobs here in the United States and on our competitiveness in the global marketplace.

The current balance between labor and management has been in place for over 50 years. I believe that there is good reason for this: It is fair and it works.

The National Labor Relations Act, originally enacted as the Wagner Act in 1935, established broad rights for collective actions by employees but did not specifically address the issue of whether employees who chose to strike for economic reasons are guaranteed return to their former positions at the end of a strike.

The so-called striker replacement issue arose quickly in a Supreme Court case way back in 1938. The MacKay case established a fundamental distinction between two kinds of strikes—unfair labor practice strikes and economic strikes.

Permanent replacements are barred in unfair labor practice strikes, but not in economic strikes.

This has been the law now, as I indicated, for 55 years.

My fear is that if economic strikes become an unchecked tool for union leadership, which cannot be countered by any action on the part of the employer, then these actions can become detached from the realities of the employment market.

I fear that this will lead to good jobs moving overseas.

I am sure we can all agree that we want to avoid losing jobs because of our legislative actions here in the Congress.

Our goal should be to create new jobs. Measured against that yardstick, I have to oppose H.R. 5 the so-called striker replacement ban, because it certainly does not create one job and may even lose a host of jobs because companies will no longer find it in their economic interest to remain here.

Let me mention another fact that I stressed during the debate on virtually the same legislation in 1991.

Over the years, labor law has been reviewed and amended on several occasions. At no time has the issue of banning permanent replacements been seriously considered.

In fact, during a major overhaul of labor law in the Carter administration, the concept of banning permanent replacements was found unacceptable.

This further leads me to believe that we should leave well enough alone. Why change the law if it has produced a workable balance for all these years?

One argument Members will hear repeatedly from proponents of this legislation is that permanent replacements have become standard practice in labor disputes. But looking at the facts, this is clearly not the case.

Yes, there have been several high-profile situations where replacement workers were hired or companies threatened to hire permanent replacements. But according to GAO, only 4 percent of striking workers were permanently replaced in, for example, 1989.

There was a high-profile situation in my district just last year where a strike ended after Caterpillar, Inc., announced that it was seeking to hire permanent replacements.

The last time we debated this legislation in Congress I said on the floor of this House that banning replacement workers was not necessary because no reputable company in my district had resorted to this practice, and only a few had resorted to it through out the country.

I can no longer make this claim because the issue of replacements did arise with the largest employer in my district.

Caterpillar, I should point out, is a world leader in the manufacture of construction and mining equipment and a major producer of diesel and gas turbine engines. Their strategy is to compete globally from primarily a U.S. manufacturing base, and that is a very important point to be made.

Caterpillar is also one of America's largest net exporters. One-half of everything they manufacture in this country is sold offshore, with these exports alone providing about 20,000 jobs for their employees and 40,000 jobs for their suppliers in this country.

All of Cat's major global competitors are based in either Japan or Europe.

The primary issue in Cat's dispute with the UAW was the company's need to remain globally competitive. The strike began in late 1991, primarily over the issue of a pattern bargaining agreement that the UAW had just signed with Deere & Co. That is a large farm implement company in Moline, IL, and in other places around the country.

The UAW argued that the same pattern should prevail for both Deere & Co. and Cat, but they are two different types of companies, with Deere producing farm machinery primarily for the domestic market and Caterpillar producing construction equipment, mining equipment, and engines with half of their production sold abroad in a very competitive market.

In April 1992, after a 5-month work stoppage, and with parties at an impasse, the company invited all striking employees to return to work.

□ 1630

Caterpillar announced it would hire permanent replacements for workers who chose not to return because they had had their final offer on the table for a considerable period of time.

When 1,000 employees returned, the UAW leadership ended the strike. Today their employees continue to work under the terms of the company's final offer, but without a signed contract.

The contract offer under which the company's UAW-represented employees returned is among the best in U.S. manufacturing.

Let me point out some statistics: Over 6 years with typical overtime, average wages rose from approximately \$42,000 to \$52,000 annually.

In addition, Cat's employees also have first-dollar medical coverage within a network that ranks in the 96th percentile in the entire country, improved pension benefits, generous additional benefits, and each employee by name was assured a job for the next 6 years. In addition, during that period the company pledged to close no U.S. plants.

Ironically, UAW leaders never allowed the company's employees to vote on Cat's final offer, even though the company has successfully negotiated five contracts with employees represented by other unions at Cat's other facilities.

Incidentally, when Caterpillar announced that it intended to hire replacement workers, an Illinois Bell spokesman said that calls to Caterpillar's special number in Peoria ran at the rate of 30,000 calls per hour for much of the first day from all around the country of people who know what was offered and were saying "Hey, I'll work for that".

I believe that the Caterpillar situation was one where actions by the union became detached from the reali-

ties of the employment market and therefore required some correction.

I fear that if H.R. 5, banning permanent replacements in the case of a strike for purely economic reasons, that we may get away from the realities of the employment market. We may get to the point that good jobs are moved out of the United States.

As a matter of public policy, we want to preserve all of the good jobs that are now in the United States and moreover, create new ones. That is the name of the game.

But, passage of H.R. 5 could very easily lead companies to move their operations overseas in order to remain globally competitive. That would mean fewer jobs for Americans and that is one good and sufficient reason why I will vote against H.R. 5 tomorrow.

I appreciate the gentleman so much taking this special order. I know there are others who want to participate. But in the final analysis, it upsets that real delicate balance that has prevailed and was created roughly 50 years ago in this country. When Government intervenes on one side of that delicate negotiation that is going on, then it is not truly a negotiated contract between labor and management. And I think it would be absolutely catastrophic for us to embark upon that kind of a program at this juncture, particularly when day in, day out we are all talking about is what helps create jobs.

How do we improve the climate and the environment around here for encouraging employers to hire new people as distinguished from giving them their pink slip?

So I compliment the gentleman on the great work that he does in his committee. I see an array of his supporters, Mr. BOEHNER from Ohio, Mr. HOEKSTRA from Michigan, Mr. BALLENGER from North Carolina, and they do such a wonderful job on the gentleman's committee. And yes, Mrs. ROUKEMA is here right in front of me, and we will look forward to the kind of remarks she will make during the course of the debate. I know time is going to be limited when we actually do have the bill up for consideration, and it is best that we have an opportunity during a special order to make the arguments and present them for the RECORD.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman for those remarks. I think the Caterpillar situation is a very good example.

I know back in my district I have so many people saying to me that Congress will not really pass a law like that, will they? In my area, for instance, I think 100 percent of all of the residential construction is nonunion labor. They have nothing against unions, but it just happens to be that way. And it is that way in most of the Nation.

To take from them that last resort, the right of being able to hire permanent replacement workers, they will

not even believe me when I say it is possible that yes indeed, Congress may do something like that.

I think the gentleman is well aware of many polls that were taken last year. Time magazine asked the question in April 1992 to the public in general: "Do you favor a Federal law that would prohibit employers from hiring permanent replacements for striking workers?"

Yes, 29 percent; resoundingly no from 60 percent of the people. And I repeat, 88 percent of the workers are nonunion.

I thank the gentleman very much for those succinct words.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, we have MARGE ROUKEMA here, who of course is our fine ranking member of the Labor and Management Subcommittee, and our leader in regard to matters dealing with that particular subcommittee. She comes from New Jersey, and MARGE, I would like to have you join with us in some comments.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, and certainly thank him for securing this special order. It is a critically important issue, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is a diligent and hardworking member of the subcommittee. I extend my congratulations to him.

The debate surrounding the Workplace Fairness Act, H.R. 5, is as strongly emotional as any Congress has engaged in over recent years. However, when stripped of the emotional appeals, the facts prove that the bill, otherwise known as the striker replacement bill, is a policy Pandora's box and nothing more than a windfall for organized labor. It should be defeated.

The bill's title notwithstanding, the striker replacement bill has nothing to do with workplace fairness or enhancing U.S. competitiveness. It is about tipping the scales of power and gaining an advantage. Unfortunately, those pushing for passage of this bill are seeking to gain that advantage in the wrong arena, the arena of the past—confrontation, rather than the arena of the future—competitiveness. The arena of confrontation will close factory doors for good; the arena of competitiveness will not.

In today's competitive marketplace, there can be no doubt that an experienced, well-trained and loyal work force is one of any employer's most valuable assets. That fact alone should quell the concerns of those advocating the dramatic labor law reforms embodied in the striker replacement bill. The notion that employers cavalierly decide to replace entire units of employees contradicts the nearly universal efforts of employers to ensure work force stability.

Regardless of its duration, any strike causes disruption to our productive capacity. If employers who are faced with

unreasonable demands from a union cannot consider hiring permanent replacements, even as a last resort, many businesses will be faced with a Hobson's choice of either closing down altogether, or agreeing to the potentially outrageous demands that will affect their inability to compete in the marketplace. Either choice will have devastating economic effects on the employees, their families, the owners, and the communities in which they live. And, as this country prepares to face the ongoing global economic wars, that is a result that we can ill afford.

Given these economic considerations, the contention made by proponents of the bill that enactment will somehow enhance U.S. competitiveness is perplexing. How can providing an unfair advantage to one party at the bargaining table improve workplace productivity? To the contrary, the result will be shrinking profitability, investment, and ultimately, jobs.

If this Nation is going to succeed in the new global economy, labor and management must work together.

Many do not understand the legal underpinnings of labor-management relations and the importance of the balance of power at the negotiating table. To maintain that balance of power, we must also maintain the balance of risks. This was the basis for the Supreme Court precedent established over five decades ago.

The right of the American worker to strike is guaranteed in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. In 1938, the U.S. Supreme Court issued the MacKay doctrine which further defined strikes into one of two categories. In the case of an unfair labor practice strike, a strike is called in response to illegal labor practices committed by the employer. Striking employees are entitled to immediate reinstatement at the end of the strike. In contrast, employees participating in an economic strike do so in an effort to recognize economic gains including higher wages and broader benefits. Because they do not strike to protest an employers illegal action, they may be replaced with permanent workers. Once the strike has ended, they must be offered a similar position as it becomes available. This has been the basis and balance of U.S. labor law for over 50 years.

The proponents of H.R. 5 claim, but not one has made a credible case, that permanent replacements are being used unfairly and with greater frequency than at any time since the MacKay doctrine, was established. In fact, the General Accounting Office, in a study actually commissioned by the proponents of H.R. 5, concluded that permanent replacements were used in only 17 percent of strikes in 1985 and 1989, and that only 4 percent of all workers who were permanently replaced during this time period were not reinstated in comparable positions at the strike's end.

The MacKay doctrine simply provides a level playing field. It allows workers to use their best economic weapon, the strike, and allows employers to use their best economic weapon, hiring permanent replacement workers. Since both sides bear an economic risk from failing to reach an agreement at the bargaining table, the strike and permanent replacement weapons are meant to encourage both parties to resolve their differences.

Clearly, current law can be improved to ensure more productive labor-management relations. However, the time and resources devoted to the striker replacement bill, by both the supporters and opponents alike, could be far better spent on securing meaningful improvements within the current framework of the National Labor Relations Act which seeks to maintain this balance of power at the bargaining table.

One place where Congress might start is in addressing case-processing delays at the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB]. At a minimum, these delays have done much to contribute to perceived injustices of employees in securing the otherwise fair and equitable remedies available under current law. If current remedies for unfair labor practices by an employer where readily and speedily available to replaced workers, namely immediate reinstatement and back pay, I do not believe we would be facing H.R. 5 as an issue of abiding concern to organized labor.

The suggestion that legislation as bitterly divisive as the striker replacement bill will somehow bring workers and management together ignores the acrimony that has for too long permeated this issue. Moreover, it ignores the many new challenges posed by today's global economy; challenges that labor and management must face together. Instead of tampering with current law, we should be concentrating our efforts on how to make that law work even better; to provide labor and management with tools necessary to meet those challenges and to succeed, together.

To that end, the Clinton administration's establishment of a commission, comprised of several distinguished experts, to study the future of labor-management relations is encouraging. The commission's mission statement specifically called for a review of "what if any changes should be made in the present legal framework and practices of collective bargaining to enhance cooperative behavior, improve productivity, and reduce conflict and delay." Congress and the public would be well-served by such a study.

Therefore, it is only logical that the President's commission should be the forum for reviewing the issues and implications raised by legislation such as the striker replacement bill. It is unfortunate that the administration has declined to include this issue on com-

mission's agenda. Instead, it has decided to support the striker replacement bill, legislation that will undermine the very goals the commission is seeking to promote.

The President should grant the commission the flexibility and latitude to consider all issues—including the use of striker replacements—that will help improve the American workplace. It is time to get the National Labor Relations Act working as intended. Such efforts will surely be welcomed by employees and employers alike.

If H.R. 5 were enacted, organized labor would have nothing to lose by going on strike, no matter how legitimate the issue, because they would be guaranteed their jobs back. As a result, employers' choice would be limited because of the inability to continue operations.

If relations between labor and management are to improve in the future, they must be based on the common sense foundation of the National Labor Relations Act which must be enforced fairly to protect the rights of both employees and employers. Not coincidentally, it is the same foundation upon which American business must operate if it is to compete successfully in today's global economy. Congress, for its part, should seek ways of strengthening that foundation. The striker replacement bill is simply not one of them.

The debate surrounding H.R. 5 is powerful and emotional. However, it must face the facts, not the emotions, that guide the debate—and ultimately the defeat—of H.R. 5.

□ 1640

It is unfortunate that the administration has declined to include the issues revolving around striker replacement on the commission's agenda. It has given the commission a very fine agenda, but it has refused to include the questions of expediting hearings before the National Labor Relations Board as part of that, nor any other questions that have been raised by striker replacement.

That, I think, is most unfortunate. I think it is ill advised, and it kind of smacks of a political payoff to labor rather than being objective about looking at the total numbers of problems that we faced in the competitive new world that we are facing.

Mr. FAWELL. I agree. I thought it was very unfortunate that we had this commission established, and yet they would not even take a look at what is obviously, from the viewpoint of labor, a tremendously important problem. They apparently believe they have got the ability to get this thing across, pass this bill, and establish what they want through the Congress and are not willing to go, therefore, into a study and review of the matter.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Again, I would say we are opening a Pandora's box here.

The counterproductive results of this legislation, if, heaven forbid, it is ever passed into law, will be to reduce our competitiveness and our communities, and job opportunities are really going to suffer. Jobs will be lost. Factories will be closed, and communities will become maybe ghost towns, I am afraid, as we move overseas for further factory outlets.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, again.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER]. The gentleman from North Carolina has one great advantage coming into the Congress. He has, for many years, operated a business, and he had to meet a payroll and had experience in the market in negotiating with labor, and so he speaks from that kind of an experience as well as being a valuable member on our House Labor Committee.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say that, as a businessman, it gives me a real opportunity to come here and explain things to some people that really have never had the opportunity to worry about workers and strikers and so forth.

Madam Speaker, American businesses are the engine of economic growth. So why is Congress trying to pass legislation that would tie the hands of employers and prevent them from running their business, providing jobs for Americans and contributing to the Nation's gross national product?

I am talking about H.R. 5, and I call it the strikemaker bill. If the Congress enacts this bill, that is exactly what will happen. Employers will be unable to hire permanent replacement workers so that their businesses can continue to operate during an economic organizational strike.

If we remove the threat of being replaced, I guarantee you more strikes will occur, and more companies will go out of business.

Is this the kind of policy that we want to pursue as we emerge from a recession?

Here, I have an open letter to Congress given to us by the National American Wholesale Grocers' Association. As you can see, this letter, signed by more than 150 executives of American food industry, representing tens of billions of dollars in annual sales, and as this letter says, this legislation is a serious threat to the food distribution industry as a whole. By removing the risk of replacement, the bill would encourage workers to strike first and negotiate later, resulting in more strikes and more food companies closing their doors. In this current economic climate, it makes no sense to pursue a policy that will encourage strikes, cost jobs, and hinder growth. The food industry is trying to tell Congress that

under this bill they would have very limited choices during a strike if temporary workers are not available, and then they would have to shut down all, or parts, of their operations or give in to the demands of the workers or the unions. For many wholesale grocers and food service distributors, shutting down operations for any length of time would mean shutting down permanently.

As soon as that happens, their customers, grocery stores, convenience stores, schools, restaurants, hotels, and hospitals will face a choice: Either they close their own doors or find an alternative supply, alternative sources of supply. Either choice means that nonstriking workers are going to be out of work.

I would also like to comment about nonunion companies that are affected by this bill. Nonunion employers would not be able to hire permanent replacements for workers who refused to work and walked off the job seeking recognition by a union. This strike bill would essentially grant representation status to any union with a card-check majority. The effect would be to greatly lower the threshold for union organizers, enabling them to unionize workers who would never choose to do so for themselves under the secret-ballot process.

If unions can promise prospective members that they will never ever lose their jobs during a strike, most likely workers will vote for a union and strike when they become organized.

Also, consider the strike activity in the United States. It is at its lowest levels since the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935.

I would also like to add that this legislation is the organizing tool of a lifetime. Just imagine, union leaders will be able to say, "Join the union, and if you go on strike, your job is guaranteed. If you do not join, you can be permanently replaced."

Representing less than 12 percent of the private work force, big labor knows that their financial viability rests in organizing small business, and that is exactly what this bill will do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 5. A no vote will signal your support for promoting economic growth, job-creating businesses, and it is the right thing to do.

I would like to say one thing more, following up on our leader's voice, people have talked over and over again about worrying about the North American Free-Trade Agreement, that we are going to lose jobs in this country; we are going to lose jobs because they are going to go to Mexico. If you really want to lose jobs in this country, pass this bill, and you are going to force individual businesses to look for a way to continue, and the way to continue is to move it out of this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman. I think his point, too, in regard to the discrimination that this act creates in regard to those who are not members of unions; never before have we had a bifurcation of basic rights in regard to the workers who were not members of unions and workers who are members of unions, and now we are saying, as a practical matter, to the one who may decide that he wants to exercise his right not to strike, for instance, "Fine, if you do so, but you are going to be bumped from that position, and it is going to do you no good."

□ 1650

It is going to do you no good; you had better be a part of the union apparatus.

Mr. BALLENGER. If I may paraphrase what the gentleman is saying: 21 of the 50 States have a right-to-work law as part of their law in this country. Anybody with any intelligence and any legal knowledge at all will accept the fact that if this bill is passed, those right-to-work States will lose that right because eventually the Federal law will push the whole thing out of the window.

So, for those folks back home in North Carolina, I hope they will understand that I will do the best I can to defeat this bill.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a freshman Member of this Congress, also a member of our House Committee on Education and Labor, and the man also who has been in business with a prominent manufacturer for a number of years before coming to Congress, and has contributed and will continue to contribute a great deal to the Labor Committee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as we talked about this bill, and what we wanted to tell the American people, we talked about putting this bill into a historic framework about why we were seeking this change. Is this bill trying to reestablish something that we had for 50 years that had changed, or does this really create a fundamental shift between employee and management? That is what I am going to try to do for the next few minutes, talk about the historical perspective of this bill, where it comes from and where it may take us.

As our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], talked about earlier, we really have to go back to 1935, where this issue first came up in the Wagner Act. This bill forms the basis for all of our collective bargaining agreement work and all of our law. At that point in time there were really no provisions for reinstatement of employees. It just was not talked about in the bill.

In 1938 there were some legal cases that were decided, and there were two common types of strikes that were identified, one which dealt with unfair labor practices. And in those cases where a company was found to deal with unfair labor practices, it allowed for immediate reinstatement of the employees.

Now, when you go to the other type of strike, which is an economic strike, which is for economic benefit, it became very clear that employees who were replaced were not entitled to immediate reinstatement but would be entitled to reinstatement as new positions opened up.

That distinction now has not been questioned for 50 years. That has been the law of this country. It is a law, I think, that we found has really worked to balance the relationship between companies and their employees.

As one of my constituents wrote, "It was the unions' right to strike and management's right to hire new employees that ultimately brought both parties back to the table to negotiate a fair and balanced agreement."

So, what we see is that with H.R. 5, we see not bringing us back to something that we had in the past but this sets a brandnew precedent in terms of how management and labor are going to have to work in the future.

You know, there is a lot of talk about, well, in the 1980's we saw a lot of use of replacement workers. The facts just are not there.

Now, here you see these bar graphs show you the number of cases that were talked about. Back in previous years, pre-1981, that is. So, really since 1935 there were 225 NLRB cases involving the MacKay decision.

Since 1981 there were only 21 cases. So, on a historical level, the activity on this bill and on this issue has remained fairly steady. There has not been a change in this relationship.

So the facts are not there. So what we are seeing is that we are going to see a fundamental shift in this relationship. And I think with this type of change, it is a major change with major new risks involved.

When we take a look at what is happening in this Congress and what is happening to businesses around the country as a result of what we are doing here in Washington, we are seeing an already hostile business environment, and this would just be one more piece of legislation that is going to make it difficult for companies to do business in this country. It is going to make it difficult for companies to create jobs when we are trying to compete on a global basis. It is a hostile jobs environment bill.

There are a couple of great quotes, I think, from a very respected State in this country. The first quote comes from Arkansas and it comes from the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, March 26,

1933: "This change would upset the balance of power between employers and the unions at the bargaining table and invite workers to strike repeatedly at no risk to their jobs."

There is another great quote from the great State of Arkansas, and this one says, from the Fort Smith Southwest Times Record in Fort Smith, Arkansas: "This proposed legislation, we believe, would lead to the elimination of jobs, payrolls, and many made-in-America products."

I think they are absolutely right. It appears much of what is coming out of Arkansas today is intended to eliminate jobs in America, not to create jobs in America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

At this time I would like to yield to Congressman JOHN BOEHNER from Ohio, also a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and a man who consistently brings very succinct views.

If he would like to express himself at this point, I would appreciate it.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on the committee and my colleagues who are here with us today to explain the issue of striker replacement, why we think it is bad for America.

The bill we are debating, so-called striker replacement legislation, is the Jurassic Park for labor unions, big, slumbering giants on the verge of extinction, about to be bailed out by their friends here running big Government.

Why would I say something that sounds rather outrageous? Let me explain.

One is that there is a very delicate balance between labor and management. Labor's ultimate weapon is the right to strike. Management's ultimate weapon is the right to replace those striking workers. Over the years those forces have kept the parties at the table and negotiating. What this bill will do is to give the advantage to labor.

What is the employer going to do? He either yields to the demands of labor, closes down his business, or moves out of the country. Frankly, from where I sit it looks to me like that is what is likely to happen if this bill passes.

The second point I would make is that this bill, if it were to pass, for the first time in America's history we are going to have two sets of rules for people who work in America. Up until this bill that we are going to debate tomorrow, everybody who works in America is covered under one set of standards, one set of laws, and if this bill passes, we will have two: one set of those who belong to an organized labor union, and another set of rules for those who do not, which happen to be about 89 percent of the American workers.

The people in big labor are going to have more benefits, more advantages than those who do not belong to organized labor, which brings us to point No. 3 which is the real issue this bill is on the floor.

That is the fact that this bill does not have a great deal to do with the issue of striking workers and replacement of those workers, but it has got a whole lot to do with the fact that this bill is intended to create a more fertile environment for unions to go out and organize nonunion operations.

□ 1700

That is why I call it the Jurassic Park for big labor, because what this is, is welfare, welfare from government to bail out big labor because the fact is that they have declining membership in America. They are about to go out of existence, and until they find some way to go out and organize more nonunion operations, they are not likely to be around very long.

The last point I would make is if this bill passes, we are going to have more strikes, plain and simple, more strikes, and I do not think that is what the American people want.

As I close, allow me to quote from the Washington Post, April 27, 1993:

Bill Clinton has promised organized labor to sign the bill if it is sent to him. It's a promise we wish he hadn't made and hope he doesn't get the chance to keep.

I do not often agree with the Washington Post, but I think this sums up the points about this bill rather succinctly.

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] in regard to this matter. He also is a valued member of our Committee on Education and Labor and, of course, is now a part of the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for taking this special order. I want to thank him for his leadership on this very important legislation.

Obviously, this is a critically important piece of legislation with respect to labor-management relations in America and with respect to the role of the Federal Government regarding those.

Certainly this Nation has long since established the principle of the right of workers to gather together in unions, the right of unions to make efforts to organize workers into unions and to recruit nonmembers to the ranks of union membership, and to the right of union members to strike in order to advance their position at the bargaining table.

Never before, though, in the history of this Government has this Government proposed to give to unions the right to win that strike, the right to hold the management of a corporation

at bay, affecting a prohibition against their ability to maintain operations during the course of a strike. This, of course, has very serious consequences in certain of our industries, such as the health care industry.

Can you imagine what would happen if the employees, say the nurses at a hospital, were to go on strike and the hospital were to be prohibited from hiring temporary workers?

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I may say there are several cases where indeed that was a celebrated issue and where in one instance where we had testimony in our Labor Committee, a private hospital, and indeed if it were not for the fact that they could hire permanent replacement workers, they would have to either close their doors or the cost of health care would have gone up enormously, because obviously in those circumstances they are really cornered. So it is a very good point I think that the gentleman brings out.

Mr. ARMEY. Well, Madam Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right.

Let me just make a point on this. As we look at this legislation, let us make a distinction between the working men and women of this country, hard-working men and women, many of whom, but by far the fewest of whom, are members of unions. Sixteen percent of the private-sector work force have elected to join unions.

This legislation is not written on behalf of the members of the union or of the work force. It has an arbitrary discrimination against the nonunion worker, the majority of American workers, and threatens the very jobs of the unionized workers by virtue of raising the cost of labor.

The bill is written in Washington by the AFL-CIO. If it is passed into law, it will be a triumph of the Washington-based special interest over the public interest of American working men and women. The bill is written for the purpose of setting aside the freedom in right-to-work States where the populations of the States, like Texas, like Arkansas, have said, "We wish to have the option to join or not join a union," and to assist a handful of unions in organizing in an arena where the working men and women of this country have decreasingly seen the desirability of joining."

Let me just say, if I can, the gentleman from Illinois has been an astute servant of his constituents. Every time a man or woman in the United States is elected to Congress, sent to Washington, we are advised, counseled, and cajoled by our constituents back home not to catch Potomac fever. The idea is we should not come to Washington, fall in with this Washington crowd, and forget the people back home who hired us.

This represents a perfect example of what I call institutional Potomac

fever. To vote for this legislation would be to vote for a small handful of Washington-based union bureaucrats and against the broad interests of men and women of America working in the districts, seeking the opportunity for increased job placement. It is a vote for violence in the work force, in the work world, more strikes, more union violence, and more cost to hiring workers that will most certainly diminish employment opportunities.

Madam Speaker, I suggest to our colleagues that they ought to avoid Potomac fever. Vote on behalf of the people back home.

Let me again congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this subject.

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], who also has been in business many years before coming to Congress just this year in his freshman year.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the opportunity to have a moment to perhaps close out this session this afternoon on the striker replacement bill.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this special order on H.R. 5.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for reserving this time so that we can have this important debate and discussion.

The striker replacement bill we are considering tomorrow could have dire consequences for our country. I hope we will think seriously about what it is going to do to our economy and our ability to compete internationally before we make what I believe would be a grave mistake.

At a time when the economy is the No. 1 concern in America, I cannot fathom why Congress would want to pass a bill that would not just put a brake on our recovery, but is virtually guaranteed to destroy jobs.

Make no mistake. That is exactly what this bill does.

For more than 50 years, since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, a delicate balance has existed between labor and management. Each side has a weapon the other side fears—unions can strike, and employers can hire replacement workers. As a result, reason generally prevails and the two sides reach an agreement.

By outlawing replacement workers, H.R. 5 upsets this balance, virtually guaranteeing a rash of strikes in this country.

In fact, I haven't heard anyone argue that this bill will not produce more strikes or that those strikes are not likely to be more severe.

So the real question is whether increased strikes are bad.

For anyone concerned about the economy—concerned about jobs for American workers—the answer should be a resounding "yes."

Increased strikes mean more plant closings and business shut downs. The striker replacement bill will accelerate the diversion of work to other locations, including those outside the United States.

This is not a question of labor versus management. There are no winners when a business is forced to shut down. Who comes out ahead when there are no jobs for new workers or for the striking workers to come back to?

And it does not stop there. There is a ripple effect. Suppliers suddenly find themselves without orders to fill. They, too, lay off workers.

Small businesses operate on a thin margin and cannot long survive without work. They too shut their doors.

The economy contracts.

Jobs are lost during strikes, but not through replacement workers. The reality is that only 3 in every 20 strikes involve the use of replacement workers. And even then, when the strike ends, only 3 to 4 percent of replacement workers remain on the job.

But the economic consequences of the strike will be felt by the struck employer, by other businesses dependent on the struck employer—and their innocent employees—and by the community.

Is this what we want?

My constituents in Michigan have watched the loss of jobs during a recessionary cycle.

Today, for the first time in more than a decade, our unemployment rate is below the national average.

Now we have a bill before us that would head us right back into recession. This debate is not about labor versus management. It is about jobs, plain and simple.

If you doubt the effects of this labor protectionism, just observe Germany, a nation that bans permanent replacement workers. Unions have been striking a lot there recently. Mercedes Benz and BMW are seeking to escape the high cost of these German labor protection laws by starting plants in the United States, with BMW's factory to be in decidedly nonunion South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to keep America working and defeat H.R. 5.

In fact, a recent editorial in the Detroit News likened passage of H.R. 5 to "assisted economic suicide" for Michigan. I would like to share with you excerpts from the editorial:

If this radical change in labor law is approved, no business would dare bring new jobs into heavily unionized Michigan. \*\*\*

Our heavily unionized state would pay the highest and most immediate price. Out-of-state firms, already reluctant to locate in the most heavily unionized state in the country, would write off Michigan forever.

Existing businesses would have an incentive to move to less unionized states.

□ 1710

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much those fine words from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Madam Speaker, I only want to say that all of the rights that have been referred to here tonight, the right of the union to strike, the right of employers to counter a strike by hiring people, replacement workers, and the right of individual workers not to strike, are all last resort decisions which always bring about a great deal of controversy in the communities of America. But they all play their part in this Nation's collective bargaining process, and they function within a delicate balance worked out over more than 50 years of management and labor tensions. They are today as valuable as they ever have been, and I hope that Congress will not come in here like an elephant in a china shop and disturb this delicate balance.

#### MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Just last week, Madam Speaker, I rose on two occasions to follow through and included in the special order for the RECORD, for the first time that I have seen it, the tremendous risk, gambling, that our largest banks in the United States continue to engage in, at great risk to everyone concerned, in the so-called off-balance sheet activities. That is jargon for those activities that are still not within control of the regulatory authority, the Federal Reserve namely, in its responsibility to make sure that the safety and stability of our banking system is maintained above all.

The history of our financial institutions in our country is not a happy one. We have had, from the very beginning of our history, bank failures and scandals, and we have had a very interesting and a unique development, historical development, an evolution of banking and financial institutional activities generally. But also we must remember that banking, like every other activity of a financial or economic nature, must also depend ultimately on the economic well-being of our society.

Now, Madam Speaker, it is not exclusive, one from the other, activity. In other words, if a society, as I said in my last remarks, is flagellated with usurious interest rates, or what I call exacting interest rates, to the point of actual confiscation, our society cannot be well off.

Now this is a subject matter that I have been speaking out on for almost

three decades. When I started, naturally on my advent as a Member of this great body, the country was beginning to enter a period of what seemed to be unending and continued and sustained prosperity. Nobody wanted to think that there were no laws on our books, as there are not, to protect the people against usury.

Now, Madam Speaker, all through mankind's history, going back to the first known history of mankind's activity, back to—oh, I forget how many thousands of years before Jesus Christ or Hammurabi, in which his annals, or codes, reflect the attempts that were made even in that dim history of mankind against this activity that we defined, and has been through the years defined, as usury; and so, finding that I was speaking against a backdrop of absolute indifference, and as I like to consider it, and the way I pictured it, was that I was like a coyote out in the bush country in Texas at midnight baying to the Moon. But it is on record, and I really wish that I had been totally in error.

But I was grounded on what history, through all the years of mankind's annotated, written, and oral history, reflects, Madam Speaker, and that is that no society can withstand or survive usury. Extortionate rates of interest is another definition of usury. There are various forms, as is reflected in history, in the early and dim years of mankind's beginning of societal life. But just as true as it was in a simplistic and crude existence, it still is more so in today's world.

So, Madam Speaker, what we have is compounded and is, in fact, raised to an exponential degree, as they say in mathematics, the velocity of speculative fevers, and now by our financial institutions, and also based on a usurious conduct of business, and now, when I saw that it was impossible to raise anybody's attention to this question, and I also realized, sitting on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs since I came here 32 years ago, that an historical thing had happened on June 19, 1966, which was the day, or the night, that the big banks announced a 1-percent increase overnight in the prime interest rate as it was defined then.

□ 1720

The prime interest rate was the prime interest rate, but so were stocks, and so were bonds. It used to be that a stock was a stock, a bond was a bond. Not so anymore.

Now, let us see where we are. At this point a banker, as I said on the last occasion last week, can borrow from the Federal Reserve Board at 3 or a little under 3 percent.

What has he been doing with that money? On its balance sheets account, on the off balance sheets, such as the great speculative, risky venture into

options and futures and derivatives, and they are all defined in one form or another as derivatives, which have already caused great instability in the European market last September by the mere movement, principally by one individual, a very mysterious individual that gravitates around New York, London, Israel, and other places, who was able to move or control the movement of these derivative actions in and within the European currency movement.

Now, this has become huge. I mean it is a monstrous activity. Even now as I speak you have in one instance, one fraction, a millionth of a fraction of a second, an instantaneous conveyance of billions of dollars from London, New York, Frankfurt in Germany, Paris in France, and Tokyo in Japan. You have in a flick of that blip, electronic blip, the transfer of huge amounts of money, amounting to about a trillion dollars even as I speak this day.

Now, what is that based on? Is it based on commerce? Is it based on money or values in exchange for commodities and production? No, it is paper, gambling on paper. So that today a stock or a bond does not necessarily reflect what it used to 25 or 30 years ago, and that is some inherent business or industrial activity and production of some corporation. Not today. Today this is paper.

So you have actually two financial economies or businesses in the world today, and particularly in the United States. On the one side you have this huge mountain of paper transaction, fictitious values. Then on the other side you have the traditional, the national product of manufacturing, production, services, and the like.

One now is so overgrown that it is tremendously, exponentially, greater than this real true traditional economy.

Your stock market, which obviously since 1987 it should be self-evident that it is manipulatable, just as much as these international currency future markets.

So what is it going to take? Recently the central bank of Italy lost a big chunk in this exposure to these transactions. They are reporting the least amount of gain in years.

Now, what happens when you have a manipulator? You have got the modern day pirate, financial pirate, the parasites as we have seen all of these exposures of the glamour boys that used to have the front page pictures in the business section about how this 32-year-old had made \$500 million in 2 months.

What were those \$500 or \$600 million? They were all paper speculation, and all based on unethical, improper methods even then.

So going back to when I raised my voice in 1966 and said, my colleagues, are you aware of the fact that there is

no control of interest rates, and therefore anything can happen?

Well, who thought in 1966 that you would have prime interest rates of anything over 6 or 7 percent? Very few. So when in 1979 and 1980 you had 20 and 21 percent, then I knew that this country would have to pay a very heavy price. It was just a matter of time.

These movements are glacierlike. They are slow. But they are immutable. They are inexorable. They are coming, and you are not going to avoid it.

And this is where we are today. Plus the disarray within our assemblies, where it seems as if we have had great confusion in the counsels of our Government. Why can that be and why should it be?

Well, I kept repeating in these speeches that we had to get back to basics. I raised the question, as I am now, how could Franklin Roosevelt have conducted a world war in which, at its height, before the end of 1945, 46.5 percent of our entire national effort, known as the gross national product, at that time was being utilized on the Federal level to prosecute and win the war. And he never had to pay more than 2 percent, if at all. The average the government was paying on its borrowing to conduct the war did not even average 2 percent.

Now, was that an act of God? As the Federal Reserve Board Chairmen, five in a row, used to tell us on the Banking Committee when I would ask them, they would say, "Oh, well, we can't control that. That is, the Congress is profligate, and, you know, as long as you have an unbalanced budget, why, and besides that, interests rates are not subject to us."

Now, for the past almost 10 years they would boast about how they can manage interest rates. But they would all get angry with me when I would say, "Well, what you are telling me, gentleman, is that this, known as interest rates, is an act of God. It is not a human endeavor. And you, chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board, and your members, tell me that you have nothing to do with it."

They all would shake their head and say vigorously, "Absolutely not."

Of course, they brag now about how they can and do, and how if you get this specter of inflation, they will have to jack them up. But in the meanwhile, what is the true picture that you and I, my colleagues, and the citizens, constituents that we represent, face?

□ 1730

Well, let me tell you what they face. If you are a retiree and you depend on your pension or your savings or even some of the families that came from very affluent history, and most of them thought, and their lawyers thought, well, we will place the estate in trust with the trust department of a bank.

They would be earning the interest rates that were fairly nominal and had a fair, nominal return. What do you think they are getting today? What is the saver that has a CD in an average bank getting by way of interest yield? Not 3 percent even. It is less than 3 percent.

But if he goes to that same bank and says, "I want to borrow \$3,000 in order to have an inventory for my business and its needs," he will have to pay, in my town, I have seen cases where they are paying as much as 12 percent.

In fact, here in this city, I was talking to a poor lady, who works at an establishment here in town and was worried because she was being threatened, since she was paying 17 percent. And in fact, until recently, that is what she had been paying. But if she has a savings account in that bank, that bank will not even pay 3-percent yield on that savings account, much less a checking account.

Now, it used to be that checking accounts were outlawed after the Depression. It was considered to have been one of those factors that banks foolishly handled and led to their own debacle in 1932. But then just a few years ago, with all of the deregulation and everything else, it came back. So banks are paying on checking accounts; "demand accounts" is the technical word.

But now let us look at what else the banks do. They borrow from the Fed at 3 percent or a little under. Then they go and get that money and put it in what? In treasuries that will give them a yield that the spread between what they paid for their money and what they will get from the Federal Treasury is somewhere around an average of 5 percent yield, for which the Fed does not require reserves. But Treasury is paying that amount of interest, which is a subsidy. So the bankers are subsidized more than any other segment in our country by the taxpayer more than ever before.

Well, people get all excited when they hear about a bank closure and payout and how much it costs the Treasury and the Deposit Fund and all, but everybody got on their merry-go-round during the 1970's. Why, everybody was an instant financial expert.

I remember citizens stopping me on the street in my home town and saying, "Henry, you know, I have had my savings over here at this S&L, but by golly, I want to ask your advice. You know, it doesn't pay any better than 6 percent. And in the meanwhile, I understand I can go out here and get into a money market and get 8 percent or more."

I have always said, hey, I am not a financial adviser. I am not going to tell you what to do. All I can advise you is this, you are going to go from an insured depository into, perhaps, an activity that you better ask if it is insured.

Well, of course, these were what they called noninsured, uninsured mutual money markets. Today, as they have for a few years, they account for better than 24 percent of the total deposits out there in these same institutions.

So that given these sets of combinations of events, what is it that we can expect?

Now, for years, in fact, since the great multinational fever in the 1960's, late 1960's, and then the money manias of the 1970's, including such things as money markets and the like, we have had naturally the inevitable contraction of those or the bursting of those bubbles. That is what we have had and will continue to have. And, in fact, the big bubble now being blown. No bubble lasts. All bubbles burst. So you do not have to be a prophet or even an expert. But is it fair to not speak out and report?

In addition, let me say one other thing. We have had great ado about the possibility that there will be a tax or a reduction on so-called COLA's, costs of living. Some of the greatest critics of the Social Security's COLA, for instance, are the banks. But they are the biggest COLA's of all time.

Why? Because on every loan a bank makes, they have what they call a 1 percent premium. For what? For inflation.

That is what they call the inflationary premium. Whether anybody records inflation or not, 1 percent or less, that is what they will sock you when you borrow, their 1 percent premium for inflation.

That is COLA, cost of living. Now, what did that amount to last year? \$800 billion. What did the Social Security COLA amount to? \$12 billion. So that if the bankers would just return 50 percent, that would be \$400 billion. It would take care of the deficit and everything else, the debt.

So we have gone through all of these things, and it has been painful to me, because I felt they were illusory, delusory, fraudulent, almost. Who hears now of Gramm-Rudman? Yet, it was just a few years ago that, by golly, if you did not genuflect and say you were for it, why you were some kind of a traitor. You were despoiling the economy. You were against a "balanced budget."

But from the very beginning, I took this floor and said it was a farce, that it was inimical to the interests of this country and, in fact, the proof of it was that just between the year it began in 1986 and President Reagan, the biggest pusher of all, and all the economists and the Federal Reserve Board saying, you have got to stick to this, this is what is going to save us and keep respectability for our system among the nations, I was saying, it cannot work. It will not work. And the very day that they came in, on March 15, to say that they had saved \$15 billion, was the day

I took the floor and said, maybe so, but you have just lost it because today you are having to pay an extra \$30 billion on the interest on servicing the debt. So not only have you vitiated what you say is a savings, but you are now, you have sunk deeper by another \$15 billion.

□ 1740

President Reagan and the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, whatever that thing was, it had not been, by 1990, the debt had not decreased, it had increased by \$1 trillion. In fact, everybody has this notion that President Reagan had some kind of a miraculous economic program. During his term of office the debt went to \$2 trillion additionally. How much interest are we paying on that? We have the witch's brew, as it is called, in fact, the old English used to call it the witch's sabbath, compound interest, compound interest.

About 58 years ago I was a student at what was known as the beginning of the San Antonio Junior College. I don't know why, I always sought out a library. There was a little, meager library there, but I would haunt it. I found a passage in a book that struck me that I think pictures today and the councils of our government and society, generally.

All I had was that I attributed this observation to a Sara E. Simmons. I have had the Library of Congress try to check and find out, and they wanted to know where did I get this and who is this Sara Simmons, so up to now they have not, but I know that some day I will get to it.

She said this: "The one danger is institutional decadence, due to a dying out of energy, enterprise, and power of cooperation by reason of an overgrowth of tradition and institutions which fetter the individual without serving group interests.

"The other danger is individualistic decadence due to the suffering of all common or group interests by reason of the dissolution of common faith, ideals, and undertakings of private consciousness, private feelings, and private aims.

"Strange as it may seem, the final stage of each disease is the same." She is talking about the pathogenesis of societies. "Towards the end, we have people who are egoistic without being strong in individual character, selfish without being ambitious, unscrupulous without being enterprising, depending on one another yet without the capacity of cooperation, sociable yet powerless for effective association, too indifferent for great corporate achievements, yet too feeble for splendid individual achievements."

I do not know of a better way to put it than what is confronting us. It used to be that we could get such things as the Rayburn Building, the expansion of the East Wing of the Capitol from the

north to the south, from the Senate to the House. Try to do that today.

We have the noxious belief, sponsored and spread and actually bred during the President Reagan regime, that the government is the enemy. If we reach the point where we do not feel that we are the government, we are through. What has brought about this, and why is it that in elections of great importance we cannot even get 50 percent of the eligible electorate to record a vote?

Each one of us has our ideas, and I have mine, but that is just reporting a state of being, not what I think or anybody else thinks are the causes.

I have also been speaking out sometimes at the cost of very heavy criticism, as of the last year, on the fact that we have disengaged from our Constitution. In fact, nothing is sadder than to see the herd instinct in taking the Pledge of Allegiance here in the House of Representatives. What is that pledge? That pledge was not around until just about three decades, three and a half, four decades ago. Here we are, we have taken an oath, and that oath is to the Constitution, not to the flag. The flag is a symbol. Here we are, like a good little herd, reminiscent of the Hitlerian period: "Sieg heil, sieg heil."

That sounds terrible, and maybe it sounds like it is erratic, but that is the way I feel and think. It is sad when we forget that the main oath is the main thing. That oath is to uphold and protect the Constitution against all enemies, domestic as well as foreign.

It was not always that way. Can the Members imagine if we had the tremendous passion and agitation of the Civil War, like Judge David Davis did, when he announced the decision in *ex parte* Milligan. In this area, where there was great hostility to those that were charged with not being enthusiastic enough against the Rebels, and the military were going to try to seize civilians in Indiana, here is what he said:

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and all people, equally in war and peace, and comes with the shield of its protection to all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the little man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any one of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism.

So we had one President saying, "No, this so-called attempt by Congress to limit the power to make war by one individual, the President, like the old kings, it is unconstitutional." When does a President, who takes an oath to faithfully, faithfully, faithfully administer the laws, pick the laws that he thinks are constitutional and which he should obey and should not? Yet we had that just recently.

All through my term here, during the so-called 1960's and the Vietnam period, I took this House floor. There was no

TV or anything, but it is on the record. I charged that Presidents did not have, and that included a friend and a neighbor from Texas, President Lyndon Johnson, did not have the constitutional power to compel an unwilling American and send him out of the United States to fight in an undeclared war, not declared by Congress, as one of the latest notices we have coming from Somalia.

□ 1750

But I have a letter that I placed in the RECORD earlier from the President, President Clinton. I had written him about my concern of invoking the War Powers Limitation Act not only in Somalia but in the so-called East Europe where the idea is that American troops are not involved, but they are. They are in areas of potential hostility. It does not mean hostility necessarily against, at this moment, our troops, but in areas where the potential for hostility is there.

I had a hand in the drafting of that law, even though I knew it was limited in 1973-74, but no President has had too much respect. In fact, President Clinton's reply to me was the first one from any President.

So I am going to have to raise that reply now in view of what is happening in Somalia. We were under the impression that our contingent was working under the aegis and the flag of the United Nations. Yet it looks as if all the fighting is being done by Americans, and what is worse, killing Somalia civilians by Americans. That, I think, needs some restructuring.

But this notion that Judge Davis so much warned against, that given exigencies, got lost after World War II, and you had these eminent social and political scientists saying, "Well, you know the world, and with the advent of the atom bomb, things have to be decided so quickly, we may have to think of some device known as a constitutional dictatorship." Well, that is a contradiction in terms right there.

It goes back centuries. And I have quoted that old saying, and I do not know who in England was the first to bring it out. It may have been one of the Pitt prime ministers; they said, "The argument of tyrants, necessity; the creed of slaves, necessity, always, always. Oh, I have got to do this, I have got to have this power because of this great necessity," and Judge Davis is saying, "Oh, no, you don't, that Constitution prevails, not just in peacetime but in wartime as well." And he said so explicitly.

Well, that is when we had men of fiber, is what I call it, and some kind of get after me when I like to say they are old-stock Americans.

Well, now, where are we when you then have the admixture? How much freedom can an American citizen have today if he does not have some measure

of economic liberty or freedom? And not just the freedom to seek a job that he cannot get or the freedom to starve, but I am talking about economic, some kind of economic stability and freedom which is basic today. How many young men have I seen tragically in just the last year-and-a-half, and nobody can say that they are not educated, because they are college graduates, and they have not been able to find a job for over a year, how many have I seen who started out soon after college and then all of a sudden, because of these giant megamergers, which is what I am talking about, speculative ventures, tying up bank assets, like Nelson Bunker Hunt and his brother did back in the 1970's early when they tried to corner the silver market? You are going to get two or three almost functional illiterates like those Hunt brothers who were lucky enough to have their father find oil in Texas, and they are going to go and try to corner the silver market in London with these old 500-year experienced silversmiths and speculators and gold handlers. Why, it was ridiculous, but they tied up over \$25 billion worth of bank credit.

That bank credit should have been going to industry, to businesses, to areas in our community that lack even meager credit allocation, meager, the most meager. But, no, it was tied up there.

That is one reason I introduced an impeachment resolution on Chairman Volcker for which I was kind of ridiculed. Of course, nobody paid much attention, but then I did not do it because I thought it was the bombastic thing to do, since I have said that the Federal Reserve is really not a Federal agency, which it really is not. How could I then impeach Volcker? But I wanted to expose the fact that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board had met in what was supposed to be a secret meeting in Florida in a hotel with Nelson Bunker Hunt and the then head of the largest bank at that time, Citicorp, because they were trying to protect that money they had put into the Hunt brothers.

It all ended up in the courts, and the Hunt brothers declaring bankruptcy. The bankruptcy laws being what they are today, that does not mean they are bankrupt. That means that they are still pretty rich. They have been able to twist the laws, use the laws, forge the laws, and Congress has been the instrumentality, I hate to say, my colleagues, that makes it possible for these scapegoats and these malefactors of great wealth to escape even the barest of accountability.

So today we are meagerly trying to find some way.

I spoke about having introduced legislation a few years ago, a few Congresses ago, in an attempt to control usury. I did. I called it the Usury Con-

trol Act, and it was just trying to restore what the country had lived with since the beginning, and that was an interest rate control, usury control, anti-usury law, and that was a struggle from the very beginning of our country.

It is all through the history of our country, even in its first nationhood attempts, the First and Second Continental Congresses. You know, you have to have bankers or some kind of financials, so the First Continental Congress wanted to borrow money. And where did they have to go? To the Philadelphia bankers. The bankers being what they were then, and are now, they said, "Yes, we will loan you money, but we have to charge you this huge amount of interest." Thanks to Thomas Jefferson, they did not get away with it.

Like Franklin Roosevelt, how could Franklin Roosevelt have financed the war never having to pay more than 2 percent, in fact, on average during the war, less than 2 percent? And now to finance our debt, you, the taxpayers, you and I, because we all pay taxes, are paying more for the interest on the debt than we are for our defense appropriations.

What is interest? Interest is the mechanism in a society by virtue of which wealth is transferred from one sector to the other, and it is also, by definition, the most inflationary factor of all.

Interest is what? Something for nothing that accrues to the benefit of those who happen to lend and have the credit to lend at an unconscionable and, through the centuries, outlawed usurious rate.

Flagellated as we are, there can be no end to this except some untoward event which I hate to think of. Because the ability to change we have lost, and when a society does not have the peaceful and the right ways to change and give rise to change, and the only reasonable absolute law of life is that everything changes, and when we cannot change our institutional ethno in order to give life to huge segments of our citizenry, it is inevitable that something will happen that will bring about change in an institutional way.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, CESAR CHAVEZ WORK-PLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-129) on the resolution (H. Res. 195) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based upon participation in labor disputes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2333, DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATIONS, AND H.R. 2404, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-130) on the resolution (H. Res. 195) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2333) 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, and of the bill (H.R. 2404) to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1800

#### LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LAMBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, it is very important at this moment that we take a snapshot of the situation with respect to Haiti. It is a critical moment in the latest set of developments.

We have had the resignation of the Prime Minister of Haiti, the Prime Minister who was illegally installed by the military thugs who took control when they overthrew the legally elected president, President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. At that time they went through a series of maneuvers which resulted in finally emplacing Marc Bazin as the Prime Minister.

Madam Speaker, the resolution of the illegally installed Prime Minister of Haiti represents a golden opportunity, and it comes at a time when a number of other developments related to Haiti are occurring, which also add to that window of opportunity.

We have a situation now where the United Nations is preparing to debate a resolution which has been sponsored by the United States and a few other nations to tighten the sanctions on Haiti, to move beyond sanctions that have been imposed merely by the United States and the organizations which belong to the Organization of American States. In other words, we want to go beyond this hemisphere and get all of the nations of the world to participate in a process which we hope will lead to the restoration of democracy in Haiti.

The debate will go forward, and that is very welcome. The initiative taken by the White House is welcome. It was a bit delayed, and we have been disappointed at the delay in affirmative action on Haiti, but it is finally beginning to move.

At the same time, we have had some other developments which have moved things a bit. The Federal judge, Judge Sterling Johnson, ruled that the Haitians at Guantanamo Bay who have HIV infections must be brought to the United States and given appropriate medical care, a humane act which I consider very important if this Nation is to maintain its image in the world as really being a nation that cares about people.

The White House did not challenge or appeal that ruling. That is another step forward.

At the same time, we see a breakup of the unity among the thieves in Haiti. There are some positive developments taking place in other parts of the world in this hemisphere, including this pending debate in the U.N. Security Council on the tougher sanctions on Haiti. It is very important to note that the Congressional Black Caucus on May 19 set forth a program. They called for immediate action to restore democracy in Haiti. We are pleased that some of the steps that were laid out and set forth in that statement have begun to materialize.

I would like to review the statement in order to set a frame of reference for what is happening.

The Members of the Congressional Black Caucus fervently believe that the human rights of the Haitian people are no less noble than others who seek freedom and democracy in other parts of the world. The Congressional Black Caucus today released a list of six points which were announced first on May 12, 1993. We reiterate for the Clinton Administration and international organizations of which the United States is a Member nation the elements of this plan to insure the restoration of democracy to Haiti.

#### POINT ONE

Because the Haitian coup leaders have made a mockery of the negotiation process by refusing to accept the most generous possible amnesty terms, General Cedras and his corp of military dictators should be given a ten day ultimatum. The illegal military rulers must be told:

At the end of a time certain they will no longer be accepted at the negotiating table.

A solution will be developed by the OAS and the UN, supported by the United States government to be implemented immediately should the hunta fail to respond within the stated time from of ten days.

The military leaders would be instructed that failure to act by designated deadline forfeits their rights to any consideration of amnesty and they are hereby deemed to be war criminals. This finding is predicated on the illegal overthrow of a lawfully elected government and the commission of more than 3,000 atrocities against the people of Haiti should not go unpunished.

That is point No. 1. We are happy to report that point No. 1 to some extent has moved forward and that Dante Caputo, the primary negotiator for the Organization of American States, has indicated that when negotiations are resumed in Haiti, they do not want the military present. They want to negotiate with the elected officials of Haiti

who are still there, the members of the legislature of Haiti, and not have the elected officials present. We think they should be at this point locked out by the negotiations; 10 days have passed, long passed, and the military junta thugs who overthrew the lawfully elected Government of Haiti should no longer be included in these negotiations.

Point No. 2 of the Congressional Black Caucus statement says that,

Within 10 days the United States Government should take all necessary steps to halt the flow of drugs from Haiti into the United States. Agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation should act in concert with military forces to eradicate the pipeline of poison to the youth of America.

Haiti has always been a bit of a transshipment center for drugs.

Under the present military regime, it has completely expanded at every level of the military. They are all involved in the transshipment of drugs. It is not any longer confined to generals, it is down to the colonels and the captains and the sergeants. They all have their various ways of helping the shipment of drugs through Haiti bound for the United States. They get the bribes at every level. They are financed, and they are able to dig in and resist negotiations because they are financed by drug money. In other words, they are endangering democracy in this hemisphere on the one hand. On the other hand they are increasing the flow of drugs into the United States to the youth of America. We certainly have several reasons to want to put an end to this illegal military government in Haiti.

I do not think we can report that the United States has taken some kind of aggressive action against drugs. We do not know. We hope so. I must report that shortly after this statement was issued, members of the Congressional Black Caucus did meet with President Clinton. At that time President Clinton showed a great deal of interest in this particular point. He said he was not aware of the extent to which the drug trade was involved in this situation; that he wanted his staff to more fully explore and examine and review the situation and report to him on the implications of a drug-financed government in Haiti and the implications of a military junta being supported by drug funds, and the implication in terms of the impact of increased shipment of drugs through Haiti to this country. I do not know what the President has gotten from his staff. We have not received any further information about this. But I do appreciate the fact that the President took note of this very important point.

Point 3 of the Congressional Black Caucus statement states as follows:

Within 15 days the most effective possible enforcement of the embargo on strategic ma-

terials, including oil, should be commenced. Ships presently in place to prevent Haitians from leaving their island should be utilized to enforce this embargo.

□ 1810

Additional ships and planes should be deployed also to signal to the military dictators of Haiti that the United States Government is serious.

At the same time the administration should freeze the assets of the coup leaders and revoke the visas of the military and their supporters.

We are pleased to report and observe that the President has taken this step quite seriously and he has moved to call upon the United Nations, as I mentioned before, to impose the strongest possible sanctions on the illegal Government of Haiti. He has moved to call for a serious embargo on oil. Oil is the lifeline of Haiti. Electricity in Haiti is provided via oil, and Haiti's economy would definitely be brought to a standstill. The military vehicles also would not be able to operate and a number of other items are directly dependent on oil. If an oil embargo can be made effective, then that oil embargo will bring down the military government.

The President has taken steps, as I said before, and discussions are on the way in the United Nations.

The President has also moved on the second part of this recommendation. The President has moved to freeze the assets of the coup leaders and the people related to the coup leaders.

We now have a State Department in the process of developing the names, and some names have been already listed of the people who are considered supporters of the coup as well as the coup leaders, and that process is going forward. We applaud the actions of the President on this point.

Point four of the statement of the Congressional Black Caucus reads as follows:

Within 30 days of the date of our statement, the U.S. Government should announce a commitment to supply the necessary resources for the United Nations and the Organization of American States to insure the safe return of President Aristide. The U.S. shall not supply manpower for this transition, but will provide equipment, supplies and transportation to the international protective force. The U.S., the OAS, the U.N. should immediately commence an information and education campaign directed at the populace of Haiti via radio, television and air drop of leaflets to outline steps as they are taken to return President Aristide to power.

This very important point has not, of course, been implemented to this date. Thirty days have not elapsed, so we are not behind schedule yet.

It is important to note that the United Nations and the United States Government have agreed before to attempt to install a 500-man police force in Haiti. They have reached a preliminary agreement. In fact, they thought they had the agreement of the Haitian military to go forward with the landing of

this police force which would set up a situation which would guarantee the protection not only of President Aristide upon his return, but also the protection of all other elected officials and people who consider themselves opponents of the Aristide government.

Unfortunately, the military after giving its word backed down. The 500-man police force was vetoed and the military of Haiti is insisting that nobody should come in to do anything of the kind.

We are saying that it is impossible to deal with the military thugs. It is impossible to deal with the drug smugglers. It is impossible to deal with a group of people who are guilty of the deaths of 3,000 people and other atrocities. We should not go forward attempting to deal with people who really are responsible for torture against their own people.

There is a certain kind of person in the world who will respond only to force. That is a sad fact. It may be that a large percentage of the species homo sapiens, we human beings, a large percentage of us are made in the image of angels, but there is a percentage of us who are made just a little higher than snakes, and they demonstrate themselves over and over. They come forward over and over again throughout the world. We have them in Serbia. You know, the minute a weakness is shown by the international community, the Serbians have now renewed their attack. They are not only shelling cities and towns, but graveyards, sports stadiums, wherever they can find large groups of people they are doing that. We, of course, know about the house-to-house driving out of people in an effort to achieve ethnic cleansing, the systematic rape of women. On and on it goes. Every atrocity that you can imagine has been committed in Serbia.

A long way away from Serbia, in Somalia you have the complete collapse of all law and order. There are Somalians against Somalians.

Some people attempt to explain what happened in Serbia and Yugoslavia as a matter of conflict between religions, conflict between ethnic groups who have long hated each other.

In Somalia, what is the excuse? In Somalia, most of the Somalians are of African descent. They are black people. In Somalia most of the people speak the same language. In Somalia, most of the people have the same religion. What is in Somalia is the factions who war with each other to the extent that they care little about the lives of women, children, and innocent people, and refuse to allow convoys, refuse to allow envoys from the United Nations to come in and implement an effective feeding program for the citizens of Somalia. So you have that small percentage of Somalians who are a little higher than the snakes.

Let us face it. You put guns in the hands of some people and they become kings. They become dictators. They have nothing in particular to offer the human race. They are not particularly bright. They are not particularly strong physically. There is nothing they have except the willingness to use a gun in a cold-blooded way. When they have that willingness to murder women, infants, and children, to block food shipments, then they become very effective against ordinary human beings.

What we did in Somalia, and I do think that we did the right thing, sending people into Somalia, sending forces into Somalia to guarantee that the majority, 90 percent of the population who are peace-loving people, who are like human beings anywhere else in the world, would not be terrorized, would not continue to be denied the basics of existence, something as basic as food. We did that in the interests of the human rights of the majority of the people of Somalia, against the small percentage of snakes who are willing to do anything in order to maintain some semblance of power.

We have seen this brand of human being before. Some of them even have a particular kind of genius. Adolf Hitler was of the same ilk. Six million people were cold-bloodedly murdered, in addition to rempaging across Europe in cold blood, destroying nations. So there is a certain group of human beings who have to be dealt with forcibly. You can only deal with them at that level, and in Haiti you have a group in control that must be dealt with by force.

We are going to have to send in a protective force. We are recommending in point four that a protective force go in with President Aristide to return him to power. It would be a group of bodyguards, a corps of bodyguards, not an invasion force. Haitians are pretty sensitive about an invasion force. They were once invaded by American Marines. Marines occupied the area for a long time. They are very sensitive about that. He who comes with the Marines will not find many friends in Haiti.

We are not talking about sending in an invasion force. We are talking about sending in a protective force with the legally elected President, the man who was elected by 70 percent of the voters. It has been a long time since anybody has been elected President of the United States with 70 percent of the votes, but Jean-Bertrand Aristide was elected with 70 percent of the vote. He deserves the protection of the international community. He deserves to be returned and not have his life threatened. He deserves to have whatever is necessary, a corps of bodyguards to return with President Aristide, as large as is necessary to guarantee his safety and the safety of the other legally

elected members of the Haitian Government.

Within 45 days, we said that the United States should actually announce a date for the return of President Aristide, and within 60 days we call for the return of President Aristide as our point six.

We think that between now and the middle of July is time enough for all this to be worked out and President Aristide should be returned sometime in the middle of July.

We close the statement of the Congressional Black Caucus with the following:

We have witnessed the most horrific atrocities visited upon the men, women and children of Haiti. Its peasant movement has been assaulted and wiped out. In light of these developments and the continued intransigence of the military coup leaders, the Congressional Black Caucus believes it is critical that this Nation confront the overwhelming force being used in Haiti to enslave the civilian population. We have 7,000 men with guns and armored vehicles, 7,000 men with officers who were trained in the United States of America leading them who are holding a population of 7 million in hostage. They hold them hostage because they have the guns.

We believe the coalition of conspirators must be exposed.

We believe the aristocracy whose stolen riches are protected in repositories in this nation and throughout the world must see their assets frozen or impounded.

We demand that the military terrorists and the drug smugglers who impose a savage and inhumane oppression on the people of Haiti bring an end to these gross violations of human rights.

□ 1820

Last, we call upon the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to join in interventions at every appropriate level with the international community to implement these measures.

Now, we made that statement on May 19, and, as I said before, there has been forward movement. We want to applaud the Clinton administration for the forward movement we see. We are in the position of exploiting a window of opportunity, and my plea today is:

Let us not hesitate. We should not wait any longer. We should not hesitate. We should not procrastinate. We should not listen to those voices that tell us, "Be careful. If you return Aristide to Haiti, a lot of good people are going to suffer." There are all kinds of safeguards to guarantee against that, but that is a big lie that has been perpetrated.

How can anyone reasonably, examining the facts, conclude that President Aristide would be a threat to the people of Haiti or any segment of the population? Among leaders of the world my colleagues are going to find very few who have the qualifications of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, very few people in leadership positions anywhere in the world, and that includes the industrialized nations, that includes the United States of America.

Aristide is an ex-priest, or a priest still. He was excommunicated by people who did not like the fact that he got involved in politics and believed in the liberation theology. But Aristide is a priest who was very well trained. Aristide speaks five or six languages fluently. Aristide has considerable training as a scholar, a biblical scholar, considerable training in a number of other areas, far surpassing most of the leaders that we have in the world. There is every reason to believe that with his training, with his history of compassion, with his ability to inspire a downtrodden people who have been abused in so many ways, who have been subjected to machine-gun fire at the polling places, who have been subjected to trickery of all kinds in an attempt to thwart democracy; he led those people and inspired them to come out in the first democratic election ever to take place in Haiti; and 70 percent of them voted for Aristide.

Madam Speaker, there is no substance to the charge that Aristide is in any way a threat to anyone or any group in Haiti. This is a big lie that is perpetrated here in Washington by people who are very rich and who are very powerful, by the same people who have held Haiti in bondage for the last 50 years, a group of rich people who do not pay taxes, who never have given anything to the country, who drained it of its resources, who have participated in drug smuggling and all kinds of crimes. They are the people who are now financing lobbyists here in Washington to tell us that Aristide is a threat to the people of Haiti. It is a big lie that we should reject. It is a big lie which has caused our Government to hesitate and procrastinate. We should reject that hesitation. We should move forward.

Madam Speaker, there are many problems still related to Haiti which can be resolved only with the return of Aristide to Haiti. We still have a problem in terms of a desperate people who want to get out of Haiti, who are faced with a situation not only of hunger and deprivation, but also torture. The Organization of American States has had observers in Haiti, and those observers report that the torture is still going on daily. In front of them it takes place.

There is a report in the Washington Post which appeared just this past weekend, on Sunday, which talks about torture in the countryside. It is a report which appeared in the Sunday, June 13, paper and is entitled "A Place Called Hopeless," and the subtitle is "In Rural Haiti, Believing Bill Clinton Can Be Hazardous to Your Health." It talks about how in the countryside a terror campaign continues day in and day out. It even describes a blind man who formed a school of other blind people to teach blind children, but because the military is suspicious of anybody who organizes anything, they have de-

stroyed the school of the blind man. Everything in the countryside is the subject of military terror. Madam Speaker, when the peasants planted trees, the military called them Communist trees and uprooted the trees.

We have seen a movie, a film, that was made of the peasant movement in Haiti which demonstrated a very confident, self-sufficient group of people in the countryside trying to rebuild their economy from the ground up, organizing their own granaries, organizing their own rural agricultural experiments, in every way moving forward before the coup was staged against President Aristide, and, because they were close friends of Aristide, they received his blessing, they have been labeled the enemy, and everything that they do, the MPP it is called, the local peasant organization in Haiti—everything that they do is subjected to terror and torture.

Madam Speaker, there is one account here of how the punishment is administered in Haiti. I am quoting from the Washington Post article on June 13:

Those arrested are usually beaten with small wooden batons. They are normally given 150 blows, 50 blows for being Aristide supporters, 50 for being members of the local peasant organization, and 50 are given for the OAS. They have to count off the blows as they are given, and, if they miss a number, the blows will start from zero again. Without any enforcement power and without the restoration of democracy, the international observers who are in Haiti now have been reduced to simply watching even these sessions of torture and beatings. They can only help people after the torture has ended.

The Haitian rulers, the military thugs, hold OAS in contempt. They hold the observers in contempt. They are people who have no hearts, as I said before. The rulers of Haiti, the military thugs, now belong to that category of human beings who are just a little higher than the snake. They have no heart, they have no compassion, they have no soul. They will not bend until the international community comes down on them with serious force, and I do not mean necessarily violence in every case. They are not an army that has ever fought a battle. The Haitian army has not fought anybody except the people of Haiti.

Madam Speaker, I do not think there will be any great resistance if the international community says it is time to stop. If we impose the sanctions, if we move from the sanctions to announcing the return of Aristide, and we make it clear that Aristide will be accompanied by an international police force, I think the military thugs will back down because they are not used to fighting. But they must be confronted with this kind of international ultimatum, and they must be confronted with a serious group of people who understand how low they are, that they are as bad as any of the people who are terrorizing any parts of the world with

their guns and their worship of power and force.

It is very important that we take advantage of the window of opportunity that was created now, very important that we not pressure President Aristide to name a new Prime Minister. We have a situation now where the negotiations for a long time were centered around the question of should a new Prime Minister be appointed and would the military government accept him. Marc Bazin decided to step down. Marc Bazin was a tragedy because Marc Bazin was a very well-trained bureaucrat. He spent a lot of time in the World Bank. He was looked upon highly by most of the leaders of the nations as being a person who had the technical know-how. It will be very helpful to the future of Haiti. Marc Bazin sold his soul, Marc Bazin, through his lobbying with the military thugs, and now they have decided to dump Marc Bazin probably because he had enough know-how, enough of a conscience, enough of a sense of loyalty to the people of Haiti, for them to be disturbed. They do not want one ounce of decency, one shred of decency, and, therefore, Marc Bazin had to go. Now that they have thrown out Marc Bazin, we think that President Aristide should be allowed to name a new Prime Minister when he is ready to name a new Prime Minister, and he should not be forced to name a new Prime Minister until the military dictatorship has stepped down. They are trying to pressure him to name a Prime Minister and let that Prime Minister govern while he remains outside the country. This would be folly, it would be stupid. We would be losing the window of opportunity.

Madam Speaker, the window of opportunity is open now. It is important that we step forward, allow President Aristide to name a new Prime Minister, but only allow that Prime Minister to take his place when the present military thugs have been pushed out of power.

□ 1830

They must go. They must leave the country. There is no way this country is going to coexist with the military leaders who staged the coup against Aristide still in power and President Aristide still running the country. The administration here in Washington, President Clinton, needs to work with President Aristide. They need to accept President Aristide as a partner in fashioning an acceptable scenario for replacing the coup regime with a lawful government and high command. This is altogether fitting and proper.

Nothing else would be appropriate. After all, Aristide was elected by 70 percent of the people of Haiti. We should unite with him. The blueprint for a new Haiti should be fashioned in the office of President Aristide with technical assistance he needs supplied

by President Clinton. The administration should stop those people who want the negotiated scenario which is demanded by the Haitian high command and Haitian aristocrats and their well-paid lobbyists here in Washington.

We should go forward and take advantage of the window of opportunity. We are not talking about the need for the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy. We are not talking about bombing missions. We are not talking about committing large numbers of ground troops. We are not talking about committing millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer money.

We are talking about asserting and moral authority, stating to the military junta, the officers trained in the military schools here in this country, that we mean business, that we want democracy restored in Haiti. We are talking about making it clear that President Aristide will be returned to his rightful place.

I want to close with two things. I want to say that the time has passed to deal with the military thugs. The time has come to declare them as war criminals. That is what they are. They are responsible for 3,000 deaths, daily torture, and a continuing reign of terror in Haiti.

Raoul Cedras, the commander in chief, is a war criminal. Jean Claude Duperval, Phillipe Biambi, Carl Dorelien, Henry Max Mavard, Romulus Martial, Frantz Douby, Henry Robert Marc-Charles, Alix Rene, Henry Robert Augustin, Michel Louis, Florestant Joseph, Eddy Louis, Michel Francois, and others.

All of these colonels and generals are the people who are responsible. Individually they must be held accountable. They had an opportunity to receive amnesty, and they refused it. They should be declared in the international arena as war criminals and it should be made clear to them they are not going to be received in the international community as honorable retiring military people. Their time has come and gone. They should be clearly isolated and ostracized everywhere on the face of the Earth.

The other thing I want to close with are some excerpts from a statement made by President Aristide on March 26 in a session to the Permanent Council of the OAS. President Aristide stated as follows:

The Haitian crisis can only be resolved by Haitians themselves within the framework of their Constitution. Happily, the Resolutions by the Ministers of the hemisphere are emphatic on that subject.

However, it is no secret to anyone that the Haitian people cannot by themselves—in the short term—defeat the power of money in Haiti, money from drug trafficking, from contraband, from corruption, and from bribery. We need international solidarity and we need your support. This is so because our societal project implies dialogue with the rest of the world, it implies openness in the ad-

ministration of the country's internal affairs, and it implies our recognition of the assistance from this gathering which was offered when our citizens went to the polls.

Ladies and gentlemen, bear with me as I offer you the definition of national sovereignty that our Constituent Assembly had the wisdom to inscribe within our Constitution:

“TITLE V—NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

“Article 58: National sovereignty is vested in all citizens.

Citizens directly exercise the prerogatives of sovereignty by:

(a) Electing the President of the Republic;

(b) Electing the members of the Legislature;

(c) Electing members of all other bodies or all assemblies provided for by the Constitution and by law.”

Haitian national sovereignty cannot be conceived as the creation of a concentration camp where ill-disguised nazis make the rules. Haiti is not a ghetto where gangs of assassins, drug dealers, smugglers and pillagers govern. Nor is Haiti's national sovereignty a concept which is defined by President Jean-Bertrand Aristide or his government. Our Constitution and Article 48 are clear.

Consequently, contempt for our national sovereignty is contempt for our elections. Contempt for our national sovereignty is the imposition of a military regime on the bodies of thousands and thousands of dead, on the pain and suffering of hundreds and thousands of displaced persons, on the agony of 40,000 political refugees, of sick people surrounded by barbed wire, and of refugees incarcerated with common criminals. Contempt for our national sovereignty is preventing those who suffer from atrocities by a military regime to flee toward safe haven.

But there is more. Contempt for the sovereignty of the Haitian nation is expressed by formidable efforts to show that President Jean-Bertrand Aristide is inflexible. It is made of formidable efforts to not read or to not understand the reports of absolutely every human rights group and organization. Contempt for the sovereignty of the Haitian nation is to try to establish that the speeches and words evoked by the President of the Republic (in a language which one does not know), are violations as serious as making blood flow in all the cities and provinces of Haiti.

Contempt for the national sovereignty of the Haitian people is to allow oneself to become exhausted in the struggle for democracy, and to propose in the name of a hollow pragmatism, the sale to assassins, of our legitimacy in exchange for the pleasure of power and its privileges. It is also the undue pressure put on the President of the Republic to grant to the authors of the coup d'etat the right to veto the project of a democratic society of which the Haitian people are dying even today.

We are small and weak. We know it and we are suffering from it. We have not been able and we are not able to stop these violations of our national sovereignty. Our only resource is to refuse to be part of the crimes being committed against our nation for almost two years now.

Thus, despite our smallness and our weakness, we have obligations which we respect, and will continue to respect, at any price. Our obligation is to stop this slaughter, our obligation is to put an end to the exodus of Haitians, our obligation is to build institutions which we lack, such as a police force.

Our obligation is to reform our existing institutions prostituted by decades of dictatorship.

We know very well that we cannot accomplish these tasks alone. That is why we are here before you. We ask for your assistance and have no qualms in requesting it given our ideal of building an open society, free to enter into exchange with all nations.

The international community requires a price from us in exchange for such assistance. There is a price which we can pay, and there exists a price beyond our means.

We have heard, and a certain Haitian press organ repeats, that some quarters advocate the intention to place Haiti under trusteeship. Without any false modesty and without bravado, we believe that if we insure the respect for national sovereignty, there is no way to place Haiti under trusteeship, by any action or omission whatsoever, that we would have committed or accepted to be committed on our behalf.

Conversely, it is evident to us that those who have trampled, and continue to trample on our national sovereignty as described by our Constitution, have but one objective: i.e. to keep Haiti under their tutelage, or to place it under the trusteeship of their international allies. Because we should acknowledge that they have international allies and can buy even more.

We continue then to invite the active participation of the international community in a solution to the Haitian crisis and believe that the Secretary General of the United Nations has, in paragraph 5 of Resolution A/47/20, the necessary mechanism—if he judges it appropriate—to involve all organs of that Organization, including the Security Council, on resolving the Haitian question. We are also convinced that the Resolutions adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Continent, and those of the United Nations constitute an adequate barrier to insure respect for the sovereignty of the Haitian nation.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Permanent Council, the request that we, through your intermediary, are presenting to the hemispheric community is not to forget its legitimate interests—to the contrary—but, to assist us and assist the Secretary General and his Special Envoy to find the formula which would allow us to pay the price which is required of us to put an end to the atrocities that our own human rights institutions have reported, to drug trafficking which our own institutions of narcotics control have also reported, and to the exodus of Haitians which our own coast guard can attest to.

What we ask of you is your active solidarity, this solidarity which refuses to admit that within the OAS Charter we can do nothing, outside of an accounting of massive human rights violations in Haiti. (That within the Charter) we can do nothing except wait two, three, or four years until a bloody revolution explodes in Haiti.

What we ask of you is your active solidarity, based on our constitutional definition of sovereignty. Allow me to read you once more:

“TITLE V—NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

“Article 58: National sovereignty is vested in all citizens.

Citizens directly exercise the prerogatives of sovereignty by:

(a) Electing the President of the Republic;

(b) Electing the members of the Legislature;

(c) Electing members of all other bodies or all assemblies provided for by the Constitution and by law.”

The Haitians who are dying are made of flesh and bone. Our suffering, our tears, our grief, are the sufferings, the tears, and the grief of real human beings, just like your children, your brothers, your sisters, and your spouses. It is in the context of respect for the dignity of the human person; in the context of respect for the Haitian Constitution; in the context of respect for the Charter of our Organization; in the context of respect for the Inter-American Conventions which we are party to; in the context of the Resolutions which our Ministers of Foreign Affairs have adopted, that we appeal to your solidarity, to assist us in forging the mechanisms necessary for the solution of this crisis which has lasted far too long.

It is also in this context that the Government of the Republic supports the effort of the Organization's Special Envoy, Mr. Dante Caputo. We support him in every way where these efforts mesh with our current interests, our statutes, and international law.

What we are asking you is very simple: this is to apply the measures you have adopted. That is, to put an end to promises which have gone on for two years, and to assist us in offering a people to whom we have taught to have confidence in the international community, concrete results, instead of beautiful words and beautiful promises.

We have these promises in writing. And we await the results. Shouldn't the OAS/U.N. Civilian Mission have more members deployed in the field? Does it not have as its mandate to realize tangible progress? Listen to what the OAS Civilian Mission said after months in Haiti.

"\* \* \* The Mission also protested strongly to the military authorities for their lack of respect for the terms of reference of the Mission when it acted within the framework of its mandate. It especially deplores its inability to gain direct and immediate access to those kept in detention.

"The most serious human rights violations observed include arbitrary detention, systematic beatings and torture perpetrated and inflicted by members of the Armed Forces and those linked to them \* \* \*.

"In numerous other cases throughout the country people are harassed and frequently beaten for having written or uttered slogans, for having in their possession photographs of President Aristide, or for having listened to foreign radio broadcasts. Numerous journalists have been harassed, detained or have received threats in order to stop them from freely exercising their functions. These are all attacks on the fundamental rights recognized by the Haitian Constitution."

And, I could have continued with this litany.

What does this say then about the credibility of the Mission in Haiti? Do we need to invent the sentence which President Aristide would have pronounced and which would justify why the military putschists have no respect from human rights? Where are the measures that we approved since our first meeting? Where are the measures reiterated at the meeting in Nassau, the Bahamas? Where then, is the respect for human rights which we sought when we accepted that the president of the Presidential Commission, Rev. Antoine Adrien, would sit at the negotiating table here, with Ambassador François Benoit? Even here (at the Council) haven't we heard concrete promises by the Special Envoy on that very subject?

We have the sad impression that it is easy to prevent Haitians from fleeing oppression, torture, harassment, or forced disappear-

ances, but that it is very dangerous to offend the sensitivities of the military putschists.

We tell you this in a clear and straightforward manner, with all the respect and humbleness of those exhausted from suffering: We cannot accept that a multinational presence, which is supposed to help us raise a new police force, would cohabit with the military putschists. We cannot accept that General Cédras should choose the members of a new police force, and retain the right to veto the choice of a prime minister by the Constitutional Government which he himself sent into exile.

We cannot accept this because our Constitution prevents us from doing so. We cannot accept this because the Resolutions adopted at the OAS as well as at the U.N. clearly state that all forms of technical, financial and economic assistance should be made once constitutional order is re-established.

Sometimes, it seems to us that the ultimate objective is not to abide by the commitments solemnly made as far as human rights are concerned, but to protect and accommodate the participation of the military putschists for reasons deemed practical. But who will think of protecting thousands and thousands of Haitians held hostage by the military dictatorship of Haiti? What is that sort of democracy for poor countries that we are being requested to set up in Haiti?

The only way out of critical poverty is through real democracy, a real national sovereignty, as defined by our Constitution.

We say this publicly: If the multinational presence which is supposed to assist us in raising a new police force and to reform our institutions prompts the immediate departure of the putschists, then we accept its deployment immediately.

If the military putschists refuse to accept the assistance the international community is offering us in the framework of the mechanisms at their disposal, we ask the international community to simply apply the measures that it had unanimously adopted and in particular, the embargo against weapons and ammunition, and the embargo against petroleum and petroleum products. There is more. We are in agreement that these measures should be universally obligatory for all nations of the world.

The sovereignty of the Haitian people is at stake. The future of democracy in Haiti and the future of democracy in the Americas are at stake. The lives and the future of our children are at stake.

I thank you Ladies and Gentlemen, Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives, and ask that you excuse me for having taken up so much of your time.—Jean Casimir, Permanent Representative

□ 1840

This is an address made by President Aristide on May 27 to the Organization of American States. I recite the address just to give you some idea of the eloquence of the man.

Once and for all, we should put to bed the big lie that President Jean Aristide is a fanatic or that President Jean Aristide would in any way endanger any segment of the population of Haiti.

We have a window of opportunity, without using the resources of this country to any great extent, without armed conflict, with a minimum amount of effort, the U.S. Government, the Organization of American States,

and the United Nations can resolve the conflict, with a minimum amount of effort. All of the problems will fall into place. Haiti can be given a bright and productive future by taking one definitive step, and that step is returning its lawfully elected President, the man who was elected by 70 percent of the people, to his rightful place as the ruler of Haiti.

President Jean-Bertrand Aristide should be returned. We should move as rapidly as possible, no later than the middle of July. We should set a target for the middle of July for the return of Aristide. There is a window of opportunity right now, and we should take advantage of that window of opportunity.

Let us not let it close. Let us not let a situation develop where the people of Haiti, 7 million people, rise up against the army of 7,000, and there will be a bloodbath. Let us not have to respond to a bloodbath in Haiti.

Instead, let us take advantage of the window of opportunity and move aggressively toward a peaceful settlement, confront those people in Haiti who are willing to hold 7 million people hostage, confront them with the international community's power and insist that the rightfully elected government be restored and democracy be returned to Haiti.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS (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. FAWELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOEHNER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, for 5 minutes each day, on June 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, on June 15.

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

Mr. LAROCO, for 5 minutes, on June 16.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on June 17.

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

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. ISTOOK.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. KING.

Mr. HYDE.

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

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. WASHINGTON.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER in two instances.

Ms. SHEPHERD.

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

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

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

Mr. BATEMAN.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 18, 1993:

H.R. 2. A bill to establish national registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes.

On May 4, 1993:

H.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1993 as "National Arbor Day."

On May 19, 1993:

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

On May 28, 1993:

H.R. 1723. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program under which employees of the Central Intelligence Agency may be offered separation pay to separate from service voluntarily to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to downsizing, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution designating May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II."

On June 1, 1993:

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

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

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1993, at 11 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1407. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's fifth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 103-100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1408. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the General Services Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1409. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of June 1, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 103-99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1410. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the

current Future Years Defense Program fully funds the support costs associated with the multiyear, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2306(h); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1411. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting volume II of the Mobility Requirements Study, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 909; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1412. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-37, "Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia Term Holdover Temporary Amendment Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1413. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a report on the implementation of certain recommendations of the Commission on Education of the Deaf concerning programs and services for children who are deaf or hard of hearing, pursuant to Public Law 102-421, section 135(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1414. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report from the Director of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect on the incidence of child abuse among children with disabilities, pursuant to Public Law 100-924, section 102(a); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1415. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a notice of meeting related to the International Energy Program to be held on June 15, 1993, in Paris, France; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1416. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-06), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1417. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-07), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1418. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1419. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-14), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1420. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of S. 564, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1421. A letter from the Chairman, Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993, and the Board's Management

Report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1422. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1423. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending March 31, 1993 on activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1424. 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.

1425. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on management systems, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1034(a) (105 Stat. 1977); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of intent to exercise authority under section 506(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, in order to provide emergency assistance to Ecuador, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

*[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 10, 1993, the following report was filed on June 11, 1993]*

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 103-126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

*[Submitted June 14, 1993]*

Mr. HOYER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2403. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1876. A bill to provide authority for the President to enter into trade agreements to conclude the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to extend tariff proclamation authority to carry out such agreements, and to apply congressional "fast track" procedures to a bill implementing such agreements (Rept. 103-128, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution providing

for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes (Rept. 103-129). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 196. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2333) 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, and the bill (H.R. 2404) to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-130). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELLUMS (by request):

H.R. 2401. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCURDY (for himself (by request) and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2402. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 2403. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 2404. A bill to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (by request):

H.R. 2405. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Merit Systems Protection Board; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BATEMAN):

H.R. 2406. A bill to provide the Internal Revenue Service with increased authority and resources to be used in reducing evasion of the diesel fuel taxes and other tax evasion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve coverage of nursing facility services under the Medicaid Program and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of long-term care insurance; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 2408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increases in the wine tax enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to maintaining the active-duty mission of McGuire Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

170. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Naval Air Warfare Center in Ewing Township; to the Committee on Armed Services.

171. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to proposed cutbacks at Fort Monmouth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

172. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to awarding the U.S. Navy's 5-year phase maintenance contract to firms based in the New York/New Jersey harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

173. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

174. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to "ENABLE" program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

175. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to approval of drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

176. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to chronic fatigue syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

177. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to unclaimed securities distributions to the States from which they were paid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

178. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to closing of polls; to the Committee on House Administration.

179. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to a national sales tax or value-added tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

181. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Connecticut, relative to Mortgage Revenue Bond Program and the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

182. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Old Spanish Trail; to the Committee on Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

183. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Caddo Adais Indians; to the Committee on Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 2409. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Brandaris*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2410. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for each of the vessels *Mariner* and *Northern Light*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Leteane Clement Monatsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2412. A bill to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Sailing Vessel Alexandria*; 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. 14: Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. STARK, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. YATES, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 145: Mr. LINDER and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 468: Ms. MALONEY.

H.R. 472: Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 485: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 562: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 584: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 672: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 703: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 715: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 741: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 901: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 911: Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 916: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 999: Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1015: Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. BARLOW.

H.R. 1056: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1141: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1174: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1195: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1337: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1377: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FROST, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1419: Mr. SERRANO and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1437: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1493: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BAKER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1586: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1634: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1641: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1709: Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ORTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1755: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1873: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 1902: Ms. THURMAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1910: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KLUG, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1997: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 2050: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 2062: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. LEVY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2091: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2095: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2127: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2130: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 2226: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGRICH, and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 2253: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2278: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2307: Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 2375: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. ORTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Ms. FOWLER.

H.J. Res. 112: Mr. KING, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. TEJEDA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. GALLO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. REED, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. BUNNING and Mr. LEVY.

H.J. Res. 155: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. STUPAK.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 35: Mr. WILSON, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H. Res. 47: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. McMILLAN.

H. Res. 127: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. STUPAK.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 35: Mr. WILSON, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H. Res. 47: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. McMILLAN.

H. Res. 127: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council, Madison, WI, relative to the use of marihuana as a medical preparation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

41. Also, petition of City Council, Ponce, PR, relative to section 936 of the Federal Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2200

By Mr. ROEMER:

—Page 4, line 11, through page 6, line 2, amend subsection (a) to read as follows:

(a) SPACE STATION FREEDOM.—The Administrator shall cancel the Space Station Freedom program. There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the cost of such cancellation for fiscal year 1994, \$825,000,000.

—Page 12, lines 10 and 11, strike paragraph (1).

—Page 12, line 12, through page 16, line 9, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (39) as paragraphs (1) through (38), respectively.

—Page 16, line 11, strike "(39)" and insert in lieu thereof "(38)".

—Page 16, line 13, strike "\$570,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$545,300,000".

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

—On page 14, line 22, strike subsection (24) and renumber accordingly.

—On page 11, line 1, strike "and \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are" and insert "is".

—On page 11, line 4, strike "and transferring the production" and all that follows through "Yellow Creek, Mississippi".