HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 28, 1994*

The House met at 12 noon.

Rev. Douglas Tanner, executive director, Faith and Politics Institute, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Lord, we convene today, conscious of having spent yesterday recalling the life and the era of President Richard M. Nixon, and we find ourselves remembering over 40 years of history.

Guide us, we pray, to know more deeply the history that has shaped us—as individuals, as communities, as a nation, as a community of nations. Connect our souls with both our grief and our greatness. Lead us to know the truth, and grant us the grace to be set free by it.

Strengthen our faith that while the moral arc of the universe may be long, it does bend toward justice—and compassion—and human dignity—for all. Be especially this week with the people of South Africa as they receive encouragement to embrace that truth. Be with the people of Bosnia as they are given cause to doubt it.

Instill within each of us, we pray, a consciousness that You call us to follow that arc, and to help bend it. 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 New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. RICHARDSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill, H.R. 2333.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1636) "An Act to authorize appropriations for the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and to improve the program to reduce the incidental taking of marine mammals during the course of commercial fishing operations, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL SERVICES OF LATE HONORABLE RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 411, the Chair on Wednesday, April 27, 1994, announced his appointment of the following Members of the House to join with a committee of the Senate to attend the funeral services of the late Honorable Richard Milhous Nixon, 37th President of the United States, in Yorba Linda, CA:

Mr. FOLEY of Washington;
Mr. MICHEL of Illinois;
Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia;
Mr. MOORHEAD of California;
Mr. THOMAS of California;
Mr. DREIER of California;
Mr. HUNTER of California;
Mr. DORNAN of California;
Mr. GALLEGLY of California;
Mr. HERGER of California;
Mr. COX of California;
Mr. CONDIT of California;
Mr. CALVERT of California;
Mr. KIM of California;
Mr. MCKEON of California;
Mr. ROYCE of California;
Mr. PICKLE of Texas;
Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas;
Mr. BEVILL of Alabama;
Mr. MYERS of Indiana;
Mr. MAZZOLI of Kentucky;
Mr. SPENCE of South Carolina;
Mr. GILMAN of New York;
Mr. REGULA of Ohio;
Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania;
Mr. WALKER of Pennsylvania;
Mr. ROTH of Wisconsin;
Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin;
Mr. EMERSON of Missouri;
Mr. MCCOLLUM of Florida;
Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas;
Mrs. ROUKEMA of New Jersey;
Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico;
Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut;
Mr. BOEHLERT of New York;
Mrs. VUCANOVICH of Nevada;
Mrs. BENTLEY of Maryland;
Mr. CALLAHAN of Alabama;
Mr. KOLBE of Arizona;
Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina;
Mr. UPTON of Michigan;
Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut;
Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee;
Mr. MCNULTY of New York;
Mr. SCHIFF of New Mexico;
Mr. STEARNS of Florida;
Mr. CAMP of Michigan;
Mr. PETERSON of Florida;
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina;
Mr. CANADY of Florida;
Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina;
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia;
Mr. DICKEY of Arkansas;
Mr. HUTCHINSON of Arkansas;
Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia;
Mr. KING of New York;
Mr. LINDER of Georgia;
Mr. MICA of Florida;
Mr. MILLER of Florida;
Mr. SMITH of Michigan;
Mr. TORKILDSEN of Massachusetts; and
Mr. UNDERWOOD of Guam.

PROFESSIONAL BOXING CORPORATION ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this weekend's heavyweight championship fight between Evander Holyfield and Michael Moorer demonstrates that professional boxing is in dire need of reform and Federal oversight.

It has now been revealed that Holyfield, the great champion, has been fighting with a serious heart ailment over the years. One physician at the fight stated that it was a miracle that Holyfield was able to finish the fight without serious injury.

The very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness, the subcommittee of jurisdiction, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] held a hearing on boxing reform this last Tuesday which I commend to all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Chamber, Republican and Democrat, have been trying to set up a Federal Boxing Commission with the express purpose of developing and enforcing uniform health and safety standards for professional boxing in all 50 States. For every multimillion dollar fighter like Holyfield and Moorer, there are hundreds of young ghetto kids that have no worker protection, no pensions, and are often at the mercy of unscrupulous promoters.

Mr. Speaker, money should not dictate what happens in boxing. Safety issues in this sport need to be addressed.

AN EMPLOYER MANDATE WILL STIFLE INNOVATION

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

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 6) 45

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, if an employer mandate were enacted, my State would lose 14,300 jobs. That is more jobs than at Pratt & Whitney or more jobs than Electric Boat.

As Congress discusses the use of an employer mandate as a means to finance health care reform, it is important to highlight the implications of imposing a new fixed cost on America's employers.

Many of my colleagues will address the job impact of employer mandate further, so I want to touch on a critical component of reform, maintaining the innovative cost containment strategies that are working in the market today.

We have heard a lot about preserving what works in our system. The issue of an employer mandate will separate those who really believe we should preserve our system's strengths from those who would rather throw out the system and start from scratch.

Under our current 100 percent voluntary system, employers are engaged in many activities aimed at ensuring their employees are receiving the highest quality, cost effective care available in today's market. Rather than drop employee coverage altogether as costs increase, employers are actively engaged in programs aimed at reducing the rate of growth in their insurance and medical costs. These include wellness programs emphasizing healthy lifestyles, smoking cessation and employee assistance programs. Each and every one of these programs is offered under a 100 percent voluntary program. A mandatory system would cut them out.

H.R. 4013 IS A RESPONSIBLE PIECE OF LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4013, which will come up for a vote later today under suspension of the rules, is a responsible piece of legislation. It is not a blanket exemption, but only protects services provided by the VA health care system. If we fail to pass this bill, the effect of OMB employment cuts on the 3 million veterans that are served will be devastating.

Defeat of this bill may close up to 22 major hospitals. It can close clinic doors which serve millions of veterans. It may close specialized training programs for treating post-traumatic stress disorder, Alzheimer's disease, and AIDS.

H.R. 4013 does not freeze employment levels. In fact, it specifically calls on VA medical centers to streamline where possible.

□ 1210

But it properly exempts those facilities from arbitrary cuts that will hurt our veterans.

Now listen to this: the President's proposed Health Security Act calls on the VA to compete under a national health care reform. But within months after that legislation was introduced, OMB in the fiscal year 1995 budget proposed the first round of cuts of more than 25,000 VA health care employees. The administration cannot have it both ways. The VA health care system cannot gear up for health reform if it must slash its employment levels. That just makes sense.

The responsible vote today is a vote for H.R. 4013.

AN EMPLOYER MANDATE IS NOT ABOUT HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, if an employer mandate were enacted, my State would lose 45,000 jobs.

The debate earlier this year over whether or not an employer mandate to pay 80 percent of premiums was a tax, clearly highlights the fact that an employer mandate has little to do with health care policy. In reality, the employer mandate is a product of the difficult economic times in which this Congress is operating. What is particularly troublesome about this debate is the precedent we may set if an employer mandate is enacted.

As this Congress has finally recognized the implications of huge annual budget deficits and the escalating debt, we are forced through statutory requirements to pay for any new spending. Of course it is our prerogative whether we find new revenue or spending cuts to finance new spending. The debate over employer mandates set the stage for a new disturbing government burden which should be recognized for what it is. The fact is an employer mandate is nothing short of an attempt by some in this Congress to finance new entitlements through the pocketbooks of America's employers.

This leads to several disturbing possibilities. First, as is always the case with laws enacted by Congress, this will surely be only the first of several new employer-financed entitlement programs. Second, by financing programs on the backs of America's employers, we will lose the limited budget discipline we have developed over the last few years. Third, and perhaps most importantly, we should not delude ourselves into believing that America's employers are the pot of money under the rainbow. The fact is, our employers, unlike this Congress, are forced to live and die by the bottom line, and are painfully aware of the consequences of spending more than they collect.

The ironic part of this whole debate is that we can achieve successful health care reform without an employer mandate. We should focus on those issues where there is broad bipartisan support and enact real bipartisan health care reform of which we all can be proud.

LEGAL DRUG PUSHERS

(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, a constituent of mine was in an auto accident. Not too serious. Taken by ambulance to a hospital 8 miles away. The bill, $1,350, $1,350, 8 miles. He could have hired a taxi cab for 10 bucks.

Another constituent had surgery and in the hospital 6 weeks, $170,000. The pharmacy bill, $17,000. They line-itemed aspirin.

My colleagues, a heroin addict would have had a stone-cold overdose on the street 6 weeks with 17,000 bucks. This is unbelievable. I do not even think this is health reform. I think we need criminal reform with hospitals and pharmaceutical companies.

Congress, I think we are worried about kids on the street. We better start with some of these legal drug pushers, CEO's, with $17,000 worth of legal drugs. Beam me up.

It is time for Congress to act and put some of these big shots in jail and maybe let kids alone.

EMPLOYER MANDATE CONSEQUENCES

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as the colleague who just preceded me said, we do need health care reform. But one of the purposes of health care reform ought to be that we increase people's chances to get insurance, not decrease their chances of having a job. That is the problem with the President's proposal for an employer mandate.

Coming from rural western Wisconsin, I can tell Members the story of the hardware store owner in one small town in my district who said, "Steve, I would love, if I had the volume and the revenue, to give all three people who work here health insurance. But the hard, cold reality is, in this small town, if you put that kind of a mandate on my business, instead of giving them insurance, I will have to eliminate their jobs. And when I go out on a repair run to one of my customers, I will simply lock the door and put a sign in the door that says, I will be back in 1 to 2 hours."

That is why I hope this Congress is, as we seek to increase the people's availability for health insurance, will understand an employer mandate does

not gain people insurance. It costs them their job.

ELECTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of South Africa, who have taken a giant step on the road to democracy. For the first time, all South Africans, regardless of color, have been allowed to participate in the political process. The result of this week's historic elections will be a multiracial government that represents each segment of the population.

These elections signal the end of white minority rule which has been the main feature of South African politics through centuries of colonial domination and more than four decades of apartheid. International opinion has been outraged as blacks, Indians, and other nonwhites have been denied fundamental human rights on the basis of their race. Only now, after so much suffering and bloodshed, can all South Africans exercise the right which we as Americans often take for granted: the right to vote.

I would like to commend Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk for their roles in this process. After 27 years as a political prisoner, Mandela has emerged as the unifying force behind the struggle for freedom and equality in South Africa. For his part, President de Klerk recognized the importance of change, and has helped pave the way for the recent political reforms. Without the cooperation of these two men, these historic elections would never have been possible.

The time for racial hatred and division is over. With the elections completed, all South Africans, black and white, must work together for a peaceful transition to democracy. The whole world hopes they succeed.

AN EMPLOYER MANDATE WILL COST JOBS

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

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, if an employer mandate were to pass, my State would lose 24,685 jobs.

Study after study has shown that if an employer payment mandate is used as a means of financing health care reform millions of jobs would be lost. A recent study commissioned by the American Legislative Exchange Council [ALEC], the Nation's largest bipartisan organization of State legislators, found that the Health Security Act would cost America 1,021,000 jobs. Other studies suggest the amount of job loss may be as high as 3.1 million.

This level of job loss is unacceptable particularly now that the economy is struggling to recover. We have seen significant restructuring as employers have positioned themselves to compete in an increasingly global economy. At the very time that they are beginning to see some improvement in their competitive position, this Congress is considering a payment mandate which will negate all of their gains.

We should not be pitting jobs against health insurance. No one is served by the promise of health insurance at the expense of millions of jobs. Under today's 100 percent voluntary system, the vast majority of America's employers offer comprehensive health insurance benefits. Reform should focus on enabling all employers to offer comprehensive benefits.

A mandate is not necessary to achieve successful reform. There are so many issues upon which there is broad bipartisan support and we should be moving to address the real world problems our constituents face. Drop the employer mandate and enact real bipartisan health care reform.

THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, a constituent of mine, Murray Callan was shot to death while walking to a video store while on vacation. Murray Callan was truly a legend in San Diego. For the past 40 years he taught swimming lessons to children and was beloved by many, many young San Diegans. His death is a tremendous loss to our community.

Last week I received a letter from Mr. Callan's son, Glen, urging me to do what I can to take guns off the streets and out of the hands of criminals. He offered to stand with me in the fight to ban assault weapons.

Glen, I accept your offer and I promise to do all that I can to see that an assault weapons ban passes the House.

To those of my colleagues who say, "Guns don't kill people. People kill people," I say stop insulting the intelligence of the American people.

The assault weapons ban is smart, sensible gun control legislation that has been endorsed by every major law enforcement group in the country. I urge my colleagues to support an assault weapons ban.

AN EMPLOYER MANDATE WON'T WORK

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, if an employer mandate were to pass, my State of Colorado would lose 15,000 jobs.

As we move health care reform forward, it is important that we review each proposal and each policy thoroughly. Unfortunately, many in this Congress have taken at face value that an employer mandate will guarantee universal coverage. The fact is, there is no empirical data available anywhere in the world, let alone in this country that suggests an employer mandate is an effective mechanism for providing universal coverage.

If we review the available information we will find that even in those countries that supposedly provide universal coverage, a significant portion of the population is actually not covered. For instance, in France universal coverage is defined as 95 percent coverage. The best they have ever achieved is 5 percent uninsured. If you look closer to home at Hawaii, which has had an employer mandate for 20 years, you will find the uninsured rate is 8.1 percent. A recent analysis by Andrew Dick found that high rates of coverage has more to do with the characteristics of the population than the effectiveness of an employer mandate.

Clearly, we should review all of the available data before we blindly accept the assertions that an employer mandate is the only means of achieving universal coverage. It is amazing that one can look at the level of insurance coverage available in America today, under which 85 percent of the population is covered under a 100-percent voluntary system, and come to the conclusion that we must enforce a job killing employer mandate to provide coverage for the 15 percent of the population currently not covered.

The most ironic part of this debate is that an employer mandate is not a necessary component of successful health care reform. We should be moving forward with debate on the many issues upon which there is broad bipartisan support and enact real bipartisan reform.

□ 1220

INTRODUCTION OF THE WORKING OFF WELFARE ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce with my colleague, Representative RALPH REGULA, the first bipartisan welfare reform bill—The Working Off Welfare Act.

This bill is based on experience: Mine as a welfare mother 25 years ago, and Representative REGULA's 23 years of experience in the House of Representatives.

We came together because we know that our welfare system is broken. It does not work for the recipient, and it does not work for taxpayers. It needs fundamental change.

Mr. Speaker, our bill will reduce reliance on welfare by: Strengthening support services and case management; improving education and job training programs; abolishing penalties against two-parent families; making work pay; and, increasing child support collection.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, although I was working, I needed welfare so I could take care of my children. Now, I am in a position to reform that same system in order to ensure that all of our Nation's children are given the care and support they need. I hope my colleagues will join me in achieving this goal.

SUPPORTING SAFETY ZONES

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as you may have noticed, there are many new faces in the Chamber today, including my 14-year-old daughter, Christina Maloney, and her classmates Carolina Dorson and Kate Slattery.

A number of Members and I are bringing our daughters to work today, in an annual event to celebrate the talents of women in a wide variety of jobs—so that our daughters will know early in their lives that they can choose goals and work toward wherever their vision leads them.

Today happens also to be the day when the Supreme Court is hearing a case on court-mandated safety zones around health clinics.

And so today we support the principle of those safety zones, so that we and our daughters as they grow up can use health facilities and services without fear of violence by antiabortion extremists.

Ninety percent of American women receive their health care in such clinics.

The right to choose is meaningless without the ability to choose.

It is fitting that we stand together, mothers and daughters, in support of women's freedom to choose.

EMPLOYER MANDATES

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, President Clinton has often spoken of the need to help small businesses in America. He has noted, rightly, that small businesses create most of the news jobs in our economy. What he does not seem to have noticed is what small business owners are saying about his health care plan.

Like a doctor starting an operation without asking the patient where it hurts, the Clinton plan seeks to impose employer mandates without consulting those who would have to pay for them.

A recent survey by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce found that an overwhelming three out of four small business owners strongly oppose a Federal mandate requiring them to provide health care for their employees.

Mr. Speaker, when a ship is slowly sinking the last thing you want to do is load on more cargo. American small businesses are foundering because the Federal Government has loaded them up with so many taxes, regulations, and mandates that they are dead in the competitive water.

It may be too much to hope that the Clinton administration might give small business a break by easing regulation or lowering taxes. But at least the administration can avoid making things worse.

Employer mandates are job-killers, Mr. Speaker. Let us listen to our patients before we put them under the knife.

URGING MEMBERS TO REJECT H.R. 4013

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

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the content of a letter all of us have received from Leon Panetta, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. In it he expresses in the strongest possible terms the administration's opposition to H.R. 4013, a bill which would bar the Department of Veterans Affairs from reducing employees in the Veterans Health Administration over the next 5 years.

According to the letter from the Budget Director, "This legislation," if passed, "would make it impossible for the administration to carry out the downsizing of the executive branch required under * * * the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act."

He asks, quite appropriately, "If we provide special protection for veterans' health care, why should we not provide the same protection to law enforcement, the National Institutes of Health, Education, Head Start, the Food and Drug Administration, and countless other agencies and programs?

"If we start exempting one agency from this workforce reduction requirement, we would have little hope of maintaining a fair and rational process," according to Budget Director Panetta. Indeed, the administration feels it would then be impossible to meet the goal established by the Congress of reducing the Federal work force by 272,000 personnel over the next 5 years.

We passed the Workforce Reduction Act by a vote of 391 to 17. By rejecting H.R. 4013, today we will stick with our commitment to achieve that 10-percent reduction in the next 5 years.

THE CHAMBER LEADING THE CHARGE

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, if an employee mandate were passed in the health care reform process, my State would lose 28,000 jobs. The Members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce understood this, and in a chamber poll recently the chamber members rejected mandates 71 to 24 percent. To more taxes, which everyone would pay for more Government, chamber members rejected them 87 percent to 8 percent.

The fact chamber members rejected employer mandates by 3 to 1 and more taxes by over 10 to 1 is important. The people who know business best and know what is best for business know that the Clinton plan would be bad for business and bad for America.

More Federal costs and more Federal taxes would mean fewer American jobs.

The chamber has long led the charge for American prosperity. It still is, as it leads the charge away from the Clinton health plan.

FEDERAL RESERVE'S ACTIONS ON SHORT-TERM INTEREST RATES

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

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, three times in the last 3 months the Federal Reserve has acted to increase short-term interest rates.

Although I respect the independence of the Federal Reserve, I'm concerned about its recent actions and particularly how they may affect our current economic recovery.

Slight increases in short term rates certainly protect inflationary pressures, but continuing actions by the Fed have now driven up long-term rates, which slows business activity and threatens the creation of new jobs—and all this when inflation has actually fallen in the last 2 years.

Madam Speaker, the administration and Congress have worked hard to turn the economy around and create jobs.

The Fed's recent actions threaten continued growth and hurt working families, who are just beginning to recover from the recession.

Although the Fed is independent, it is still accountable to the American people, who rely upon the Board to guide our economy.

If the Fed takes further steps to increase rates, they should explain the basis of their decision to Congress, and more importantly, to the 8.5 million Americans who remain unemployed.

AMERICAN BUSINESS OPPOSES GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED EMPLOYER MANDATES

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

Ms. WALSH. Madam Speaker, in central New York we have seen some 10,000 well-paid manufacturing jobs evaporate over the past 5 years. I am concerned about the effect of the Clinton health care plan on jobs—and so is the majority of American business according to a recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey.

They do not want this plan. About 71 percent of the 40,000 respondents are opposed to Government-sponsored employer mandates. These are the people who have seen Government mandates before. They have seen price controls, and they have seen the negative results.

From 350,000 to 600,000 people will lose their jobs as a result of the Clinton health plan. How do I know this?

The president's chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, Laura D'Andrea Tyson, has said so. It is not hard to believe; in fact, some business people I have talked to predict higher job losses.

The Congressional Budget Office in February put the range of expected job losses at 300,000 to 1.2 million.

Why? Because history shows that when Government mandates what business must do, the costs are high and the effect is loss of jobs. This will be especially true in my home district, Madam Speaker, where we have major employers in the insurance and health care fields.

Health care, yes. More taxes, more bureaucracy, more recession, more lost jobs? No.

□ 1230

SUPPORT VETERANS' HEALTH PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to vote for House bill 4013, a suspension bill.

Madam Speaker, I want to make it very clear to my colleagues that this bill does not block reductions in the number of doctors, nurses, or technicians in the VA health center. The Secretary of the VA has the authority to reduce FTE's anytime he wants to, and we say that in the bill. The bill does block the meat ax approach of cutting employees of the VA across the board.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line in this bill is whether we in the Congress should decide the size of the Federal work force on an agency-by-agency basis through the appropriations process, or should we give up our role in this area and let it be done by OMB downtown. That is wrong.

We are taking our lead from the Vice President's report on "Reinventing Government," which said that the size of the Federal work force should be determined by the budget process and the availability of operating funds, not by FTE ceilings.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

THE A TO Z DISCHARGE PETITION

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, Wednesday, May 4 is accountability day for Members of Congress. Yes, on Wednesday next week, the A to Z Discharge Petition will be available for signing at the Clerk's desk.

Last summer when the President's budget was squeaking through the House by one vote, 234 Members of Congress signed a bipartisan letter to the Speaker asking for a 10-day session to consider the A to Z spending cut proposal.

Now these 234 Members who have talked the talk about budget cutting will have a chance to walk the walk on spending cuts. It is called accountability, Madam Speaker.

A majority of this House, 230 Members, have cosponsored the A to Z spending cut plan. On May 4, accountability day, those 230 Members will have a chance to show their constituents if they are serious about cutting our $4 trillion debt.

Accountability day will show whether their cosponsorship of the A to Z plan was simply politics as usual or a genuine desire to cut spending. The people of America want an accountable Congress. The A to Z plan gives each Member of Congress a unique opportunity to stand up and be counted.

THE RISK ASSESSMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Members' support for the Risk Assessment Improvement Act of 1994, legislation which I am introducing today along with some of my colleagues on the Science, Space and Technology Committee.

The purpose of the bill is to improve environmental risk assessment at the Environmental Protection Agency and throughout the Government.

Risk assessment is critical to ensuring that Federal resources are being spent wisely on environmental protection. Currently, however, there are vast inconsistencies in the way that risks are calculated because of the piecemeal way that environmental statutes have been passed.

The Risk Assessment Improvement Act will help put more consistency and common sense in regulatory decision-making and it will help ensure that taxpayer dollars are spend as effectively as possible on environmental protection. The bill calls for coordination of existing risk initiatives spread throughout the EPA, and it calls upon the administration to coordinate the way risks are evaluated by different Federal agencies.

I urge my colleagues' support for the Risk Assessment Improvement Act of 1994.

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the loss of President Nixon. It is my hope that after yesterday's ceremony, there will be a greater understanding of the Nixon Presidency and its contributions. It is also my hope that there will also be a greater respect for the institution of the Presidency.

Yesterday was a national day of healing and reflection. It has been almost one-quarter of a century since our Nation stopped to remember and mourn a past President. It is good for our country to come together to pause and reflect at the same time.

There was an underreported compassionate side to Richard Nixon. My father met President Nixon at the Republican National Convention in 1960 and had the occasion to work with him during his visits to Long Island prior to his Presidency.

When my father suffered a stroke, President Nixon sent my family some money to aid in his recovery. And when my father died, President Nixon issued a statement saying what a great personal loss his passing was to him.

The death of President Nixon marks the end of an era for our Nation. It also marks the end of an era for someone who touched my family.

TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS TO WORK DAY

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

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, today on Take Our Daughters to Work Day, thousands of people throughout the country are giving young women a first hand look at the opportunities that are now open to them in the professional world. Many of these opportunities were not available when their mothers or grandmothers were their age.

It would be so wonderful not to have to have a special day like this. But unfortunately we do. We need to focus on the needs of young girls because as they enter adolescence, they begin to lose their self esteem, they begin to fall behind in math and science classes as teachers call on girls less and less.

Take Our Daughters to Work Day shows that girls can do what boys can do. But this one day will not turn around the inequities that young girls experience. That is why I have introduced House Joint Resolution 302, which designates the remaining years of the decade the "Years of the Girl Child" and calls attention to the mistreatment girls endure throughout the world. It also calls on the President to urge all U.S. diplomatic personnel and appropriate Cabinet members to encourage equality for girls in health care, education, and all phases of family life.

I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this important resolution. And if we all provide opportunities to girls, then one day we will not need to have a special day calling attention to their needs. We will have a society where girls and boys can both achieve the same things.

My resolution has been endorsed by the following organizations: Academy for Educational Development, African-American Women's Clergy Association, Alliance for Child Survival, American Association of University Women, American College of Nurse Midwives, American Psychological Association, American Public Health Association, Americans for Democratic Action, Aspen Airport Business Center Foundation, Association for Women In Science, Association of Population/Family Planning Libraries and Information Centers International, Bread for the World, California Population Committee, Center for Democratic Renewal, Center for Policy Alternatives, The Center for Development and Population Activities, Center for Population Options, Center for Women Policy Studies, Citizen Advocate for Responsible Birthing, Commonwealth, Contraceptive Research and Development Program, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Creative Associates International, Inc., Crossroads Counseling, Development Associates, DKT International, Family Care International, Inc., Family Health International, Fund for a Constitutional Government, The Futures Group, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Heartwood Institute, Institute for Health Policy Studies, University of California, San Francisco, Institute for Reproductive Health at Georgetown University, IPPF, Western Hemisphere Region, International Projects Assistance Services, Johns Hopkins University Population Center, Lutheran World Relief, Macro International, Management Sciences for Health, Margaret Sanger Center International, Planned Parenthood of New York City, Ministry for Justice in Population Concerns, Missouri Botanical Gardens, Ms. Foundation, National Asian Women's Health Organization, National Black Women's Health Project, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Committee for an Effective Congress, National Conference of Women's Bar Associations, National Council for International Health, National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, National Federation of Business and Professional Women, National Museum of Women In the Arts, National Optimum Population Effort, National Wildlife Federation, National Women's History Project, National Women's Law Center, Native American Women's Health Education Resource Center, Nurture; Center to Prevent Child Malnutrition, Office of Population Research, Princeton University Pathfinder International, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Population Action International, Population Communication, Population Communications International, The Population Council, Population-Environment Balance, Inc., The Population Institute, Population Speakout, Program for Appropriate Technology in Health, Research Triangle Institute; Center for International Development, RESULTS, Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS), Sierra Club, Southern California Ecumenical Council, Transnational Family Research Institute, Treasure Coast Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Tulane (LA) School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, UKIMWI Orphans Assistance, Inc., Unitarian Universalist Church, United Church Board for World Ministries, United Church of Christ, Coordinating Center for Women, United Church of Christ, Network for Environmental and Economic Responsibility, United Church of Christ, Office for Church and Society, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society's, Ministry of God's Human Community, United States Committee for UNICEF, Voters for Choice, The Woman Activist Fund, Inc., Woman's National Democratic Club, Women Employed, Women of All Red Nations, Women of Reform Judaism, The Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Women's Action Alliance, Women's Caucus for Art, Women's Information Network, Women's Research and Education Institute, World Federalist Association, World Vision Relief & Development, Worldwatch Institute, Young Women's Project, Zero Population Growth.

SUPPORT VETERANS' HEALTH PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, health care reform is at the forefront of the national agenda, and that reform will have a tremendous impact on the VA health care system. Under the administration's health care proposal, VA medical centers will have to compete with private sector hospitals. At the same time, the administration's reinventing government plan recommends full-time equivalent employee reductions totaling 25,493 for the Veterans Health Administration.

If Congress allows this to happen: VA hospitals will lose 5,000 doctors, nurses, and other direct patient care staff over the next year and 25,000 over the next 5 years; thousands of beds will have to be closed because of these staff reductions; and 430,000 veterans will be turned away from VA hospitals during the 5-year period.

In my opinion these reductions jeopardize the VA's survival under health care reform. How can the VA compete with one leg tied behind its back?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4013.

THE VOTE IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years the world around us has changed so very rapidly. We now have a United Europe. The Berlin Wall has been brought down. Nelson Mandela is not only free, but a leading candidate in that country's first all races election. Side by side, come what may, South Africans of all ethnic backgrounds—Afrikaners, Zulu, Xhosa—pronounced Hosa—have cast their ballots on the future of democracy in that country. Oppressed blacks long under the chains of apartheid, can now chant: Free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty we are free at last.

Thousands of those who fled the oppression—white and black—can now look forward to a brighter future in their homeland.

During the past 3 days the people of South Africa have begun turning the page on a very dark history, and ushering in a new majority rule democracy the likes of which that country has never seen. The joy they feel at casting their ballots for the first time parrallels the feelings of joy experienced by African-Americans some 50 years ago in this county.

Mr. Speaker, what we have really witnessed this week is the birth of a new South Africa through the wonderstruck eyes of its citizens.

Freedom, Mr. Speaker, freedom. This week's vote in South Africa was about freedom. A voice to the voiceless. Power to the powerless. That is what this week's vote in South Africa was all about.

□ 1240

NEW TAXES INTRODUCED THE WEEK OF APRIL 15

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked last week to see the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means choose the week after April 15 to propose two new tax increase proposals. Early in the week, he proposed a 31-percent increase in the Social Security tax on employees and businesses, and he proposed a reduction in the level at which the Social Security tax on senior citizens would take place to $22,000. He proposed a cut in the cost-of-living increase for Social Security. He proposed an 8.6-percent reduction in Social Security for the average recipient, and a 20-percent reduction in Social Security benefits for upper-income recipients. That was early in the week.

Then the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means came back and said, "We are going to need a broad-based tax increase to pay for health care."

Now, we had a tax increase in 1990 which I opposed and most Republicans opposed. We had a tax increase in 1993 which every Republican opposed.

I cannot really believe that the Democratic leadership thought that the week after April 15 was the right week to propose punishing Social Security retirees, raising the Social Security tax, and creating a brandnew broad-based tax increase on all Americans.

INTRODUCING THE RISK ASSESSMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly announced the introduction of the Risk Assessment Improvement Act of 1994. Environmental regulations are not doing the job. Threats to health and safety are not being addressed, while precious resources are frittered away on unproductive activity. At the same time we put unnecessary roadblocks in the path of business, causing loss of jobs.

This legislation strengthens and coordinates the scientific methods used to calculate threats to human health and provides a basis for protecting the environment while preserving American jobs.

It establishes a director of risk assessment at the EPA to oversee a new risk program and bring together the variety of existing risk assessment initiatives spread throughout the Agency. This will ensure that state-of-the-art scientific methods are the basis for the risk assessment guidelines developed by the EPA. Second, the bill established a pilot program using comparative risk analysis to rank the severity of various environmental hazards. Also, the President's Science Adviser will coordinate mechanisms in risk assessment to ensure that Government agencies address similar risks using compatible methods.

This bill already has broad bipartisan support and I urge all Members to cosponsor this important initiative.

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today, we are preparing to vote on the State Department's reauthorization. Included in this conference report is language in support of President Clinton's proposed policy change, lifting the ban on weapon sales to the Bosnians.

I am not here to debate whether or not we agree on this point. But this proposed policy shift underscores the need for open congressional debate on this important matter.

Earlier this week, I forwarded a letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher, putting four questions to him. These are:

What are America's vital interests in Bosnia and how will these interests be furthered by lifting the arms embargo?

How will we maintain our technical neutrality once the embargo is lifted?

Do we, by association, compromise the neutrality of our NATO allies who have some 15,000 ground troops in the region?

Are we compromising our ability to secure future embargoes?

We not only have the opportunity to press for these answers, but an obligation to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in calling for answers to these questions.

OPENING OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUR DAUGHTERS

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my 9-year-old daughter, Justine, joined me at work today. She is the youngest of my four children, and her older sister, Hilary, is a freshwoman at Princeton.

The professional world Justine enters after she graduates from college in 2006—or even the world Hilary enters in 1997—will be very different from what was available to me as a 24-year-old law school graduate in 1969.

A major reason why the workplace is and will be different has much to do with courageous women who fought and refought so many battles for equality for women.

I was pleased to play a part in this fight, as a young lawyer who wrote a landmark appeal for the Women's Legal Defense Fund, as an advocate in the Carter White House for extension of time to ratify the equal rights amendment, and as an initial cosponsor and passionate supporter of the Freedom of Choice Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Freedom of Access to Clinics Act and legislation to promote gender, workplace, and health equity for women.

Women taking our place at the table as equals. This is what the election of more women to public office means. I am honored to serve and to help open up infinite opportunities for Justine, Hilary and all our daughters.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT IN THE 103D CONGRESS

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, this House voted down the rule for the bill elevating the EPA to cabinet status because it did not allow for debate on the so called Johnston-Mica amendment that would require cost-benefit analysis of all environmental regulations. That vote proves that Congress is ready to debate environmental risk assessment.

In recent years, we have learned that the most dramatic and well publicized risks are not always the most dangerous to human health and the environment.

A number of Members, including Mr. KLEIN and myself, have introduced a bill that would begin to establish a framework for making informed environmental decisions based on sound science instead of the knee-jerk emotional reactions that often govern our health and environmental policy. The Klein-Valentine-Zimmer bill is one important component of the legislation we need for our environmental decisionmaking to be more rational and cost effective.

H.R. 4013, THE VETERANS' HEALTH PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the passage of H.R. 4013, which would exempt the Veterans Health Administration from a law that will cut 25,000 VHA full-time positions.

This bill is intended to keep the VHA strong during a time of tremendous and unprecedented change. The VHA expects its workload to be enormous in

the coming years as it tries to cope with the changes brought on by new health care reform laws.

To knowingly propose a decrease in the VHA work force when it is certain to have an increase in its workload is unfair and illogical.

Critics say it should be defeated because it will rescind the power of reinventing government laws.

Have you no compassion. The VHA is charged with caring for many of the men and women who risked their lives for you and me and democracy. Many of them will carry red badges of courage to their graves. Let us not desert our veterans, for they never deserted us when we needed them. Health care is one of the few rewards that remain for veterans service—a benefit they earned with blood, sweat, and tears on the battlefield. It would be dishonorable to strip them of this badge of honor.

WHO WORKS FOR WHOM?

(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, a congressional Representative is supposed to represent the American people. But in recent days, frustrated liberals determined to impose a Government-run health system seem to have written a new prescription for their view of representative democracy. A leading player in the other body's health reform efforts recently told AP, "We're going to push through health reform regardless of the views of the American people." In other words, people do not count, Government knows best—trust us. That is a tough statement when you consider that we work for the American people and most Americans oppose the liberals prescription for health care reform. They do not want bureaucrats making their health care decisions and they do not want job-killing payroll taxes. Maybe it is time to remind those who scoff at the views of the American people just who works for whom. Is that not what elections are for?

PRICELESS GIFT: A TRIBUTE TO A FREE PRESS

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want all of my colleagues to know that in their respective cloakrooms today there is a priceless gift awaiting all of them. It is a newspaper from Sarajevo, a newspaper which has been published every single day during the 2-year siege of Sarajevo, a newspaper written by Serbs and Croats and Moslems, men and women of all religions, men and women who have tried to make of Bosnia a multiracial, multiethnic, multi-religious society.

This magnificent newspaper is a tribute to a free press. It is more precious than the New York Times and the Washington Post.

□ 1250

It is being published in the nuclear bomb shelter of a building which was destroyed by terror and force. It is a newspaper which is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the people of Bosnia, who are determined to create for themselves a free and open and democratic society.

EMPLOYER MANDATES: THE DEVIL IN THE DETAILS

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office a few minutes ago, and I heard much of the debate with regard to business mandates. Most of us here in this Chamber in fact want health care reform. We know the people with preexisting conditions, we know the people who are scared to change jobs because they will lose their insurance, we know the nightmare of the paperwork and other requirements that they are forced to fill out for reimbursement, and we know the kids without insurance whose families are denied.

We know of the inequities where people in fact are rewarded more for going on welfare instead of working. But the people across this land want the right prescription for health care reform, and as people across this Nation examine the details of the President's plan, they have in fact figured out the devil in the details. The thing they do not like is the business mandate.

Employers want incentives. They do not want more mandates. They do not want more payroll taxes.

I would urge my colleagues in this body to in fact oppose employer mandates as part of a health care reform package.

KEEP THE PROMISE: SUPPORT H.R. 4013

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4013. While some Members have raised valid points in opposition, the bottom line is whether or not we are going to be able to keep the promise that our country has made to our veterans.

Throughout our Nation's history, we have made a commitment to our veterans. In return for their service to our country, we have promised them certain benefits, foremost among them being health care. If you want to break this promise, you will vote against H.R. 4013. If you want to keep this promise, you will vote for H.R. 4013.

The Veterans Health Administration is supposed to be getting ready to become a competitive health care provider. Even with current staffing levels, VA hospitals and outpatient clinics cannot provide services to all veterans who seek care. Restrictions on hiring will increase this problem and could assure failure during health care reforms.

Making government more efficient is important, but we must do this intelligently—not arbitrarily. H.R. 4013 follows the Vice President's recommended approach. Agency managers should be free to set personnel levels, based on available budgets, that will best fulfill the agency's mission.

The VA has identified several ways of eliminating unnecessary personnel. H.R. 4013 does not require the VA to employ unnecessary people. It requires that the VA, not outside budget examiners, make decisions about the way to serve our veterans.

To vote no on H.R. 4013 would mean: a loss of 5,000 doctors, nurses, and other direct patient care personnel over the next year—and 25,000 over the next 5 years and another 430,000 veterans will be turned away from VA hospitals during the next 5 years.

Is this the way to keep the promise to our veterans? It is not. I join with the major veterans' organizations in urging a "yes" vote on H.R. 4013.

RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON: HIS STRENGTH AND FLAWS WERE THE STUFF OF SHAKESPEARE

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this Nation mourned the passing of Richard Milhous Nixon, grocer's son, Navy officer, Congressman, Senator, Vice President, President, and ultimately, senior statesman to the generations which followed him, both in this Nation and abroad.

The measure of any man, public or private, is the legacy which lives beyond his allotted span. The opening of China, the first breach of the Iron Curtain, the beginnings of disarmament and his inauguration of international human rights and the Helsinki Commission are just a few of the global landmarks fashioned by this remarkable intellect.

The national day of mourning yesterday recognized the respect in which this giant was held by the Nation's leaders and the thousands of Americans who never lost faith in his vision for the country and its place in modern history.

In the post-war world, Richard Nixon's influence and stature will be assured in the history of the last half of the 20th century. His strength and

flaws were the stuff of Shakespeare; the one so great, the other so human, so unfortunately tragic.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to know him as his first major woman appointee.

God bless his family and his memory.

WHAT IS THE FED UP TO NOW?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just have a slight message for the Federal Reserve Bank. You know, I would be the last to ever want to politicize the Federal Reserve, because I feel their independence is very, very valuable. But I am horrified to see that apparently the Federal Reserve has decided to play politics on its own.

What do I mean by that? They have never raised interest rates before in the history of their existence, as well as I can tell, based on the data we have now.

Now, I want to know, No. 1, what economist is telling them that whatever they did in the past is wrong and they have to change courses; I have not seen anybody saying that, or what kind of data are they getting that looks entirely different than the data everybody has seen?

This is very puzzling, and it could be very harmful to this economy that is on its way back. I just want to say to them, "If you have some reason that fits the standard way you have been acting in the past, we ought to know it, because otherwise it looks very bad and it looks like you are playing politics and trying to do everything you can to try to cause trouble in the economy."

SUPPORT H.R. 4013 TODAY

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, later on today there will be a vote on the passage of H.R. 4013, which exempts the Veterans Administration from certain Federal work force cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let us make it perfectly clear: This bill does not prevent Federal work force cuts from being made in the Department of Veterans Affairs; it simply says that in the Department of Veterans Affairs there shall be no cutbacks in jobs for doctors, nurses, and those who deliver medical care services in our veterans hospitals. That is all the bill does.

There will be equitable cuts in the Department of Veterans Affairs, in administration and everywhere else except for the one section I mentioned. That is the way it should be.

So I urge all Republicans and Democrats to support this piece of legislation; it is vital. Otherwise OMB, as it has under former Republican administrations and under the present Democratic administration, will impose cuts across the board. That means laying off doctors and nurses. We cannot allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, support H.R. 4013 today.

WORKING OFF WELFARE

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Congresswoman WOOLSEY in introducing the first bipartisan welfare reform bill called working off welfare. We hope that the committees of jurisdiction will consider our ideas along with the many others embodied in various bills.

We provide a commonsense approach to welfare reform, creating a more sensitive system of social, educational, and economic supports which would empower individuals on welfare to become permanently self-sufficient.

Through working off welfare we hope to reinstill the values of work, family, responsibility, individualism, and hope.

Working off welfare encourages work by allowing the mother to keep more of her earnings when she gets a job. We make it possible for a poor family to receive child care and health benefits without entering the welfare system.

We encourage families to stay together, eliminating the rules which discriminate against two-parent families in seeking AFDC assistance.

We expand job training and education opportunities by tripling funding for the JOBS programs for AFDC families. We focus education and training on jobs which pay a family wage and nontraditional occupations for women.

We strengthen the paternity system, making the IRS responsible for collecting and distributing child support moneys.

Our goal is to help welfare recipients get the training they need to find jobs that provide a livable wage. If we succeed, we foster self-esteem where there was despair, role models where there were few, and a generation of children with hope where there has been a cycle of dependency. We encourage those who believe that welfare reform does not have to come at the expense of compassion and reason to join with us.

□ 1300

AMERICANS IN STRONG OPPOSITION TO EMPLOYER MANDATES

Mr. Speaker, Americans are continuing to speak out against Government run health care reform and mandates.

In a poll by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Nation's largest business advocacy group, 71 percent of those polled oppose employer mandates.

These numbers reinforce what I have been saying all along—Government-imposed mandates on our Nation's businesses will kill jobs, decrease wages, and reduce benefits of the American worker.

Study by Nation's leading health care consulting firm, Lewin-VHI, shows that 88 percent of cost of employer mandates will be passed along to the worker in the form of reduced wages and benefits.

Laura Tyson, Clinton's Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, claims 600,000 jobs will be eliminated by Government imposed mandates in health care reform. The Employment Policy Institute says employer mandates will destroy between 780,000 and 1.2 million jobs.

President Clinton should not advocate Government-controlled and government-run health care at the expense of American employers and employees.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). The Chair will remind Members not to refer to persons temporarily on the floor of the House as guests of the House.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1994

Mr. BONIOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-485) on the resolution (H. Res. 414) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IRAQ CLAIMS ACT OF 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 410 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 410

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. 3221) to provide for the adjudication of certain claims against the Government of Iraq. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 Foreign Affairs. 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 Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order unless printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII before the beginning of consideration of the bill. The amendment caused to be printed in the Record by Representative Bereuter of Nebraska (relating to certain commercial claims) may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment. After disposition of all other amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, it shall be in order to consider an amendment caused to be printed in the Record by Representative Bonior of Michigan (relating to humanitarian assistance) and an amendment caused to be printed in the Record by Representative Solomon of New York (relating to war crimes) in the order stated. Points of order against each of those amendments for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. After disposition of those amendments, no further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order. 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 Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this month, America was celebrating our victory in the Persian Gulf war.

We had defeated the forces of Saddam Hussein.

We had liberated the people of Kuwait, and our troops were rightfully welcomed home with flags, parades, and all-star salutes.

But Mr. Speaker, 3 years after the war ended, there are still some people who are paying the price.

Thousands of the brave men and women who fought for America in that war still suffer physical and emotional injuries, including the effects of Persian Gulf war syndrome.

Many of the crew members injured in the prewar Iraqi attack on the U.S.S. *Stark* still have outstanding claims from the injuries they suffered, and many United States corporations who did business in prewar Iraq and were owed money for services rendered, were left high and dry after the United Nations imposed sanctions and the United States Government itself is owed a hefty chunk of change as the result of defaults by the Iraqi Government.

Mr. Speaker, all told, American claims against Iraq for losses, damages, and injuries suffered as a result of the gulf war run to about $5 billion.

And Saddam Hussein is not about to pay a dime of it back.

But this bill before us today will help us recoup some of those losses.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today, there are approximately $1.2 billion in frozen Iraqi assets in the United States, assets that were frozen by the United States after Iraq invaded Kuwait.

For most of the people and businesses owed money by Iraq, these frozen assets are the only means they have of being reimbursed.

There is no other way.

But under current U.S. law, those assets must remain frozen. They cannot be used for anything or to reimburse anybody right now.

But the bill that we will be discussing in just a few minutes changes all that.

This bill authorizes the United States Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to use the $1.2 billion in frozen Iraqi assets to pay American claims against the Government of Iraq.

It also sets up a mechanism by which these claims may be processed fairly, and it directs the commission to give first priority, as it should, to claims filed by veterans of Operation Desert Storm, victims of the U.S.S. *Stark* attack, and small claimants who can't afford to hire expensive attorneys to get their money back.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to mention an amendment I intend to offer later today as authorized by the rule that the Clerk just read.

As we speak about the people who are still paying the price of the gulf war, nobody is paying a higher price today than the Iraqi people themselves.

Saddam Hussein has turned his back on the people of Iraq, and with sanctions in place, hundreds of thousands of civilians in that country are dying today due to a lack of food, water, and basic medicine.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, this is a startling statistic. An estimated 120,000 children under the age of 5 have died in Iraq in the past 3 years alone. Iraq today is a place where mothers see their babies scream in agony because operations must be performed without anesthesia. There is no anesthesia in the country. It is a place where diabetics lapse into comas, there is no insulin. It is a place where children suffering from leukemia are routinely sent home from the hospital because there is no medicine to provide them care. I intend to offer an amendment to address that situation. I will speak to it a little later as this bill progresses.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the right thing to do, it is the right time to do it, and I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the bill on final passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, although this rule was unnecessarily clouded by a requirement that proposed amendments be preprinted—it is basically an open rule. And for that I would like to commend Chairman MOAKLEY, as well as Chairman HAMILTON and ranking member GILMAN, of the Foreign Affairs Committee. While we objected to the preprinting requirement as a needless restraint on Members' ability to proposed changes to this bill, because of unrelated national events, Members with an interest in the Iraq Claims Act of 1993, did in fact have additional opportunity to formulate and submit suggested amendments.

H.R. 3221 provides a measured, technical process to help victims of the Persian Gulf war—private and public—recoup some of their serious losses. Clearly the available resources—$1.3 billion in frozen Iraqi assets—fall far short of covering the estimated $5 billion in total claims against the Iraqis resulting from the war. As a result, this legislation is only one step toward an equitable prioritization of claims against the Iraqi Government. After the war, the United Nations established a Commission on Compensation to deal with losses by governments, individuals, and corporations stemming from Iraq's aggression against Kuwait, violations of international law, and inhumane treatment of prisoners. Despite this mandate, though, many claims against Iraq stemming from the war do not fall within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Commission. Under H.R. 3221, frozen Iraqi assets will be liquidated and divided between the Federal Government and private claimants whose grievances fall beyond the jurisdiction of the U.N. commission. H.R. 3221 rightfully gives preference for settlement of such claims to families of U.S. servicemen killed and veterans injured during Operation Desert Storm and the attack of the U.S.S. *Stark*. Private companies with business interests in Iraq that suffered losses because of the war will also be eligible, once veterans' and survivors' claims are settled. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein's debt to the international community can never be repaid in full. H.R. 3221

will help make amends to some of those who suffered because of his insatiable appetite for power and indefensible aggression against innocent people. Of course, there remain serious consequences of the gulf war, for the Iraqi people who continue to suffer under the dictatorial rule of Saddam Hussein and for the American veterans whose lives are forever changed by their service in Desert Storm. I strongly support an amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON, expressing Congress' interest in a U.N. war crimes tribunal, and I believe the list of crimes should include Hussein's deliberate attacks on the environment. In March 1991, this House passed a resolution deploring the blatant degradation of the environment and holding Saddam Hussein and his government expressly liable for related damages. At the time, we called this the send-the-bill-to-Saddam resolution. Americans vividly remember the gruesome images of purposely dumped sludge fouling the coastline and black smoke from deliberately torched oil wells blocking the Sun. Residents of the region will no doubt suffer long-term health and economic consequences from this terrible crime—while hundreds of American military personnel now report mysterious health problems that could relate to toxic exposure during their active duty in the Persian Gulf. While the legislation before us today clearly does not address all of these lingering problems stemming from the gulf war, H.R. 3221 lays the groundwork for settling at least part of our score with the Iraqi Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	60	12	20	48	80

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Apr. 22, 1994.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number/date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173, May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States Forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department, H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-Postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401–0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. F: 205–216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D–109; R–40)		A: 246–172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization			PQ: 237–169. A: 234–169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D–3; R–9)	1 (D–1; R–0)	A: 213–191–1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization		91 (D–67; R–24)	A: 241–182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238–188 (Oct. 6, 1993).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D–0; R–7)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 240–185. A: 225–195. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 239–150. (Oct. 15, 1993).
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 273, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	PQ: 235–187. F: 149–254. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D–7; R–7; I–1)	10 (D–7; R–3)	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 282, Oct. 20, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 281: Continuing appropriations through Oct. 28, 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 286, Oct. 27, 1993	O	H.R. 334: Lumbee Recognition Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 287, Oct. 27, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 283: Continuing appropriations resolution	1 (D–0; R–0)	0	A: 252–170. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 289, Oct. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 2151: Maritime Security Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 293, Nov. 4, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 170: Troop withdrawal Somalia	NA	NA	A: 390–8. (Nov. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 299, Nov. 8, 1993	MO	H.R. 1036: Employee Retirement Act—1993	2 (D–1; R–1)	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 9, 1993).
H. Res. 302, Nov. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 1025: Brady handgun bill	17 (D–6; R–11)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 238–182. (Nov. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 303, Nov. 9, 1993	O	H.R. 322: Mineral exploration	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 16, 1993).
H. Res. 304, Nov. 9, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 288: Further CR, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	
H. Res. 312, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3425: EPA Cabinet status	27 (D–8; R–19)	9 (D–1; R–8)	F: 191–227. (Feb. 2, 1994).
H. Res. 313, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 796: Freedom access to clinics	15 (D–9; R–6)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 233–192. (Nov. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 314, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3351: Alt methods young offenders	21 (D–7; R–14)	6 (D–3; R–3)	A: 238–179. (Nov. 19, 1993).
H. Res. 316, Nov. 19, 1993	C	H.R. 51: D.C. statehood bill	1 (D–1; R–0)	NA	A: 252–172. (Nov. 20, 1993).
H. Res. 319, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3: Campaign finance reform	35 (D–6; R–29)	1 (D–0; R–1)	A: 220–207. (Nov. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 320, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3400: Reinventing Government	34 (D–15; R–19)	3 (D–3; R–0)	A: 247–183. (Nov. 22, 1993).
H. Res. 336, Feb. 2, 1994	MC	H.R. 3759: Emergency supplemental appropriations	14 (D–8; R–5; I–1)	5 (D–3; R–2)	PQ: 244–168. A: 342–65. (Feb. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 352, Feb. 8, 1994	MC	H.R. 811: Independent Counsel Act	27 (D–8; R–19)	10 (D–4; R–6)	PQ: 249–174. A: 242–174. (Feb. 9, 1994).
H. Res. 357, Feb. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 3345: Federal workforce restructuring	3 (D–2; R–1)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: Voice Vote (Feb. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 366, Feb. 23, 1994	MO	H.R. 6: Improving America's schools	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote (Feb. 24, 1994).
H. Res. 384, Mar. 9, 1994	MC	H. Con. Res. 218: Budget resolution fiscal year 1995–99	14 (D–5; R–9)	5 (D–3; R–2)	A: 245–171 (Mar. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 401, Apr. 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 4092: Violent crime control	180 (D–98; R–82)	68 (D–47; R–21)	A: 244–176 (Apr. 13, 1994).
H. Res. 410, Apr. 21, 1994	MO	H.R. 3221: Iraqi Claims Act	NA	NA	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ-Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who has an important amendment to this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the legislation that it brings to the floor. At the appropriate time, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and I will offer two separate amendments concerning the atrocities that continue to be inflicted on the Iraqi people. And if we think things are bad with what is going on in Bosnia and in other flash points around this world, in Turkestan and Azerbaijan and Georgia and many of the former Soviet republics, let us remember what continues to go on in Iraq.

I support the Bonior amendment and urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support it. It is so terribly important, the message and help it delivers.

As for my own amendment, it simply lists the most serious and abusive of actions by Saddam Hussein and his regime during the Persian Gulf crisis and continuing right to today. It calls on the President of the United States to request the United Nations to establish a war crimes tribunal to hold Saddam Hussein and other officials in his regime accountable for their atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, all decent people throughout the world were appalled by the brutality of Saddam Hussein's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Our memories are still vivid when we recall the atrocities committed by Iraqi forces against the people of Kuwait. We are still repulsed by Saddam Hussein's cynical use of so-called human shields as a means of protecting his important military facilities against threatened attacks. And we still recoil at the recollection of indiscriminate Iraqi missile attacks against innocent unarmed civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, the final chapter in Saddam Hussein's bloody history has not yet been written. I remain hopeful, indeed, very confident, that the day will come when Saddam Hussein has to face the bar of justice, when he has to face the court of world opinion. As a way of continuing to keep the pressure on his regime, I urge the establishment of a war crimes tribunal. Let the process of organizing the evidence begin now. And let us continue to keep the moral outrage of the civilized world focused on these atrocities. Surely, the day will come when Saddam Hussein and his henchmen are held accountable.

My amendment simply expresses the sense of this Congress that the President should request the United Nations to establish a tribunal to charge this war criminal for his crimes against humanity. I urge Members to please support the amendment when it comes up.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, the Honorable JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY, the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the distinguished minority floor manager, PORTER GOSS from Florida, for their efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor. It should provide Members on both sides of the aisle with the opportunity to consider and amend H.R. 3221, the Iraq Claims Act of 1993, reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee on November 20, 1993.

I agree with Chairman HAMILTON on the importance of this legislation and the need for its prompt consideration by the House. We need to establish a fair and orderly system of adjudicating the claims of United States nationals against Iraq.

The $1.2 billion in frozen Iraqi assets is far outweighed by the $5 billion in total claims by the United States Government, individuals and companies.

The bill authorizes the vesting of these frozen Iraqi assets to pay claims that are not within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Compensation Commission and authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to administer and allocate any funds received from the U.N. Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the Iraq Claims Act.

□ 1320

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding time to me.

This legislation originated in our Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the rule and for the bill.

As has been said here a number of times, there are about $5 billion in American claims which have been pending for years against Iraq. And we are holding about $1.2 billion in Iraqi assets, which we seized at the time of the gulf war. This legislation will allow these frozen assets to be distributed as partial settlement to these longstanding American claims. And the important part of this legislation is since these claims are far more than the seized assets, this bill sets up a Government Commission to make partial settlements.

The Commission would determine the most equitable basis for allocating favorable and available assets. The bill sets a priority for resolving the claims of American service people at the head of the line. This is why I think this legislation is so important. Those injured in the U.S.S. *Stark* attack and those injured in the gulf war would be first in line.

Other claimants, including the U.S. businesses and U.S. Government, would also receive settlements. In my view, it is long past time when we can help the American soldiers, American businesses, and American taxpayer recover as much from Iraq as possible. Unless we pass this legislation, these claimants face a free-for-all in court. Let me repeat that. Unless we pass this legislation, these claimants face a free-for-all in court, where the winners will be determined by those with the best lawyers, not the best claim. That is why I am so determined that our service people are at the head of the line when these claims are allocated. That is why our subcommittee wrote this bill, and that is why the House should pass this bill today.

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

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his work on this issue and so many others, trying to work out a responsible solution, as I think we have. And it could not have been done without his help.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the chairman of the committee for those kind words. Let me say that the chairman is too modest because the chairman is the one that put this legislation to the Congress, and we appreciate his working with us in doing that.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], another distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindness and courtesy in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to support the rule. First, I would like to say that I completely support one goal of this legislation to fully compensate those United States armed servicemen, or their families, who were injured in the *Stark* attack or bravely fought in the Persian Gulf war and were either injured or killed in that war. However, the unprecedented step by the U.S. Department of Treasury to compensate those servicemen out of a pool of frozen assets—some of which is owed to U.S. commercial and Government interests—has created some very inequitable results. And it is important to recognize that such payment to servicemen, who are not abused POW's, from frozen enemy assets is indeed, apparently, a precedent-setting step. Unfortunately, our Government failed in the United Nations to have our United States servicemen, or their families,

compensated from Iraqi oil revenues collected by the U.N. Commission as they should have been. Therefore, I fully understand the need and desire to utilize other funds for this very important and necessary purpose. Nevertheless, the United States should still pursue the U.N. option.

I strongly object to the way the Treasury Department has handled this matter. It seems only fair and equitable that the United States Treasury Department should not prohibit the relatively small number of United States exporters—who have actually shipped goods to Iraq before the embargo—from collecting payment owed to them by the Iraqis when the Iraqis authorized payment. This was not the way Treasury treated exporters in a similar circumstance with respect to frozen Iranian assets. United States exporters who shipped goods to Iran prior to the embargo were paid, and United States exporters who shipped goods to Iraq prior to the embargo should be paid—especially if the Iraqis had also authorized payment from their assets abroad. In addition, I am concerned that current Treasury Department regulations will add substantial noncommercial costs to U.S. exporters in the future by forcing them to purchase expensive, confirmed letters of credit for much of their export financing. These noncommercial costs will damage our competitive stance with foreign competitors.

The U.S. Treasury Department could avoid the inequities locked in place by this legislation by reexamining its current regulations. It should do so. I believe that a permanent policy should be developed which would permit both U.S. exporters and their financing institutions to understand and rely upon set rights and obligations when a Presidential freeze of foreign assets occurs.

This Member attempted to develop a compromise amendment to this legislation which would more equitably distribute limited assets to all claimants including: U.S. armed servicemen, victims of the *Stark* incident, the U.S. Government, and all commercial claimants. Unfortunately, it is clear that the fundamental source of the inequitable distribution of limited assets lies first in Treasury Department regulations.

Therefore, this Member believes it would be appropriate for the Treasury Department to carefully reexamine its current regulations and attempt to resolve the inequities created by existing regulations. I would suggest that for reasons of equity, and as a message to Treasury to go back and do their job properly.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control has not responsibly administered the assets which were blocked pursuant to Executive order by President Bush. Unfortunately, the Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control more responsibly administered the assets which were blocked pursuant to Executive order by President Bush. Unfortunately, the Office of Foreign Assets Control and a man who apparently operates like an arrogant little tin god, Mr. Richard Newcomb, has administered these blocked funds in a haphazard and inequitable manner:

First, OFAC intended to allow exporters to be paid out of blocked assets. OFAC's original policy for releasing blocked Iraqi assets (General License No. 7, August 15, 1990) authorized the issuance of licenses to permit payment from a blocked account for all exporters who shipped goods to Iraq prior to the embargo.

Then, OFAC limited this authority (General License No. 7, October 18, 1990) to U.S. banks for goods shipped based on letters of credit issued or confirmed by U.S. banks. This is a radical departure from OFAC policy with regard to frozen Iranian assets which were paid to exporters who shipped under all letters of credit.

As of March 3, 1994, OFAC has—despite its objections to piecemeal distribution of blocked Iraqi assets—issued 444 specific licenses allegedly authorizing the release of assets frozen by the Executive orders including the following:

First, a CCC payment of $450 million to Gulf International Bank, a Middle Eastern bank partly owned by the Government of Iraq, and reportedly involved in financing embargo-busting activities.

Second, release of frozen assets to Saalim Noman, the reputed head of Iraq's military procurement network in the United States.

Third, release of $16 million from frozen Iraqi assets to a major political contributor (see Statement of the honorable former senior Senator from Colorado, Senator Tim Wirth, 138 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S15731, September 30, 1992).

Fourth, transfer of more than $107 million from blocked Iraqi accounts in United States banks to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Foreign Assets Control has plenty of precedent to permit U.S. exporters to receive full payment for their transactions, yet they have instead permitted disreputable individuals and entities which have allegedly engaged in embargo busting activities to erode claims that are entitled by this legislation to be awarded to U.S. veterans, U.S. businesses, and other individuals.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these allegations against the Department of the Treasury, this Member demands that the Treasury Department's inspector general investigate these important allegations. Because Mr. Richard Newcomb and the Office of Foreign Assets Control will not provide the details on who has received licenses from his perch atop this apparently unaccountable agency within the Treasury Department, this Member believes such allegations at least, must be considered as possibly true until proven false.

Mr. Speaker, to remedy these aforementioned abuses and inexcusable practices of the Office of Foreign Assets Control, an amendment I have drafted merely places those U.S. exporters who shipped goods prior to August 2, 1990, in a similar status but still below that which the Office of Foreign Assets Control has elected to confer on U.S. banks who issued or confirmed letters of credit to U.S. exporters. It seems only fair and equitable to this Member that the United States Treasury Department should not prohibit United States exporters—who have actually shipped goods to Iraq before the embargo—from collecting payment owed to them by the Iraqis when the Iraqis authorized payment.

Mr. Speaker, without the amendment I have drafted, this legislation will preclude us from reversing an administrative policy that will adversely impact U.S. commerce, U.S. exporters, and the financing of international commercial transactions. Without the Bereuter amendment, H.R. 3221 would deter U.S. exporters from selling goods to foreign countries where the threat of hostilities—which is increasingly common—could cause them to lose everything if funds payable to them become subject to a blocking order in a U.S. financial institution.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this Member has today endured one of the more damaging and irresponsible descriptions of an amendment which I hope to offer. A "Dear Colleague" which was circulated prior to consideration of this legislation grossly and unfairly characterizes this Member's amendment by associating it with attempts to place commercial claims before the legislation's priority designation of payment for members of the Armed Forces, victims of U.S.S. *Stark*, and other individuals. Clearly, this Member's proposed amendment does not affect H.R. 3221's priority designation of those claims. In fact, this Member took extra caution and care to ensure that H.R. 3221's priority designation be left unaffected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in regard to a letter circulated to Members of Congress by a bank which claims that my proposed amendment "violates established principles of commercial law," this Member would like to state that my proposed amendment does nothing to change letter of credit law, and in fact, maintains current legal distinctions between confirmed letters of credit and advised letters of credit. Under current Treasury Regulations U.S. financial institutions have been reimbursed from frozen Iraqi assets after paying out of their own funds,

confirmed letters of credit. The proposed Bereuter amendment does not permit unconfirmed letters to be paid out of frozen Iraqi funds. Rather, it places exporters who shipped under unconfirmed letters of credit firmly behind those exporters who shipped under confirmed letters of credit—which are even ahead of veterans claims—and firmly behind the priority claims of members of the U.S. Armed Forces, their families, and victims of the U.S.S. *Stark*.

Therefore, the drafted Bereuter amendment, as published in the RECORD on page 8608, April 26, 1994, does nothing to create extra obligations for U.S. financial institutions who finance international commercial transactions. The drafted Bereuter amendment was aimed at promoting U.S. exports and U.S. financing of export transactions; it intentionally avoided creating extra obligations for U.S. financial institutions.

□ 1330

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 410 provides, as we have heard this afternoon, for the consideration of H.R. 3221, the Iraqi Claims Act. This is, as has been stated, a simple open rule that provides 1 hour of general debate and makes in order any amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule allows the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], who has just spoken, to offer an en bloc amendment which modifies portions of the bill not yet read for amendment. The bill waives clause 7 of rule XXI for an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] relating, as he so aptly described, to the war crimes issue and Saddam Hussein, and for an amendment that I intend to offer relating to humanitarian assistance.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of the 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 (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 410 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. 3221.

□ 1334

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. 3221) to provide for the adjudication of certain claims against the Government of Iraq with Ms. ESHOO 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 Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Madam Chairman, first let me express appreciation to those Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who have worked very diligently on this amendment and on this bill, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member of the committee.

Madam Chairman, I just want to say also a word of appreciation to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. He may offer an amendment a little later on with which I disagree, but I have enormous respect for him, and I have appreciated the dialog I have had with him as we have tried to work our way through this complicated issue. I know that from the start of this process he has been very uncomfortable about any amendment which would put certain companies before veterans in terms of access to the limited Iraqi assets available to settle claims.

The committee has been in a position of not knowing until this morning, when Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was available, precisely what amendments would be in order. Over the last several weeks some companies have sought to reorder the process of claims adjudication, and have wanted their claims paid first. We have had to prepare for that eventuality.

Fortunately, we are not confronted with an amendment which seeks to pay certain companies with claims before veterans, so I simply want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the care he has given in drafting his amendment, so that veterans do not operate at a disadvantage. However, while the problem of the veterans has been removed, if his amendment is offered, I will, of course, oppose it.

First, Madam Chairman, let me explain the bill. H.R. 3221 provides the necessary authority to establish, maintain, and ultimately terminate a fair and orderly system for adjudicating the claims of United States nationals against Iraq. In other claims situations, the U.S. Government has not started the claims process until it has reached a government-to-government settlement.

With Iraq, of course, there is no reasonable prospect of reaching such a settlement. For this reason, the United States needs the authority this bill provides to invest and then use the proceeds from frozen Iraqi assets under United States control to provide awards to United States citizens and claimants.

There are serious negative repercussions if we do not approve this legislation. We need to be very clear about one point. It is not at all likely that everyone with claims against Iraq will be reimbursed in full for their loss. In fact, it is likely that no one will be reimbursed in full. There is simply not enough money to go around. It is estimated that there will be approximately $4 to $5 billion in individual, business, and government claims. There is approximately $1.2 billion in frozen Iraqi assets in this country, so we need to try to ensure a process that is fair and equitable for settling outstanding claims.

The bill before us is directed towards two goals. It sets up a system for dealing with the claims of U.S. nationals that predate the gulf war, but gives priority to veterans with gulf war claims; and, second, it sets up a structure for handling funds the United States may receive from the U.N. Commission. The U.N. Commission is handling most claims that result from Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

A word about the bill further. The bill authorizes the United States Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to administer and, if necessary, to allocate funds received from the U.N. Commission.

□ 1340

The U.N. Commission plans to use Iraqi oil exports to provide compensation to foreign governments, individuals, and corporations that have suffered direct loss, damage, or injury as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

The U.N. Commission's mandate includes providing compensation to prisoners of war who suffered losses or injuries due to treatment that violated international humanitarian law.

The U.N. Commission will not hear claims of United States servicemen who may have suffered losses in the course of their duty during the Iraq war. For this reason, these servicemen are given special priority under the U.S. Commission procedures.

Madam Chairman, the bill authorizes the U.S. Commission to pay claims that are not within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Commission.

In other words, the U.S. Commission will handle other losses suffered by U.S. claimants, such as prewar debts and obligations, injury claims of seamen on the U.S.S. *Stark*, and death and injury claims of Operation Desert Storm veterans.

Madam Chairman, the U.N. Commission is up and running. Filing deadlines for claimants with the U.N. Commission have been set. The United States needs a structure in place to accommodate the U.N. process.

Since we will not be able to reach settlement with Iraq, claimants deserve to have their claims heard while the evidence of their losses is still fresh.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3221, the Iraq Claims Act of 1993, reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee on November 20, 1993.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and his staff, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], and the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for their cooperation and support in bringing this bill to the floor today under an open rule.

Also, I want to pay tribute to all the minority members of the committee who helped to shape this legislation and influence its consideration particularly Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BEREUTER.

I fully agree with Chairman HAMILTON on the importance of this legislation and the need for creating a fair and equitable procedure and framework for American claims not within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Compensation Commission.

This legislation provides a fair and orderly system for satisfying the claims of United States nationals, companies and the United States against Iraq as a result of the August 2, 1990, invasion of Kuwait.

The Iraq Claims Act follows the standard procedure utilized in the past to provide compensation of Americans in similar circumstances.

The bill authorizes the President to use the $1.2 billion of Iraqi assets frozen in 1990 to award payments on the estimated $3.1 billion of pre-August 2 claims and $2.3 billion post-invasion claims.

It would permit the available compensation to be allocated equitably among all claimants including individuals, Desert Storm and Desert Shield veterans, and commercial claimants.

This bill authorizes the vesting of these frozen Iraqi assets to pay claims that are not within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Compensation Commission and authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to administer and allocate any funds received from the U.N. Commission.

The U.N. Commission plans to reuse revenues generated from Iraqi oil exports to provide compensation to foreign governments, individuals, and corporations that have suffered damage or injury as a result of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Other losses suffered by U.S. claimants, including any unpaid pre-war commercial debts and obligations, injury claims of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Stark* and death and injury claims of Operation Desert Storm veterans, fall outside of the U.N. jurisdiction. This legislation will ensure that these claims will be adjudicated by the U.S. Commission.

In our review of this legislation, many members expressed concern with the limited jurisdiction of the U.N. Commission, particularly over the fact that this commission will not consider the war-related claims of service personnel from any Nation unless such personnel were prisoners of war who were mistreated.

To the extent that the members of our Armed Forces in the Desert Storm and Desert Shield operations are not fully compensated, our Government should continue to hold Iraq accountable. At such time as we reestablish normal relations with that country, we should seek payment in full for the balance of these claims.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this important legislation.

Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise to follow some of the concerns of the distinguished chairman of the committee and to simply stress that with regard to at least the principal amendment that is going to be offered from this side, that it is with some reluctance that I express some skepticism.

Madam Chairman, I think one should always recognize that care has to be given so that law is written with precedent in mind, with the understanding that the best law has the widest general applicability and the most dubious statute is particularist in nature. The amendment to be offered later has the effect of advantaging some and disadvantaging others in the assertion of claims. It also has the effect of overturning, after the fact, legal precedent.

Madam Chairman, I personally have very little doubt that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is entirely correct in expressing concerns about the allocation of the $1.2 billion in frozen assets which are currently available to dispense, however, about $5 billion in expected claims are being considered. But moving one group of creditors to the head of the line, as deserving as they may be, pushes other equally deserving creditors to the back of the line. And so with the greatest reluctance, I would stress that even though the particular group that is in effect has some very heartrending circumstances, there are other groups that also have heartrending circumstances from an economic perspective and that in the name of fairness and equitability, the best reliance for this Congress is established law.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEACH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I wonder if he would not admit that this difficultly about assessing the claims of one claimant class against another could be best handled by an administrative agency discharging their duties in a fashion that is consistent with previous precedents that have been established such as during the Iranian conflict?

Mr. LEACH. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman has a fair point, but I would not take it too far.

Madam Chairman, one of the reasons that one should be careful about taking it too far, in the Iranian circumstance there was a surplus of frozen assets compared to claims. In this circumstance, there is a sparsity of frozen assets in relation to claims and so it was relatively easy to make an accommodation in that circumstance and not quite as easy in this particular one.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LEACH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, that is certainly true, but the gentleman is aware of the fact that the U.S. Government failed to make its case convincingly with the United Nations so that in fact the claims for a substantial number of our claimants could have been paid for out of Iraqi oil proceeds which is entirely appropriate, true?

Mr. LEACH. Madam Chairman, it would have been far better for this country if our Government had made that claim. We are dealing with a circumstance that exists, not one that we would prefer to be the case.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEACH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. This gentleman is very, very reluctant to offer an amendment like I have drafted on the floor,

even though we put veterans in the preferred first priority status where they ought to be. But when we have OFAC, this is the body within the Treasury Department responsible for these kinds of claims matters, failing to discharge their duty in a consistent fashion and making arbitrary distinctions that are inconsistent with precedent, a Member really has no other alternative but to come to the committee and then to the House floor to try to get some kind of realistic and acceptable action out of the administrative agency that ought to be handling this. And I think that is what this gentleman intends.

Mr. LEACH. Madam Chairman, I say to the gentleman, I respect very much what the gentleman has in mind, but I would also say that the fact that this particular institution, and in my comments I made reference to the fact that I thought the gentleman had some fair points in this regard, may have been capricious does not mean that, therefore, greater capriciousness is the reward for that group that happens to have the brightest and the most astute Member of Congress advocating their case.

□ 1350

And what we have here is one of the finest, most reputable, and esteemed Members of our body who has come to the defense of one group of creditors, and I respect that more than anything, but I think the public interest should be for a general approach of the law than a particular interest.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, I rise today with regret, because I think the world of our chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has been my candidate for many things in this Congress in the past and probably will be in the future.

In going over the report language and the language in the bill today, in the last section, the Congress does address the statement of policy, and it says that it is a sense of the Congress that individuals who have served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict should not be admitted into the United States as refugees under the Immigration and Naturalization Act. That would be fine except it also says, "except in exceptional circumstances." The bill does not say what those exceptional circumstances are.

Reading on, the bill says, "until all claims certified under section 2(b) of this act shall have been paid in full." Well, there are two real considerations to me more as a matter of conscience. One, we do not sell American refugee status or citizenship to anybody, particularly those people who fight against American fighting men and women. And two, I do not think we should tie freedom to economic claims. I think they are so distinguishable, that if that is the sense of this Congress, I am embarrassed to say I am a Member of this Congress.

I have prepared and am introducing today a bill that would clearly say to the Immigration Service and State Department of the United States, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, no refugee of Iraqi descent who served in the Iraqi Army during the conflict in Iraq should be admitted into the United States under any circumstances. As we turn down Haitians, and as we turn down freedom fighters all over the world, can we say that we are going to take care of soldiers who fought against the United States? I think that is unconscionable.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, I concur with what the gentleman has stated.

I, however, would state that several months ago when it was discovered that Iraqi POW's who were finding their way to this country, we made inquiry of the Sate Department, and the State Department now changed its position, so only those ex-Iraqi POW's who did not fire shots at us and who assisted the United States in the effort would be allowed to come to this country as refugees.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, I understand that, but I saw the newscasts when a thousand or so men were in the field waiting to come to the United States, and the State Department of the United States and the Immigration Service of the United States said these are prisoners of war who cannot go home because they are threatened; that they have asked for political refugee status, and under the existing laws the Congress has passed, they are entitled to it.

I just want it very clear that if we did pass laws like that in the past which are being applied by our State Department or Immigration Service in such a way, we should change those laws. This is not to say that I would send people back to Iraq to suffer. We went to war for the benefit of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and other Middle Eastern countries. They certainly should have the ability to hold soldiers until Iraq becomes a free nation again or at least until their lives are not threatened.

It is not a responsibility for the United States to fill up this country with people who say, "I cannot go home for various political reasons"; that we have got to bring them over here in preference over other world citizens who are major contributors and true believers in freedom and democracy and willing to fight for it. These people did not fight for it.

Mr. MANZULLO. I concur with everything the gentleman said. But I would state, based upon the outrage just expressed, we took that outrage, approached the State Department, and the State Department has officially changed its policy to limit the number of POW's coming in.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Fine, but we do not know what that change is going to be.

Mr. MANZULLO. The change is in the report.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I read the report. It said they will change their policy and take into account different considerations. I do not know what those are. Until we know what the considerations are, and they are spelled out, the policy is wrong.

Mr. MANZULLO. The considerations are in the report. The considerations state very clearly that No. 1, any ex-Iraqi POW who comes to this country could not have fired any shots at this country. No. 2, he would have had to substantially aid this country in efforts to defeat.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Did you address the 500 that are here? Are they going back?

Mr. MANZULLO. What we asked was the policy be halted immediately because there were no specific guidelines.

Mr. KANJORSKI. What about those that are already here? What are we doing with the 500 that are here?

Mr. MANZULLO. Well, they are already here now. We cannot help that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We can change the law and send them back.

Mr. MANZULLO. I would work with the gentleman on any reasonable laws to change it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I will challenge my friends on the Republican side. I have sat here for years hearing motions to recommit on issues, on fine, fundamental things. We cannot offer recommittal on this side. But I challenge a Republican to offer a recommittal.

I prepared the language. I will tell you, if you put it up to a vote on this floor, if it does not pass overwhelmingly, then we ought to all go home and apologize to our constituents.

I am challenging the Republicans to find one conscientious Member on the Republican side to offer a motion to recommit so we can change this sense-of-the-Congress language. It does not need to be so harsh that we deny anybody refugee status.

Mr. MANZULLO. If the gentleman will yield further, it was the Republicans that found the problem going on, and it was the Republican Party that worked in the committee in a bipartisan.

Mr. KANJORSKI. This is no partisan issue. I drafted a bill, but I seek to make no partisan issue of it. I am asking the Republican minority who say they never have a chance, to find one of your Members that will stand up in objection to this bill and make a mo-

tion to recommit and let us vote on this floor whether it is the sense of Congress to let these refugees in.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was courteous enough a moment ago to show me his amendment, a new motion to recommit. I had not seen it before.

I do not have any doubt at all that he needs to be commended for the principle that is stated in the amendment. None of us, I think, are comfortable with the idea of welcoming as refugees into this country Iraqi soldiers who fought against us.

Now, I told the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I would try to work with him on it. This raises questions of refugee policies that are outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I do not know whether this motion to recommit is subject to a point of order or not, but it may be. But I think it is a very serious question that he has raised.

I also think, on the basis of my understanding of the problem, that it is not quite as simple as the language that this recommittal motion would suggest. In other words, there were many Iraqi soldiers who deserted. There were many who came over through our enticement. There were some Iraqi soldiers who helped us.

I just do not want to have blanket language without providing for some exceptions.

But the gentleman raises a very valid point, and I do want to try to work with him, as I have tried to work with the gentleman from Illinois, who was very interested in this matter in the committee, in order to reach a satisfactory conclusion. I commend him for calling it to our attention.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman very much. I have a friend from Pennsylvania in our delegation. He is a freshman, and he fought against the Iraqis in the gulf war, and I would doubt that he feels comfortable with the idea that in the thousands of prisoners in the field, some would have the ability to assert refugee status, and that they would get preference over all refugees around the world.

I would invite my fellow Member, if he would like, to comment on this subject.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to say what happened here is that the U.S. Military, in trying to protect American lives, said that if some of the Iraqis helped us, we would then repay them by giving them an opportunity to come to the United States.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Reclaiming my time, that may have been General Schwarzkopf's position, but it is not this Member of Congress, and I do not think it represents the position of the American people. I think we have every right in the world to protect them, we should say to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait: "We sent our boys, we lost our lives. Do you mean you can't take care of this prisoner problem in the Middle East?"

Madam Chairman, I call upon my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, from just below my district in Easton-Allentown-Bethlehem, the Honorable PAUL MCHALE, who served in the Persian Gulf. He resigned his seat in the house of representatives of the Assembly of Pennsylvania and honorably went to the Middle East and offered his life in the defense of the Middle East, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait, and to help get freedom in Iraq.

I would like his opinion of what we are passing on here today.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MCHALE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time to speak.

Madam Chairman, I had not anticipating to speak on this issue. I was not aware that it would be debated at some length. In light of the fact that it is, I want to associate myself fully with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Madam Chairman, I remember what it was like on the morning of February 24, 1991, when brave soldiers and marines prepared to walk into an enemy minefield. And I remember what it was like that evening and for the next several evenings as thousands of Iraqi prisoners were captured. Yes, at that point they were defenseless, and, yes, at that point they were willing to cooperate. But a few hours earlier they were prepared to kill Americans.

I find it outrageous that those who have taken up arms in opposition to our country have now been invited to have permanent residency status within our Nation. That is a disgrace. We owe more than that to our comrades who died on the battlefield. Brave young Americans, knowing full well what the danger was, put their lives on the line, walked into those minefields, and in some cases sacrificed their blood and their lives. I do not want to hear State Department doublespeak on this issue. I do not want to hear we are only admitting those who did not pull a trigger. Those who took up arms are morally and politically accountable for their actions, and in light of the fact that they were prepared to kill Americans, I do not want to admit them to our shores. We owe more than that to those who sacrificed their lives. I fully agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI]. This issue has been debated at length for at least 6 months. It is time to make it clear that in the past war and in any future war, those who take up arms against the United States will not be welcome in our country.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MANZULLO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, the United States of America has a penchant for putting American troops in harm's way, bleating the trumpets of victory, and then finding out that we lost the peace at the negotiating table. This time, the gulf war victory was shattered by the outrageous actions of the United Nations.

As part of the United Nations peace effort to conclude the gulf war, the U.N. Security Council adopted on April 8, 1991 Resolution 687 to provide compensation for damages caused by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. The resolution states that Iraq was liable under international law "for any direct loss, damage * * * or injury to foreign governments, nationals and corporations, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait." The United Nations established a compensation commission to administer these claims, based on a 30-percent tax on all future Iraqi oil shipments.

I discovered that this fund could not be used to pay for the war injuries to soldiers, or survivors of deceased veterans, of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces who fought Saddam Hussein. The United States delegation to the Governing Council, according to a letter I received from the State Department, fought very hard to have the claims of these soldiers included in this fund.

The letter stated:

> All members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces, or their survivors, should be able to file claims for death or injury suffered in the course of military actions against Iraq . . . [The U.S. delegation to the Governing Council] argues that these individuals had been sent into harm's way to combat aggression on behalf of the United Nations and thus they were at least as deserving as any other claimant . . . No other government supported the U.S. position.

On June 26, 1992, the Governing Council decided that only those veterans who were prisoners of war and who suffered Geneva convention rights violations would be able to use the fund to help pay for their injuries. Thus, some nations serving on the United Nations Security Council who were not even involved in the allied war effort against Saddam Hussein, such as China, determined that American soldiers and their survivors could not charge Iraq the

cost of their injuries. I enclose the full letter for the record.

The only fund available to the soldiers or their survivors is the Iraqi Claims Fund, which consists of $1.2 billion in frozen Iraqi assets. That claims fund, however, has a limit of $100,000 per soldier or survivor. There were 396 U.S. soldiers killed and some 2,000 injured in the gulf war. In addition, an additional 8,000 veterans have been treated by VA hospitals for physiological injuries arising out of the war. Needless to say, the Iraqi Claims Fund could easily be depleted by veterans' claims. Plus, the fund will be used to settle United States Government contact and property claims against Iraq and unpaid contract obligations to American companies.

Over a period of time, Kuwait will have its property damage claims by Iraq paid through the United Nations Compensation Fund. However, United States veterans of the war, or the survivors, will have to look at the meager $1.2 billion Iraq Claim Fund or regular veterans' benefits to pay for injuries or death claims.

This is not right. Saddam Hussein someday will be shipping oil and will not be responsible one bit for injuries to soldiers, or survivors of soldiers, who battled his armies. Saddam Hussein will not have to pay fo. the injuries caused when one of his SCUD's landed on the American transportation division from Pennsylvania.

I am pleased that the committee inserted report language at my request to express this outrage. I fully agree with the committee that the United States should continue to hold Iraq accountable for uncompensated veterans' claims.

It is time that we stop the process of having American soldiers shed their blood on foreign soil only to have the peace accords dictated by nations whose efforts were minimal.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, October 25, 1993.

Hon. DONALD MANZULLO,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MANZULLO: This letter responds to your request, in connection with the proposed Iraq Claims Act, for background on the eligibility of members of the United States Armed Forces to file claims against Iraq before the U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC).

On June 26, 1992, the Governing Council of the Commission adopted Decision 11 (S/AC.26/1992/11) (enclosed), under which members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces who engaged in military operations against Iraq are ineligible to file claims, unless they were prisoners of war and were mistreated in violation of international humanitarian law. You asked for an explanation of how the Governing Council arrived at this decision.

At the end of the Persian Gulf War, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 687 (enclosed), which in paragraph 16 confirmed Iraq's liability under international law "for any direct loss, damage . . . or injury to foreign Governments, nationals and corporations, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait." The Security Council went on to establish a fund to pay compensation to eligible claimants and set up the Commission to administer the fund. It was left to the Governing Council of the Commission, composed of the fifteen member states of the Security Council, to determine the specific criteria for eligible claims, consistent with the terms of the resolution.

From the outset, the U.S. delegation to the Governing Council's first session (July 23–August 2, 1991) argued vigorously that all members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces, or their survivors, should be able to file claims for death or injury suffered in the course of military actions against Iraq. We argued that these individuals had been sent into harm's way to combat aggression on behalf of the United Nations and thus they were at least as deserving as any other claimant. We said such persons were clearly "nationals" covered by paragraph 16 of Resolution 687 and deserved to be compensated for their losses. However, other governments objected strenuously to the U.S. position, arguing that national governments should be responsible for compensating members of their armed forces, there were no clear international precedents for such compensation, and inclusion here would exceed the mandate of the Commission. No other government supported the U.S. position, and the matter was put off for later consideration (Decision 1, paragraph 7) (enclosed).

At the Governing Council's fifth session (March 16–20, 1992), another government introduced a proposal, supported by the U.S. delegation, to clarify that prisoners of war who had been mistreated in violation of international humanitarian law were eligible for compensation, under established international precedents. Again there were serious objections from several governments even to this more limited proposal. The matter was again postponed in favor of further study.

Finally, at the Council's sixth session (June 22–26, 1992), consensus was reached on adoption of Decision 11 (enclosed), which clarifies that prisoners of war who were mistreated are eligible to submit claims to the Commission. The U.S. delegation continued to argue that all members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces who suffered direct loss, damage or injury as a result of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait were entitled to make claims under Resolution 687. There was no support from any other Council member for the U.S. position. Other delegations continued to disagree, based on the reasons set forth above. In the end, other members of the Council would accept a provision stating that prisoners of war were eligible to claim compensation before the Commission on the basis of mistreatment only if the provision also clearly excluded all other claims by members of Allied Coalition Forces. Under the circumstances, and taking into account the importance of reaffirming the special status and protection to be accorded prisoners of war under international humanitarian law, the decision was the best result that could be obtained. The Department of Defense informed us that their priority was to increase international recognition of the status and rights of prisoners of war, and requested that the U.S. delegation support this decision.

Compensation for other members of the U.S. Armed Forces remains a matter for national legislation. Thus, we hope you will support adoption of the proposed Iraq claims legislation.

I hope we have been responsive to your concerns. Please contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

Enclosures: 1. Resolution 687; 2. UNCC Decision 1; 3. UNCC Decision 11.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL—
RESOLUTION 687 (1991)*

ADOPTED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL AT ITS 2981ST MEETING, ON 3 APRIL 1991

Recalling its resolution 660 (1990) of 2 August 1990, 661 (1990) of 6 August 1990, 662 (1990) of 9 August 1990, 664 (1990) of 18 August 1990, 665 (1990) of 25 August 1990, 666 (1990) of 13 September 1990, 667 (1990) of 16 September 1990, 669 (1990) of 24 September 1990, 670 (1990) of 25 September 1990, 674 (1990) of 29 October 1990, 667 (1990) of 28 November 1990, 678 (1990) of 29 November 1990 and 686 (1991) of 2 March 1991.

Welcoming the restoration to Kuwait of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and the return of its legitimate Government.

Affirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Kuwait and Iraq, and noting the intention expressed by the member States cooperating with Kuwait under paragraph 2 of resolution 678 (1990) to bring their military presence in Iraq to an end as soon as possible consistent with paragraph 8 of resolution 686 (1991).

Reaffirming the need to be assured of Iraq's peaceful intentions in the light of its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Taking note of the letter sent by the minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq on 27 February 1991[1] and those sent pursuant to resolution 686 (1991).[2]

Noting that Iraq and Kuwait, as independent sovereign States, signed at Baghdad on 4 October 1963 "Agreed Minutes Between the State of Kuwait and the Republic of Iraq Regarding the Restoration of Friendly relations, Recognition and Related Matters", thereby recognizing formally the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait and the allocation of islands, which were registered with the United Nations in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations and in which Iraq recognized the independence and complete sovereignty of the State of Kuwait within its borders as specified and accepted in the letter of the Prime Minister of Iraq dated 21 July 1932, and as accepted by the Ruler of Kuwait in his letter dated 10 August 1932.

Conscious of the need for demarcation of the said boundary.

Conscious also of the statements by Iraq threatening to use weapons in violation of its obligations under the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925,[3] and of its prior use of chemical weapons and affirming that grave consequences would follow any further use by Iraq of such weapons.

Recalling that Iraq has subscribed to the Declaration adopted by all States participating in the Conference of States Parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and Other Interested States, held in Paris from 7 to 11 January 1989, establishing the objective of universal elimination of chemical and biological weapons.

Recalling also that Iraq has signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Devel-

Footnotes at end of article.

opment, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, of 10 April 1972.[4]

Noting the importance of Iraq ratifying this Convention.

Noting moreover the importance of all States adhering to this Convention and encouraging its forthcoming Review Conference to reinforce the authority, efficiency and universal scope of the convention.

Stressing the importance of an early conclusion by the Conference on Disarmament of its work on a Convention on the Universal Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and of universal adherence thereto.

Aware of the use by Iraq of ballistic missiles in unprovoked attacks and therefore of the need to take specific measures in regard to such missiles located in Iraq.

Concerned by the reports in the hands of Member States that Iraq has attempted to acquire materials for a nuclear-weapons programme contrary to its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968,[5]

Recalling the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the region of the Middle East,

Conscious of the threat that all weapons of mass destruction pose to peace and security in the area and of the need to work towards the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of such weapons,

Conscious also of the objective of achieving balanced and comprehensive control of armaments in the region,

Conscious further of the importance of achieving the objectives noted above using all available means, including a dialogue among the States of the region,

Noting that resolution 686 (1991) marked the lifting of the measures imposed by resolution 661 (1990) in so far as they applied to Kuwait,

Noting that despite the progress being made in fulfilling the obligations of resolution 686 (1991), many Kuwaiti and third country nationals are still not accounted for and property remains unreturned,

Recalling the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages,[6] opened for signature at New York on 18 December 1979, which categorizes all acts of taking hostages as manifestations of international terrorism,

Deploring threats made by Iraq during the recent conflict to make use of terrorism against targets outside Iraq and the taking of hostages by Iraq,

Taking note with grave concern of the reports of the Secretary-General of 20 March 1991[7] and 28 March 1991,[8] and conscious of the necessity to meet urgently the humanitarian needs in Kuwait and Iraq.

Bearing in mind its objective of restoring international peace and security in the area as set out in recent resolutions of the Security Council,

Conscious of the need to take the following measures acting under Chapter VII of the Charter,

1. Affirms all thirteen resolutions noted above, except as expressly changed below to achieve the goals of this resolution, including a formal cease-fire;

A

2. Demands that Iraq and Kuwait respect the inviolability of the international boundary and the allocation of islands set out in the "Agreed Minutes Between the State of Kuwait and the Republic of Iraq Regarding the Restoration of Friendly Relations, Recognition and Related Matters", signed by them in the exercise of their sovereignty at Baghdad on 4 October 1963 and registered with the United Nations and published by the United Nations in document 7063, United Nations, Treaty Series, 1964:

3. Calls upon the Secretary-General to lend his assistance to make arrangements with Iraq and Kuwait to demonstrate the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait, drawing on appropriate material, including the map transmitted by Security Council document S/22412 and to report back to the Security Council within one month;

4. Decides to guarantee the inviolability of the above-mentioned international boundary and to take as appropriate all necessary measures to that end in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

B

5. Requests the Secretary-General, after consulting with Iraq and Kuwait, to submit within three days to the Security Council for its approval a plan for the immediate deployment of a United Nations observer unit to monitor the Khor Abdullah and a demilitarized zone, which is hereby established, extending ten kilometres into Iraq and five kilometres into Kuwait from the boundary referred to in the "Agreed Minutes Between the State of Kuwait and the Republic of Iraq Regarding the Restoration of Friendly Relations, Recognition and Related Matters" of 4 October 1963; to deter violations of the boundary through its presence in and surveillance of the demilitarized zone; to observe any hostile or potentially hostile action mounted from the territory of one State to the other; and for the Secretary-General to report regularly to the Security Council on the operations of the unit, and immediately if there are serious violations of the zone or potential threats to peace;

6. Notes that as soon as the Secretary-General notifies the Security Council of the completion of the deployment of the United Nations observer unit, the conditions will be established for the Member States cooperating with Kuwait in accordance with resolution 678 (1990) to bring their military presence in Iraq to an end consistent with resolution 686 (1991);

C

7. Invites Iraq to reaffirm unconditionally its obligations under the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, and to ratify the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, of 10 April 1972;

8. Decides that Iraq shall unconditionally accept the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless, under international supervision, of:

(a) All chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities;

(b) All ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometres and related major parts, and repair and production facilities;

9. Decides, for the implementation of paragraph 8 above, the following:

(a) Iraq shall submit to the Secretary-General, within fifteen days of the adoption of the present resolution, a declaration of the locations, amounts and types of all items specified in paragraph 8 and agree to urgent, on-site inspection as specified below;

(b) The Secretary-General, in consultation with the appropriate Governments and, where appropriate, with the Director-General of the World Health Organization, within forty-five days of the passage of the present resolution, shall develop, and submit to the Council for approval, a plan calling for the completion of the following acts within forty-five days of such approval:

(i) The forming of a Special Commission, which shall carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical and missile capabilities, based on Iraq's declarations and the designation of any additional locations by the Special Commission itself;

(ii) The yielding by Iraq of possession to the Special Commission for destruction, removal or rendering harmless, taking into account the requirements of public safety, of all items specified under paragraph 8(a) above, including items at the additional locations designated by the Special Commission under paragraph 9(b)(i) above and the destruction by Iraq, under the supervision of the Special Commission, of all its missile capabilities, including launchers, as specified under paragraph 8(b) above;

(iii) The provision by the Special Commission of the assistance and cooperation to the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency required in paragraphs 12 and 13 below;

10. Decides that Iraq shall unconditionally undertake not to use, develop, construct or acquire any of the items specified in paragraphs 8 and 9 above and requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Special Commission, to develop a plan for the future ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance with this paragraph, to be submitted to the Security Council for approval within one hundred and twenty days of the passage of this resolution;

11. Invites Iraq to reaffirm unconditionally its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968;

12. Decides that Iraq shall unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear-weapons-usable material or any subsystems or components or any research, development, support or manufacturing facilities related to the above; to submit to the Secretary-General and the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency within fifteen days of the adoption of the present resolution a declaration of the locations, amounts, and types of all items specified above; to place all of its nuclear-weapons-usable materials under the exclusive control, for custody and removal, of the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the assistance and cooperation of the Special Commission as provided for in the plan of the Secretary-General discussed in paragraph 9(b) above; to accept, in accordance with the arrangements provided for in paragraph 13 below, urgent on-site inspection and the destruction, removal or rendering harmless as appropriate of all items specified above; and to accept the plan discussed in paragraph 13 below for the future ongoing monitoring and verification of its compliance with these undertakings;

13. Requests the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, through the Secretary-General, with the assistance and cooperation of the Special Commission as provided for in the plan of the Secretary-General in paragraph 9(b) above, to carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's nuclear capabilities based on Iraq's declarations and the designation of any additional locations by the Special Commission; to develop a plan for submission to the Secu-

rity Council within forty-five days calling for the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless as appropriate of all items listed in paragraph 12 above; to carry out the plan within forty-five days following approval by the Security Council; and to develop a plan, taking into account the rights and obligations of Iraq under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968, for the future ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance with paragraph 12 above, including an inventory of all nuclear material in Iraq subject to the Agency's verification and inspections to confirm that Agency safeguards cover all relevant nuclear activities in Iraq, to be submitted to the Security Council for approval within one hundred and twenty days of the passage of the present resolutions;

14. Takes note that the actions to be taken by Iraq in paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the present resolution represent steps towards the goal of establishing in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction and all missiles for their delivery and the objective of a global ban on chemical weapons;

D

15. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the steps taken to facilitate the return of all Kuwaiti property seized by Iraq, including a list of any property that Kuwait claims has not been returned or which has not been returned intact;

E

16. Reaffirm that Iraq, without prejudice to the debts and obligations of Iraq arising prior to 2 August 1990, which will be addressed through the normal mechanisms, is liable under international law for any direct loss, damage, including environmental damage and the depletion of natural resources, or injury to foreign Governments, nationals and corporations, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait;

17. Decides that all Iraqi statements made since 2 August 1990 repudiating its foreign debt are null and void, and demands that Iraq adhere scrupulously to all of its obligations concerning servicing and repayment of its foreign debt;

18. Decides also to create a fund to pay compensation for claims that fall within paragraph 16 above and to establish a Commission that will administer the fund;

19. Directs the Secretary-General to develop and present to the Security Council for decision, no later than thirty days following the adoption of the present resolution, recommendations for the fund to meet the requirement for the payment of claims established in accordance with paragraph 18 above and for a programme to implement the decisions in paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 above, including: administration of the fund; mechanisms for determining the appropriate level of Iraq's contribution to the fund based on a percentage of the value of the exports of petroleum and petroleum products from Iraq not to exceed a figure to be suggested to the Council by the Secretary-General, taking into account the requirements of the people of Iraq, Iraq's payment capacity as assessed in conjunction with the international financial institutions taking into consideration external debt service, and the needs of the Iraqi economy; arrangements for ensuring that payments are made to the fund; the process by which funds will be allocated and claims paid; appropriate procedures for evaluating losses, listing claims and verifying their validity and resolving disputed claims in respect of Iraq's liability as specified in paragraph 16 above; and the composition of the Commission designated above;

F

20. Decides, effective immediately, that the prohibitions against the sale or supply to Iraq of commodities or products, other than medicine and health supplies, and prohibitions against financial transactions related thereto contained in resolution 661 (1990) shall not apply to foodstuffs notified to the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait or, with the approval of that Committee, under the simplified and accelerated "no-objection" procedure, to materials and supplies for essential civilian needs as identified in the report of the Secretary-General dated 20 March 1991,[9] and in any further findings of humanitarian need by the Committee;

21. Decides that the Security Council shall review the provisions of paragraph 20 above every sixty days in the light of the policies and practices of the Government of Iraq, including the implementation of all relevant resolutions of the Security Council, for the purpose of determining whether to reduce or lift the prohibitions referred to therein:

22. Decides that upon the approval by the Security Council of the programme called for in paragraph 19 above and upon Council agreement that Iraq has completed all actions contemplated in paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 above, the prohibitions against the import of commodities and products originating in Iraq and the prohibitions against financial transactions related thereto contained in resolution 661 (1990) shall have no further force or effect;

23. Decides that, pending action by the Security Council under paragraph 22 above, the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) shall be empowered to approve, when required to assure adequate financial resources on the part of Iraq to carry out the activities under paragraph 20 above, exceptions to the prohibition against the import of commodities and products originating in Iraq;

24. Decides that, in accordance with resolution 661 (1990) and subsequent related resolutions and until a further decision is taken by the Security Council, all States shall continue to prevent the sale or supply, or the promotion or facilitation of such sale or supply, to Iraq by their nationals, or from their territories or using their flag vessels or aircraft, of:

(a) Arms and related *materiel* of all types, specifically including the sale or transfer through other means of all forms of conventional military equipment, including for paramilitary forces, and spare parts and components and their means of production, for such equipment;

(b) Items specified and defined in paragraphs 8 and 12 above not otherwise covered above;

(c) Technology under licensing or other transfer arrangements used in the production, utilization or stockpiling of items specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

(d) Personnel or materials for training or technical support services relating to the design, development, manufacture, use, maintenance or support of items specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

25. Calls upon all States and international organizations to act strictly in accordance with paragraph 24 above, notwithstanding the existence of any contracts, agreements, licences or any other arrangements;

26. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with appropriate Governments, to develop within sixty days, for the approval of the Security Council, guidelines to facilitate full international implementation of paragraphs 24 and 25 above and paragraph 27 below, and to make them available to all States and to establish a procedure for updating these guidelines periodically;

27. Calls upon all States to maintain such national controls and procedures and to take such other actions consistent with the guidelines to be established by the Security Council under paragraph 26 above as may be necessary to ensure compliance with the terms of paragraph 24 above, and calls upon international organizations to take all appropriate steps to assist in ensuring such full compliance;

28. Agrees to review its decisions in paragraphs 22, 23, 24 and 25 above, except for the items specified and defined in paragraphs 8 and 12 above, on a regular basis and in any case one hundred and twenty days following passage of the present resolution, taking into account Iraq's compliance with the resolution and general progress towards the control of armaments in the region;

29. Decides that all States, including Iraq, shall take the necessary measures to ensure that no claim shall lie at the instance of the Government of Iraq, or of any person or body in Iraq, or of any person claiming through or for the benefit of any such person or body, in connection with any contract or other transaction where its performance was affected by reason of the measures taken by the Security Council in resolution 661 (1990) and related resolutions;

G

30. Decides that, in furtherance of its commitment to facilitate the repatriation of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals, Iraq shall extend all necessary cooperation to the International Committee of the Red Cross, providing lists of such persons, facilitating the access of the International Committee of the Red Cross to all such persons wherever located or detained and facilitating the search by the International Committee of the Red Cross for those Kuwaiti and third country nationals still unaccounted for;

31. Invites the International Committee of the Red Cross to keep the Secretary-General apprised as appropriate of all activities undertaken in connection with facilitating the repatriation or return of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals or their remains present in Iraq on or after 2 August 1990;

H

32. Requires Iraq to inform the Security Council that it will not commit or support any act of international terrorism or allow any organization directed towards commission of such acts to operate within its territory and to condemn unequivocally and renounce all acts, methods and practices of terrorism;

I

33. Declares that, upon official notification by Iraq to the Secretary-General and to the Security Council of its acceptance of the provisions above, a formal cease-fire is effective between Iraq and Kuwait and the Member States cooperating with Kuwait in accordance with resolution 678 (1990);

34. Decides to remain seized of the matter and to take such further steps as may be required for the implementation of the present resolution and to secure peace and security in the area.

FOOTNOTES

*S. Res. 687 (1991)—reissued for technical reasons.

[1] S/22275, annex.

[2] S/22273, S/22276, S/22320, S/22321 and S/22330.

[3] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138.
[4] General Assembly resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex.
[5] General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII).
[6] General Assembly resolution 34/146.
[7] S/22366.
[8] S/22409.
[9] S/22366.

FIRST SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMPENSATION COMMISSION

CRITERIA FOR EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF URGENT CLAIMS

1. The following criteria will govern the submission of the most urgent claims pursuant to resolution 687 (1991) for the first categories to be considered by the Commission. It provides for simple and expedited procedures by which Governments may submit consolidated claims and receive payments on behalf of the many individuals who suffered personal losses as a result of the invasion and occupation of Kuwait. For a great many persons these procedures would provide prompt compensation in full; for others they will provide substantial interim relief while their larger or more complex claims are being processed, including those suffering business losses.

2. These criteria are without prejudice to future Council decisions with respect to criteria for other categories of claims, which will be approved separately as promptly as possible, with expert advice from Commissioners as may be required.

3. The following criteria are not intended to resolve every issue that may arise with respect to these claims. Rather, they are intended to provide sufficient guidance to enable Governments to prepare consolidated claims submissions. It will likely be necessary for the Council to make further decisions on the processing of claims after receiving expert advice where needed.

4. Each Government may submit one or more consolidated claims for each category established by the Council. Thus, each Government may make separate consolidated submissions covering claims in each of the categories set forth below; and it may later submit separate consolidated claims for each additional category to be established by the Council.

5. The Council will promptly establish criteria for additional categories of claims, to permit consolidated submissions by Governments for all losses covered by paragraph 16 of resolution 687 (1991). Business losses of individuals may be part of consolidated claims under the expedited procedures set forth below. The Council will provide further advice on an urgent basis as to the types of business losses eligible for consideration under the expedited procedures. Business losses of corporations and other legal entities will be covered in other criteria to be established. The Council will also separately consider claims on behalf of third parties, such as Governments, insurance companies, relief agencies and employers, which have made payments or provided relief to persons suffering compensable losses.

6. The Council will consider promptly, after receiving expert advice, the circumstances in which claims for mental pain and anguish may be admitted, the amounts to be awarded, and the limits to be imposed thereon.

7. The Council will separately examine the question of the eligibility or otherwise of claims by or in respect of members of the allied coalition armed forces; the Executive Secretary will have available, inter alia, the provisions of the relevant national legislation of the Governments concerned.

8. The Commission will process the claims in the initial categories in paragraphs 10 to 16 on an expedited basis. While decisions on the precise method of processing these claims will be made at a later stage, the following steps are contemplated. As the claims are received they would be submitted to a panel of Commissioners for review within a set time limit. If, as expected, the volume of claims in these categories is large, the Commissioners would be instructed to adopt expedited procedures to process them, such as checking individual claims on a sample basis, with further verification only if circumstances warranted. The Commissioners would be asked to report to the Council on the claims received and the amount recommended for the claims submitted by each Government. The council would then decide on the total amount to be allocated to each government. To the extent necessary, the Council would seek expert advice (for example, on what constitutes serious personal injury) at any stage of the process.

9. As contributions are made to the Fund, the Council will allocate those funds among the various categories of claims. If resources of the Fund are insufficient with respect to all claims processed to date, pro rata payments would be made to Governments periodically as funds become available. The Council will decide on the priority for payment of various categories of claims.

PAYMENT OF FIXED AMOUNTS

10. These payments are available with respect to any person who, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait: (a) departed from Iraq or Kuwait during the period of 2 August 1990 to 2 March 1991; (b) suffered serious personal injury; or (c) whose spouse, child or parent died.

11. In the case of departures, $2,500 will be provided where there is simple documentation of the fact and date of departure from Iraq or Kuwait. Documentation of the actual amount of loss will not be required. Claims submitted under this procedure for departure from Iraq or Kuwait cannot be resubmitted for a greater amount in any other category. If the loss in question was greater than $2,500 and can be documented, it may instead be submitted under paragraph 14 and in other appropriate categories.

12. In addition, in the case of serious personal injury not resulting in death, $2,500 will be provided where there is simple documentation of the fact and date of the injury; and in the case of death, $2,500 will be provided where there is simple documentation of the death and family relationship. Documentation of the actual amount of loss resulting from the death or injury will not be required. If the actual loss in question was greater than $2,500, these payments will be treated as interim relief, and claims for additional amounts may also be submitted under paragraph 14 and in other appropriate categories.

13. These amounts are payable cumulatively where more than one situation applies with respect to a particular person. However, no more than $10,000 will be paid for death, and no more than $5,000 for departure, with respect to any one family (consisting of any person and his or her spouse, children and parents).

CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS FOR UP TO $100,000 OF ACTUAL LOSSES PER PERSON

14. These payments are available with respect to death or personal injury, or losses of income, support, housing or personal property, or medical expenses or costs of departure, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The Commission will give expedited priority consideration to claims for such losses up to $100,000 per person.

15. (a) Such claims must be documented by appropriate evidence of the circumstances and the amount of the claimed loss. The evidence required will be the reasonable minimum that is appropriate under the circumstances involved, and a lesser degree of documentary evidence would ordinarily be required for smaller claims, such as those below $20,000.

(b) If the loss in question was greater than $100,000, claims for additional amounts may also be submitted in other appropriate categories. Criteria for the submission of claims in excess of $100,000 will be approved separately. Claims larger than $100,000 may be submitted in their entirety at a later date under those separate procedures, or the first $100,000 may be submitted at this time and the remainder separately.

16. Compensation will not be provided for losses suffered as a result of the trade embargo and related measures, nor will costs of attorneys' fees or other expenses for claims preparation be compensated under this category. Any compensation, whether in funds or in kind, already received from any source will be deducted from the total amount of losses suffered.

REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE UNDER BOTH CATEGORIES

17. Claims will not be considered on behalf of Iraqi nationals who do not have bona fide nationality of any other State.

18. Claims must be for death, personal injury or other direct loss to individuals as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. This will include any loss suffered as a result of:

(a) military operations or threat of military action by either side during the period 2 August 1990 to 2 March 1991;

(b) departure from or inability to leave Iraq or Kuwait (or a decision not to return) during that period;

(c) actions by officials, employees or agents of the Government of Iraq or its controlled entities during that period in connection with the invasion or occupation;

(d) the breakdown of civil order in Kuwait or Iraq during that period; or

(e) hostage-taking or other illegal detention.

19. Claims will be submitted by Governments. Each Government will normally submit claims on behalf of its nationals; each Government may, in its discretion, also submit the claims of other persons resident in its territory. In addition, the Council may request an appropriate person, authority or body to submit claims on behalf of persons who are not in a position to have their claims submitted by a Government. Each Government shall make one or more consolidated submissions of all such claims for each category. The Council encourages the submission of such claims within six months from the date on which the Executive Secretary circulates to Governments the claims forms described below; and the Commission will thereupon give consideration to such claims as provided herein. The Council will consider at a later time period within which all such claims must be submitted.

20. Each consolidated claim must include:

(a) a signed statement by each individual covered containing:

(i) his or her name and address, and any passport number or other identifying national number;

(ii) for claims under paragraph 14, the amount, type, and reason for each element of

the loss, and any compensation, whether in funds or in kind already received from any source for the claim asserted;

(iii) any documents evidencing the matters set forth in the definition of each category, as well as the items set forth in the preceding subparagraph; and

(iv) his or her affirmation that the foregoing information is correct, and that no other claim for the same loss has been submitted to the Commission;

(b) the affirmation of the Government submitting the claim that, to the best of the information available to it, the individuals in question are its nationals or residents, and the affirmation of the Government or of the person, authority or body as referred to in paragraph 19 that it has no reason to believe that the information stated is incorrect.

21. The Executive Secretary (or a Commissioner) will prepare and the Executive Secretary will distribute a standard form for submission of claims within each category, incorporating the above elements in a clear and concise manner. Except as may otherwise be agreed between the Executive Secretary and the Government in question, claims will be submitted to the Executive Secretary by Governments or by persons, authorities or bodies as referred to in paragraph 19 on the standard form and must include the information in an official language of the United Nations. Each Government may adopt such procedures as it finds appropriate in preparing its consolidated claim. The Executive Secretary (or a Commissioner) will be available to answer questions or provide assistance to any Governments which may request it.

UNITED NATIONS COMPENSATION COMMISSION GOVERNING COUNCIL SIXTH SESSION GENEVA, JUNE 22-26, 1992

DECISION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMPENSATION COMMISSION AT ITS SIXTH SESSION, 27TH MEETING HELD ON JUNE 26, 1992—ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ALLIED COALITION ARMED FORCES

The Governing Council decides that members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces are not eligible for compensation for loss or injury arising as a consequence of their involvement in Coalition military operations against Iraq, except if the following three conditions are met:

(a) the compensation is awarded in accordance with the general criteria already adopted; and

(b) they were prisoners of war as a consequence of their involvement in Coalition military operations against Iraq in response to its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait; and

(c) the loss or injury resulted from mistreatment in violation of international humanitarian law (including the Geneva Conventions of 1949).

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of efforts to revise our current Iraqi prisoner of war [POW] resettlement policy.

It is difficult to imagine that the Government is currently resettling our former enemies—not in prisons—but in neighborhoods across the country. Just think, when the administration was cutting military and veterans' benefits it was, and is presently, providing rent assistance, job placement, medical care, and cash subsidies to our former enemy. It is expected that some 4,600 Iraqis will be admitted into the United States this year alone—costing the American taxpayers $32 million—approximately $7,000 per Iraqi.

Section 10 of the "Iraqi Claims Act" expresses the sense of the Congress that no former Iraqi POW's should be admitted to the United States except in exceptional circumstances. I support this provision and hope it is adopted by the House.

In response to the resettlement of Iraqi POW's in the United States, I personally introduced H.R. 3173 on September 29, 1993, which will prevent our former enemy from immigrating into the United States. I believe that former Iraqi POW's should not be permitted to immigrate to the United States except in extreme cases.

But I would like to stress those extreme cases where they have assisted the United States or the United Nations forces during the Persian Gulf conflict and when it can be shown they did not commit or participate in any war crimes.

Certainly, if they helped us, whether by intelligence efforts or what, if you get in there and win one of the most lopsided victories in history and the army can say that they were assisting us in the process, I do not see how we could turn our back on those people.

Madam Chairman, I strongly support section 10 and urge my colleagues to cosponsor my bill, H.R. 3173. While the enactment of this sense of Congress is an important first step only, the passage of my bill will actually stop the administration from resettling more Iraqi prisoners-of-war in the United States.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1410

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3221, which puts Congress on record in opposing further resettlement in this country of Iraqi prisoners of war who fought and killed our brave men and women during the Persian Gulf conflict. This language, which I offered, responds directly to wide-scale outrage at a policy that is clearly out of touch with mainstream America. Today, I am very gratified to tell the hundreds of individuals who have contacted me that, by adopting this legislation, Congress is saying "no" to a policy that would resettle Iraqi prisoners of war in the United States, with full benefits, at a cost to U.S. taxpayers of approximately $70 million.

The original rationale behind the resettlement of Iraqi's and their families was the belief that these POW's could face imprisonment or even execution by the government of Saddam Hussein if they returned to Iraq. Many were deserters who fled their units in fear for their lives in the hours and days before the American led coalition forces sliced through the Iraqi lines. However, nowhere and at no time did the United States ever promise resettlement. As my good friend and colleague, JAN MEYERS from Kansas, stated during committee consideration, "the help promised to Iraqi deserters was to feed them and not to shoot them."

The bottom line is clear: It is an insult to all Americans for our Government to take on this responsibility—forsaking our own people and particularly our own veterans, whose entitlements are being steadily eroded. The U.S. Government has no business putting enemy soldiers ahead of some 9 million unemployed Americans, and 250,000 homeless American veterans, including veterans of Operation Desert Storm.

I have been astounded by the outpouring of telephone calls and letters from across the Nation pleading for an end to this ludicrous policy.

Madam Chairman, I am proud to say that Congress, with the passage of this bill, can tell our constituents, can tell our young men and women who have served in the Armed Forces—and can tell ourselves—that we have listened and we have responded by officially opposing any further resettlement of Iraqi POW's.

I urge my colleagues' support for this legislation.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Chairman, I listened to the plea and the argument of the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY]. But then, as I understand it, he is not going to offer a motion to recommit so that these people cannot come in. He is only going to support this little weak, wimpy statement——

Mr. GALLEGLY. If——

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is the sense of the Congress——

Mr. GALLEGLY. To respond to the gentleman, my bill originally eliminated—if the gentleman would let me finish, my bill——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Chairman, the bill I offered in the form of a germane amendment that is now in the text of this——

Mr. KANJORSKI. Is this the gentleman's bill that is in this legislation?

If this were the gentleman's bill, just a sense of the Congress, we would only

be wishing the State Department would not do the things that they are doing. It would not cost us $7,000 a year, an Iraqi; $30,000——

Mr. GALLEGLY. That is correct, inasmuch as this is in a foreign affairs bill——

Mr. KANJORSKI. We could——

Mr. GALLEGLY. Be in the judiciary, but I could not get the bill heard in——

Mr. KANJORSKI. We could argue the proposition though that, if it is only a sense of the Congress and if the gentleman does not agree to offer this motion to recommit, which would make it—notwithstanding any other law they cannot do it——

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. KANJORSKI——

Mr. KANJORSKI. The gentleman does not favor——

Mr. GALLEGLY. I have the commitment from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, where this should be held, that he will bring this up and hear it, and that is the appropriate place to put more teeth into——

Mr. KANJORSKI. Why do we not put more teeth in until we define and describe what we are doing? We have got how many thousand Iraqi refugees in this country now? They are costing us $30 million a year. When we finally get a bill to the Committee on the Judiciary and any other committee that may be necessary 5 years from now, we may be in the next war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3221, especially to the extent that it would give Persian Gulf war veterans or their survivors first priority in filing claims against frozen Iraqi assets for injuries or deaths resulting from their participation in the war against Iraq.

I understand that potential claims against these assets may exceed $5 billion. Since there are only about $1.2 billion in frozen assets, it is only right that, if any group of injured parties should be compensated by the Iraqi Government, it should be those who fought and suffered injury to defeat the forces of Saddam Hussein in the liberation of Kuwait.

I would remind my colleagues that, to the extent that these veterans have suffered injury, disability, or death while serving in the Armed Forces, we have a comprehensive benefits system in place that is administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs. The vast majority of disabilities suffered by these veterans already result in benefit entitlements from the U.S. Government. The bill would not infringe on any veteran's right to receive benefits from the VA, but it does incorporate certain offset provisions that could reduce the amount of an award provided under this bill.

Madam Chairman, we do not know how many veterans may benefit by this bill. However, we believe that it may benefit some Persian Gulf veterans whose illnesses have not yet been linked to service and, to the degree that it puts veterans at the head of the line, we should support it.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing this measure to the floor and for his strong commitment to the well-being of our Nation's veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

Mr. LANCASTER. Madam Chairman, a number of United States exporters, acting entirely lawfully and with the encouragement of the United States Government, engaged in commercial sales of their products to Iraq before our trade embargo against that country. The exporters actually shipped their goods, and Iraq received them. Iraq authorized its financial agents in this country to pay these particular debts, but before payment could be delivered, hostilities broke out and the United States Government ordered all Iraqi assets frozen. They remain so today, and the exporters have never been paid.

Among the companies caught in this situation are tobacco exporters from North Carolina. The North Carolina exporters in my area felt they had fully protected their financial interests by having letters of credit issued, a system of payment used routinely in commercial transactions and never before having been abrogated in any trade setting except, I believe, in some Nigerian transactions several years ago.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] believes, as do I, that these companies deserve to have a higher priority against the frozen Iraqi assets than should other commercial claimants. Unfortunately, H.R. 3221 as reported from committee lumps all commercial claimants together.

The committee's bill deliberately gives the highest priority to claims from individuals who served in the U.S. armed services during the Persian Gulf war. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], which I understand will not be offered, would not disturb the bill's emphasis on compensation of Persian Gulf war veterans. The Bereuter amendment would make the bill fairer to those companies, including the exporters from North Carolina who, in good faith, completed their part of a commercial contract, but have yet to receive their payment. I regret that it will not be offered but hope that this issue will be addressed in the future.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I have now had the opportunity to review section 10 of this bill in some detail. I find this to be a bone in the throat of every gulf war veteran.

Immediately prior to the gulf war, Madam Chairman, I stood in the chow line in northeastern Saudi Arabia, and I happened to look at the helmet of the marine who stood in front of me in that line, and in the handwriting that marines from time to time put on their helmet covers this young marine had written, quote, "It's not about oil," end of quote.

As I see in here today, Madam Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that it is not about money.

I have heard a description of section 10 that simply does not conform to the language printed on the piece of paper. "Exceptional circumstances" is not defined. There is no recognition of those who aided American forces or, perhaps, did not pull a trigger. It is simply a broad generic term, exceptional circumstances, and worse than that, immediately after that phrase it states, and I quote, "Until all claims certified under section 2b of this act have been paid in full," which is to say, once money has changed hands, it is perfectly acceptable, even without exceptional circumstances, to allow those who took up arms in opposition to the United States to be brought into our country.

Madam Chairman, if we vote for this today, it is a slap in the face to every gulf war veteran who put his or her life on the line for our country. Those who raised arms in opposition to the United Sates, before or after the bills are paid, should not be allowed to come into our country, and, under truly exceptional circumstances, where mercy should be shown, where in an isolated individual case an Iraqi soldier clearly did aid American forces, perhaps after he had no choice in doing so, then it seems to me that our allies in that fight, perhaps Saudi Arabia, or those who provided aid and comfort to our enemy, perhaps Jordan, should provide an appropriate residency for those who seek asylum. But how can we pass section 10 and go home to our constituents, those who served in the gulf war, and say to them, "It was about oil, it is about money, and, as soon as bills are paid, your former enemies will be allowed to be your next-door neighbors".

Madam Chairman, I find that to be disgraceful, and under any circumstances, from now until the day I leave this Chamber, I will oppose the contents of section 10.

□ 1420

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 additional minute, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, let me say that I agree 100 percent with the remarks of the previous speaker. I would call the attention of the body to page 16, the minority and dissenting views in the full report of the Iraqi Claims Act of 1993. In there it states that because of the outrage that has just been expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, going back almost a year ago, we started working with the State Department, so that the policy of the State Department has come to a situation now where the language that appears on page 16 is their former policy. In other words, only those ex-Iraqi POW's and ex-Iraqi soldiers who, No. 1, did not fire on United States personnel and, No. 2, gave tangible assistance to the allied forces in terms of reconnaissance and things of that nature, unless they meet those criteria, they would not be allowed to settle in the United States. Anybody who gave tangible assistance to Saddam Hussein would be in a position to be in harm's way, and that would be the situation.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding more time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] has some further remarks to make, and I yield to him in order that he may complete his remarks.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary courtesy under the circumstances where he and I obviously have a different position on the pending piece of legislation.

The gentleman has accurately quoted from the minority report. What I would stress to my colleague is that the language which he cites appears nowhere in H.R. 3221.

H.R. 3221, which is the relevant legislation now before the House, simply says that under exceptional circumstances, not defined, even before the claims are paid, individuals who took up arms against the United States may be brought into our country. That is a legal issue. The language in H.R. 3221 simply does not conform to the minority report which the gentleman quotes.

But more importantly, in the real world of a battlefield, particularly in armored and mechanized conflict, there is absolutely no way to tell who has or who has not overtly engaged in hostile activities. The war in the gulf was fought at a distance of 2,000 to 3,000 meters where antiarmor weapons were fired at one another. Very little infantry conflict occurred. We simply do not know, nor does anyone else, who actually fired during the course of the war.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to try to clarify what the committee position is. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] has stated the language accurately. We did try to wrestle with this question of exceptional circumstances, but I think the important point to make is really a point that is in agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and that is that as a matter of United States policy, the committee believes that any individual who served in the Iraqi Armed Forces should not be admitted to the United States as a refugee. We believe that should be the policy. Those who have spoken against this section believe that should be the policy.

The differences arise over this phrase that we put into the language of the bill, "except in exceptional circumstances," and we tried to define that in the committee report, which would be part of the legislative language, and we made two exceptions. One of them was the active involvement in the rebellion against Saddam Hussein at the request of the United States, or forced enlistment in the armed forces of an ethnic or religious minority—and there are several, of course, in Iraq.

The second exception was an Iraqi soldier who provided tangible assistance to the United States or coalition forces during the Persian Gulf war. I do not know if we have exactly the right language here with respect to these exceptions, but the committee, with the help of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from California, worked very, very hard to get the right language, and I am quite prepared to work further on it.

I did want to try to clarify the language of the committee here, but the basic point is that we are all in agreement, and that is that as a matter of policy an individual who served in the forces of the country of Iraq should not be admitted to the United States as a refugee.

Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] has asked for 1 additional minute, and I will yield that to him before I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for their extraordinary courtesy.

The point I want to make goes beyond the question of how we are to define exceptional circumstances. If we are to be intellectually honest on this issue, we must recognize that under the language of H.R. 3221, once the crimes are satisfied in full, the issue of exceptional circumstances becomes moot. Under the language of H.R. 3221, once the claims are paid and certified, the issue of exceptional circumstances is no longer to be applied. At that point those who took up arms against the United States are to be admitted wholly independent of the question of exceptional circumstances.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, that is not how the language reads. It has never been the intent of the committee, because the committee chairman in a bipartisan manner worked extremely diligently to make sure the things the gentleman just said would come to pass.

Mr. MCHALE. Madam Chairman, I do not doubt the gentleman's intent. I am reading the language of the legislation. This says, "except in exceptional circumstances, until all claims certified under section 2(b) of this Act have been paid in full." The language is clear.

Mr. MANZULLO. After the "circumstances," there is a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee, who, I think, can give us a succinct description as to exactly what happened.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the point to be made here under the language the gentleman from Pennsylvania is pointing out is that we have, we estimate, $1.2 billion available. As nearly as we can estimate, we have claims well in excess of $5 billion, so the claims are not going to be certified in full.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 3221, the Iraqi Claims Act. I urge the House to approve this vital legislation.

The purpose of H.R. 3221 is to provide a fair and orderly system for adjudicating the claims of United States nationals against Iraq. Such claims include losses, damage, or injury suffered by individuals and corporations as a result of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait or events preceding the invasion.

The bill authorizes the United States Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to use available Iraqi assets under United States control to pay valid claims. For most American claimants, these frozen assets are the only current means of obtaining reimbursement from the Iraqi Government.

I particularly want to express my support for the Bonior amendment expressing the sense of Congress that we should immediately provide basic medical assistance through nongovernmental and international organizations to the people of Iraq, who continue to suffer under the oppressive policies of Saddam Hussein. The amendment also calls on the administration to seek reimbursement for the cost of such aid from Iraqi assets.

Passage of H.R. 3221 is the right thing to do. I urge the House to approve this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read.

No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order unless printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII.

The amendment by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] relating to certain commercial claims may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment.

After disposition of all other amendments to the committee substitute, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments in this order:

First, the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] relating to humanitarian assistance; and

Second, the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] relating to war crimes.

After disposition of those amendments, no further amendment to the committee substitute is in order.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 3221

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 "Iraq Claims Act of 1993".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS.

(a) CERTAIN CLAIMS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF UN COMMISSION.—The United States Commission is authorized to receive and determine the validity and amounts of any claims referred to it by the Secretary of State with respect to which the United States has received lump-sum payments from the United Nations Commission.

(b) OTHER CLAIMS AGAINST IRAQ.—The United States Commission is authorized to receive and determine the validity and amounts of any claims by nationals of the United States against the Government of Iraq that are determined by the Secretary of State to be outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations Commission.

(c) DECISION RULES.—In deciding claims under subsection (a) or (b), the United States Commission shall apply, in the following order—

(1) in the case of claims under subsection (a), relevant decisions of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Commission;

(2) applicable substantive law, including international law; and

(3) applicable principles of justice and equity.

(d) PRIORITY CLAIMS.—Before deciding any other claim against the Government of Iraq, the United States Commission shall, to the extent practical, decide all pending non-commercial claims of members of the United States Armed Forces and other individuals arising out of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait or out of the 1987 attack on the USS Stark.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT.—To the extent they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the provisions of title I (other than section 2(c)) and title VII of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1621–1627 and 1645–1645o) shall apply with respect to claims under this Act and the funds established pursuant to sections 3(a) and 3(c).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. CLAIMS FUNDS.

(a) UN COMMISSION CLAIMS FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish in the Treasury of the United States one or more funds (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "UN Commission Claims Funds") for payment of claims under section 2(a). The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into the UN Commission Claims Funds such amounts as are allocated to such funds pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM UN COMMISSION.—The Secretary of State shall allocate funds received by the United States from the United Nations Commission, in the manner the Secretary determines appropriate, between—

(1) the UN Commission Claims Funds; and

(2) funds established under the authority of the paragraphs under the heading "TRUST FUNDS" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven", approved February 26, 1896 (22 U.S.C. 2668a).

(c) IRAQ CLAIMS FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish in the Treasury of the United States a fund (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Iraq Claims Fund") for payment of claims under section 2(b). The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into the Iraq Claims Fund such amounts as are allocated to such fund pursuant to subsection (d).

(d) ALLOCATION OF PROCEEDS FROM IRAQI ASSET LIQUIDATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall allocate funds resulting from the liquidation of assets pursuant to section 4 in the manner the President determines appropriate between the Iraq Claims Fund and such other accounts as are appropriate for the payment of claims of the United States Government, subject to the limitation in paragraph (2).

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount allocated pursuant to this subsection for payment of claims of the United States Government may not exceed the amount which bears the same relation to the amount allocated to the Iraq Claims Fund pursuant to this subsection as the sum of all certified claims of the United States Government bears to the sum of all claims certified under section 2(b). As used in this paragraph, the term "certified claims of the United States Government" means those claims of the United States Government which are determined by the Secretary of State to be outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations Commission and which are determined to be valid, and whose amount has been certified, under such procedures as the President may establish.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY TO VEST IRAQI ASSETS.

The President is authorized to vest and liquidate as much of the assets of the Government of Iraq in the United States that have been blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) as may be necessary to satisfy claims under section 2(b), as well as claims of the United States Government against Iraq which are determined by the Secretary of State to be outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. REIMBURSEMENT FOR EXPENSES OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

(a) DEDUCTION.—In order to reimburse the United States Government for its expenses in administering the Iraq claims program and this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct—

(1) 1.5 percent of any amount covered into the UN Commission Claims Funds or the Iraq Claims Fund; and

(2) 1.5 percent of any amount the Secretary of State receives from the United Nations Commission that is not covered into the UN Commission Claims funds and that is not in payment of a claim of the United States Government.

(b) DEDUCTIONS TREATED AS MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS.—Amounts deducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Commission shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury each award made pursuant to section 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make payment, out of the appropriate fund established pursuant to section 3(a) or 3(c), in the following order of priority to the extent funds are available in such fund:

(1) Payments of $10,000 or the principal amount of the award, whichever is less.

(2) For each claim that has priority under section 2(d), payment of a further $90,000 toward the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the award.

(3) Payments from time to time in ratable proportions on account of the unpaid balance of the principal amounts of all awards according to the proportions which the unpaid balance of such awards bear to the total amount in the appropriate claims fund that is available for distribution at the time such payments are made.

(4) After payment has been made of the principal amounts of all such awards, pro rata payments on account of accrued interest on such awards as bear interest.

(5) After payment has been made in full of all the awards payable out of a fund estab-

lished pursuant to section 3(a) or 3(c), any funds remaining in that fund shall be transferred to the other claims fund established pursuant to section 3(a) or 3(c), except that any funds received by the United States from the United Nations Commission shall be so transferred only to the extent not inconsistent with requirements of the United Nations Commission.

(b) UNSATISFIED CLAIMS.—Payment of any award made pursuant to this Act shall not extinguish any unsatisfied claim, or be construed to have divested any claimant, or the United States on his or her behalf, of any rights against the Government of Iraq with respect to any unsatisfied claim.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC 7. RECORDS.

(a) TRANSFER TO COMMISSION.—The head of any Executive agency may transfer or otherwise make available to the United States Commission such records and documents relating to claims authorized to be adjudicated by this Act as may be required by the United States Commission in carrying out its functions under this Act.

(b) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Freedom of Information Act") shall not apply with respect to records that, as determined by the Secretary of State, are required under the rules and decisions of the United Nations Commission to be withheld from public disclosure.

The Chairman, are there any amendments to section 7?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC 8. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS; DISPOSITION OF UNUSED FUNDS.

(a) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any demand or claim of payment on account of an award that is certified under the Iraq claims program shall be barred one year after the publication date of the notice required by subsection (b).

(b) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the end of the 9-year period specified in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish a notice in the Federal Register detailing the statute of limitations provided for subsection (a) and identifying the claim numbers and awardee names of unpaid certified claims.

(2) PUBLICATION DATE.—The notice required by paragraph (1) shall be published 9 years after the latter of—

(A) the last date on which the Secretary of the Treasury covers into any of the UN Commission Claims Funds, or into any fund described in section 3(b)(2), amounts allocated to that fund pursuant to section 3(b); or

(B) the last date on which the Secretary of the Treasury covers into the Iraq Claims Fund amounts allocated to that fund pursuant to section 3(d).

(c) DISPOSITION OF UNUSED FUNDS.—

(1) DISPOSITION.—At the end of the 2-year period beginning on the publication date of the notice required by subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall dispose of all unused funds described in paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) By making additional payments pursuant to the Iraq claims program.

(B) By depositing in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts any such funds that are not used for such additional payments.

(2) UNUSED FUNDS.—The unused funds referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) any remaining balance in the UN Commission Claims Funds or in the Iraq Claims Funds, including the amount of any unpaid certified claim under the Iraq claims program; and

(B) any remaining balance in any fund referred in section 3(b)(2) to the extent such balance reflects amounts deposited pursuant to that section.

□ 1430

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8? If not, the Clerk will designate section 9.

The text of section 9 is as follows:

SEC 9. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Government of Iraq" includes agencies, instrumentalities, and controlled entities (including public sector enterprises) of that government;

(2) the term "Executive agency" has the meaning given that term by section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term "Iraq claims program" means the claims whose adjudication is provided for in this Act and any other claims that are within the jurisdiction of the United Nations Commission;

(4) the term "United Nations Commission" means United Nations Compensation Commission established pursuant to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (1991); and

(5) the term "United States Commission" means the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 9? If not, the Clerk will designate section 10.

The text of section 10 is as follows:

SEC 10. ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES AS REFUGEES OF INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF IRAQ DURING THE PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that individuals who have served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict should not be admitted to the United States as refugees under the Immigration and Nationality Act except in exceptional circumstances until all claims under section 2(b) of this Act have been paid in full.

(b) PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "Persian Gulf conflict" means the period beginning on August 2, 1990, and ending on February 27, 1991.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 10? If not, it is in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONIOR: On page 12, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 11. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Saddam Hussein has been condemned by the international community for his unwillingness to take the steps necessary to provide for the basic humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people;

(2) dire shortages of food, medicine, and basic medical supplies (including insulin, anesthetics, and antibiotics) have resulted in a continuing humanitarian disaster in Iraq, including massive human suffering and the death of hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians during the past 4 years;

(3) This human tragedy is occurring throughout Iraq;

(4) the United States has a long history of providing humanitarian assistance to alleviate human suffering in many parts of the world; and

(5) the United States Agency for International Development has the authority under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) and other provisions of law to provide assistance to address humanitarian needs throughout Iraq.

(b) STATEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should immediately provide additional humanitarian assistance, particularly medicine and medical supplies, to alleviate the humanitarian disaster throughout Iraq;

(2) such assistance should be provided through independent nongovernmental organizations and through international organizations so that this desperately needed assistance can reach all areas of need, in particular those outside the United Nations protected areas; and

(3) the costs of such assistance should be reimbursed from any available Iraqi resources, including the Iraqi assets that have been blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act so long as such reimbursement does not reduce the amount paid on those priority claims of members of the United States Armed Forces and other described in section 2(d) of this Act and does not delay payment on those claims.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Chairman, there is a great deal of tragedy occurring in the world today.

Places like Bosnia, Haiti, and Rwanda capture our attention each and every night, and we mourn the loss of life in each of those places.

But ever since CNN and all the foreign correspondents left Baghdad 3 years ago, we haven't paid much attention to Iraq.

But 3 years after the gulf war ended, one of the great humanitarian tragedies of our time is occurring in Iraq today.

Estimates are that 120,000 children under the age of 5 have died in Iraq in the past 3 years alone.

Iraq today is a place where mothers see their babies scream in agony because operations must be performed without anesthesia.

It is a place where diabetics lapse into comas because there is no insulin.

A place where children suffering from leukemia are routinely sent home from hospitals because there is no medicine to provide them care.

Three years after international sanctions were levied on the people of Iraq, hundreds of thousands of civilians in that country are dying today due to a lack of food, water, and basic medicine.

Make no mistake about it, Madam Chairman, Saddam Hussein and Saddam Hussein alone bears responsibility for this tragedy. He continues to turn a blind eye to the suffering of his own people.

And at this point, I suppose we could just throw up our hands, turn a blind eye, point a finger at Saddam, and say we tried.

But I believe we are a better nation than that, Madam Chairman.

I believe we have a continuing responsibility as a compassionate nation to provide humanitarian relief to the mothers and children who are dying in Iraq today.

And the fact is, we do not have to send in troops to do it.

There are independent organizations in place right now—organizations like Oxfam, and CARE, and UNICEF, and the World Health Organization, and the Chaldean community, and Red Crescent, and other Moslem relief organizations—who are administering some relief to the people of Iraq as we speak.

But their combined efforts meet less than 5 percent of the needs of the Iraqi people. Any medicine we could send would go a long way toward ending the suffering in Iraq.

Yet current United States policy prohibits Iraq from purchasing medicine here, even with assets still in Iraq.

This amendment simply expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should immediately provide medicine to Iraqi citizens through these nongovernmental and international organizations, particularly in those areas outside the U.N.-protected area.

It says that this aid should be provided through already-appointed disaster assistance funds or other sources.

And it says that we should seek reimbursement for this aid from any Iraqi resources—including the $1.2 billion in frozen assets—but in a way that does not reduce or delay payment to claims filed by United States veterans of the Persian Gulf war, and the U.S.S. *Stark*.

Anything we can do would go a long way toward alleviating the suffering of the people of Iraq.

And what could be more galling to Saddam Hussein than the money he sees as his, and for his use alone, go to the people he continues to oppress.

And Madam Chairman, what could be more in line with the point President Bush made time and time again during the gulf war: that we did not wage war against the civilian population of Iraq.

They were not our enemy.

And now, there are concrete steps we can and must take to save the lives of people caught up in a war that was none of their doing, and which none of them wanted.

Saddam Hussein may do nothing to help his own suffering people. But we are a better nation than that.

And I do not believe that we, in good conscience, can stand by and do nothing.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I just want to thank the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for his amendment. I think the gentleman has pointed to a very real problem. The humanitarian suffering in Iraq has been enormous, and the gentleman has put his finger on it.

Madam Chairman, this is a good amendment, and we accept it.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Bonior amendment that expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should provide immediate assistance through nongovernmental organizations to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in Iraq.

As this resolution points out, shortages of medicine and food exist throughout Iraq. Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi Government continue to maintain a virtual embargo against the Kurds in the north and the Shia Arabs in the south and, as a result, humanitarian supplies go only to regime supporters and the military.

The U.N. sanctions regime, in contrast, exempts medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The committee also routinely considers and approves requests to send supplies for essential civilian needs. Regrettably, the supplies only seem to reach the so-called U.N.-protected areas.

This amendment would attempt to meet the humanitarian crisis throughout the entire country. I urge its adoption.

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

Madam Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by my good colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Madam Chairman, at the time of the Persian Gulf crisis, President Bush said many times that America had no argument with the people of Iraq. President Clinton has reiterated that same point. Indeed, I think that it could be said that the American people have never borne any personal animosity toward the Iraqi people.

□ 1440

Our problem continues to be with the dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein, a tyrant who is utterly without a shred of conscience, a man who has inflicted unspeakable suffering on this own people.

The amendment by the gentleman from Michigan is terribly, terribly important. Our country has a long history of offering a helping hand to the people of other countries. I hope that the initiative being made today by the gentleman from Michigan will result in some very necessary humanitarian assistance reaching the people of Iraq who have suffered so much and, indeed, who continue to suffer today under unmerciful atrocities by this tyrant.

Madam Chairman, I strongly urge support of the Bonior amendment, as well as the one I will be offering immediately after adoption of the pending amendment. I will offer a sense-of-Congress amendment which would ask the United Nations to create a war crimes tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein with atrocities against human beings in neighboring countries and amongst his own people.

I urge support of the Bonior amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Chairman, in the aftermath of the gulf war, the Government of Iraq has been responsible for terrible acts of repression and neglect for its citizens. The many victims include children, the elderly, the sick, and Iraq's religious minorities.

Rather than addressing its suffering and needy citizens, the Iraqi Government has chosen to spend its scarce money elsewhere, including the construction of a tower to honor Saddam Hussein.

The Iraqi Government has a lot of debts to pay; debts to our service men and women, American business people, as well as the Iraqi citizens who remain victims of their own Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

On Page 12, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 11. PROSECUTION OF SADDAM HUSSEIN AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE IRAQI GOVERNMENT FOR WAR CRIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) as ordered by Saddam Hussein, Iraq engaged in unprovoked aggression in its conquest and occupation of Kuwait;

(2) the Iraqi occupation force treated Kuwaiti citizens barbarously;

(3) Saddam Hussein used American and European civilians as "human shields" in an attempt to protect strategic facilities throughout Iraq and directed that captured American and allied prisoners of war be used for the same purposes;

(4) Saddam Hussein ordered his military to launch missile attacks against innocent civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia; and

(5) former President Bush and President Clinton rightly warned Saddam Hussein and Iraqi Government officials that they would be held responsible for any abuses they have caused.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRIBUNAL.—The Congress urges the President to request the United Nations to establish a tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein and other responsible Iraqi Government officials for war crimes, acts of aggression, and crimes against humanity they have committed.

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

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

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to comport with page and line numbering in the Union Calendar No. 236 version of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: In the instructions, strike "line 2," and insert "line 15."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment, as modified.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, my amendment to this bill is short, simple, and to the point. I trust it will be noncontroversial. It simply expresses the sense of Congress that the President should request that the United Nations establish a tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein and other responsible Iraqi officials for war crimes, acts of aggression, and crimes against humanity.

Madam Chairman, this amendment's simplicity does not detract from its importance. This amendment, along with the excellent amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] concerning the humanitarian situation in Iraq, will send a strong message to the rest of the world that the United States Congress has not forgotten the heinous crimes that Saddam Hussein has committed and continues to commit against his own people, the people of Kuwait, the people of Israel and, frankly, of all of the people throughout the Middle East. If he is allowed to continue, the list of victims will be even longer than that.

Madam Chairman, I do not need to remind anyone here today about just how abominable this man's crimes have been. Let me just talk about a few for the record.

This war criminal, Saddam Hussein, gassed his own citizens in 1988. He engaged in unprovoked aggression against the peaceful country of Kuwait in 1990. He then proceeded to mass troops on the Saudi Arabian border and, while subjecting Kuwait's citizens to unbelievable barbarous cruelty, which Members all remember, this war criminal took Americans and European civilians hostage and used them as human shields.

During the war, he launched missile attacks against civilians in neighboring countries like Israel and Saudi Arabia.

As the war was winding down, he lit hundreds of oil wells on fire, destroying millions of dollars of wealth and releasing incalculable levels of poison into our atmosphere, seriously affecting not only innocent women and children and others who could not help themselves but American soldiers serving there as well. Our soldiers are this very day suffering from the illnesses caused by that environmental debacle.

After the war, Madam Chairman, he unleashed brutal attacks against his own population, the Kurds and others in the north and the Shiites in the south.

Madam Chairman, after World War II, the civilized world did the right thing and brought the Nazi criminals to justice. Even if the number of Saddam's victims may not approach those of Hitler's millions, the crimes of Saddam Hussein and his accomplices are just as heinous and those heinous crimes continue right today.

Even if we do not see them on the front pages of the newspapers, even if we do not see them on the nightly newscasts, they are there. And they are just as bad as what is happening in Bosnia today and, in many cases, even worse. The cruelty and barbarity of Saddam Hussein knows no bounds.

Madam Chairman, this unspeakable dictator must be brought to justice. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment overwhelmingly, to show the support of this Congress to go on record as favoring this course of action.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], one of the most respected Members of this House and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON. Madam Chairman, I rise for the purpose of commending the gentleman for this amendment. It is a very, very worthy amendment.

He has made an excellent, eloquent statement in support of it. We support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman very, very much.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the amendment being offered by our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

This amendment urges the President to request that the United Nations establish a tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein and other responsible Iraqi Government officials with war crimes and other crimes against humanity. We cannot forgive or forget those atrocities committed against Kuwaiti and Iraqi civilians alike.

Those officials who ordered the deliberate attacks against civilians in neighboring Israel and in Saudi Arabia must know that they are going to ultimately be held responsible. And lest anyone think that we can simply close the book on Iraq and turn our attention to other areas of the world, the United Nations has recently declared that Iraq has not met its obligations toward Kuwait and third country nationals it detained during the war. Iraq continues its refusal to cooperate with the International Committee of the Red Cross in accounting for more than 600 missing individuals.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to adopt the Solomon amendment, thereby keeping the spotlight focused on this outlaw regime that refuses to adhere to the norms of international behavior.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Chairman, I understand that there is bipartisan support for the bill, and a number of veteran service organizations support it.

Personally, however, I am concerned that the bill sets up a precedent for compensating veterans from a pool of our enemy's assets.

Except in the instance of POW abuse, I am informed that this has never been done before.

It is a precedent that upon careful examination, I believe, is not as good as it may first appear.

One almost wonders whether it creates a lottery situation for veterans contingent upon whether the soldier's call to arms will be in a rich country or poor one.

I sympathize with my colleague's desire to incorporate some form of relief to veterans in this bill.

However, these veterans should be fully compensated for their sacrifices in the Persian Gulf war, as is the case with other veterans, under the current programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Clearly the Foreign Affairs Committee intends to recognize the problems faced by some of those who return from the Persian Gulf war.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has also done this by expediting legislation to give priority treatment in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who were exposed to toxic or environmental hazards during their service in the Persian Gulf war.

To the degree this bill puts veterans first in line for compensation from Iraq, it helps make up for the inadequacies of the Clinton budget for veterans and the VA.

But I would rather have members of the Foreign Affairs Committee pushing for greater VA funding, than providing for individual veterans.

We are well aware that the administration's VA budget falls short of what is required for veterans in nearly every category.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs bipartisan report to the Committee on the Budget justly puts it this way:

In striking contrast to the needs which VA faces in fiscal year 1995 and beyond, the administration requested a level of funding substantially below what is needed to maintain current services to veterans.

I hope that we would not again seek to use this type of compensation mechanism in the future.

It is our Nation's obligation to care for the soldier who answers this country's call and for surviving family members and that is where it should remain.

The compensation regime contemplated in the Iraq Claims Act of 1993 stands in stark contrast to that provided to veterans of the Somalian effort, yet their sacrifice is no less.

Shouldn't Congress look to find a more inclusive and equitable approach consistent for all veterans?

With a budget of nearly $1.5 trillion, there should be ample room for Congress to meet the Nation's obligation to its veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1450

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA) having assumed the chair, Ms. ESHOO, 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. 3221) to provide for the adjudication of certain claims against the Government of Iraq, pursuant to House Resolution 410, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MANZULLO. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANZULLO moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 3221) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike section 10(a) and insert the following:

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, individuals who have served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict may not be admitted to the United States as refugees under the Immigration and Nationality Act.".

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the motion to recommit and make a point of order against it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the motion to recommit is not germane, because as I understand it, and I have not had the opportunity to see it, but I was trying to listen very carefully. As I understand it, it tries to change the basic immigration law that is the law of the land. I therefore think it should be subject to a point of order as not germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee in raising the issue that this is a nongermane amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANZULLO. I wish to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, under these very exceptional circumstances as to this rough language that was found in this bill as brought to the house by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think it would be in the best order and in the best interests of the American public to defeat this bill in final passage and sent it back to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs to redo the language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I wish to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague on the Republican side, and compliment him for rising to the occasion to offer our motion to recommit. We join him in that.

I agree, I think it is very unfortunate that we have had to come to this point. Perhaps it is part of all of our faults, and certainly not the fault of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He knew least of this of anyone here.

Very clearly, I want to state to my colleagues that are going to be called to vote on this bill that if we send this out there, we are saying that "you can buy refugee status in the United States if you have worn a uniform and fired on American troops," and it is going on and will continue to go on, and we will have no way to stop it until years down the road, when finally this body or someone else does.

I urge all my colleagues on all sides, in honor of the people that have served in the Gulf——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman should restrict his statements to the point of order.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The point of order is that it is most unfortunate that my colleagues on either side have raised the point of order. I think the motion to recommit is very clear, what the intention of this Congress should be. I have urged my colleagues, if possible, that they relinquish their point of order so we can have an up-and-down vote on the true meaning in the language of the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] makes a point of order that the amendment contained in the motion to recommit with instructions is not germane. The test of germaneness in this situation is to measure the amendment against the bill in its perfected form. The bill, as amended, appears to confine changes in law to those within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

While section 10 does express the sense of Congress relating to Iraqi refugees, the bill does not change the Immigration and Nationality Act, other laws relating to admission of refugees, or contain other matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Since the amendment would change immigration law and the bill would not, the Chair sustains the point of order.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANZULLO moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 3221) to the Committee on Foreign Af-

fairs, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: Strike section 10(a) and insert the following:

SEC. 10. ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES AS REFUGEES OF INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF IRAQ DURING THE PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that individuals who have served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict should not be admitted to the United States as refugees under the Immigration and Nationality Act except in exceptional circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit is debatable for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], the author of the motion, for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield just to clarify that the gentleman is accepting the language of the bill as the committee has reported it, except that the gentleman is striking the words on line 21, beginning with the word "until," and the balance of that sentence, is that correct?

Mr. MANZULLO. That is line 10, beginning at line 10, through the remainder of the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. I apologize. We are reading from different bills.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is striking the words "until all claims certified under section 2(b) of this Act have been paid in full," is that correct?

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. It is beginning on line 10, the word "until" through the end of line 11.

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman is retaining subsection (b)?

Mr. MANZULLO. That is correct.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we accept that on this side.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I especially want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], who fought in the Persian Gulf war.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion to recommit is simply to make it clear once and for all that there are very limited circumstances under which a former Iraqi ex-POW can make his way to the United States under refugee status. By sending this back on a motion to recommit, this will have the effect of removing from it the time element frame with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania had concern.

His concern was as follows: That he initially agrees with the fact that individuals who have served in the Iraqi Army in the Persian Gulf conflict should be admitted to the United States as refugees under only very, very limited circumstances. Those limited circumstances are set forth in the committee report. The gentleman was concerned that the phrase that we have just stricken, "until all claims certified," meant that once all claims certified had been paid, then the door would be open to any ex-Iraqi POW, and I thank the gentleman for that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member rise in opposition to the motion to recommit?

If not, the question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the bill, H.R. 3221, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Strike section 10(a) and insert the following:

SEC. 10. ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES AS REFUGEES OF INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF IRAQ DURING THE PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that individuals who have served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict should not be admitted to the United States as refugees under the Immigration and Nationality Act except in exceptional circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No debate is in order on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 5, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd

Shuster	Swett	Velazquez
Sisisky	Swift	Vento
Skaggs	Synar	Visclosky
Skeen	Talent	Walker
Skelton	Tanner	Walsh
Slaughter	Tauzin	Waters
Smith (IA)	Taylor (MS)	Watt
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Tejeda	Weldon
Smith (OR)	Thomas (CA)	Wheat
Smith (TX)	Thomas (WY)	Whitten
Snowe	Thompson	Williams
Solomon	Thornton	Wilson
Spence	Thurman	Wise
Spratt	Torkildsen	Wolf
Stark	Torres	Woolsey
Stearns	Torricelli	Wyden
Stenholm	Towns	Wynn
Strickland	Traficant	Yates
Studds	Tucker	Young (AK)
Stump	Unsoeld	Young (FL)
Stupak	Upton	Zeliff
Sundquist	Valentine	Zimmer

NAYS—5

Filner	Kanjorski	McHale
Holden	Klink	

NOT VOTING—29

Barlow	Ford (TN)	Murtha
Bryant	Frost	Pelosi
Calvert	Goodlatte	Quinn
Clay	Gordon	Rush
Condit	Grandy	Slattery
DeFazio	Huffington	Stokes
DeLauro	Istook	Volkmer
Derrick	Kyl	Vucanovich
English	Lloyd	Washington
Ford (MI)	Murphy	

□ 1523

Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. FILNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CAMP and Mr. COX changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING VOTE ON H.R. 4250, HUMAN SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1994

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order for the yeas and nays on H.R. 4250.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3860

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 3860.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3221, IRAQ CLAIMS ACT OF 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 3221. The clerk be authorized to change "1993" to "1994" in section 1 of the bill, to correct duplicative section numbers of sections added to the bill during the amendment process, and to make such other technical corrections as may be necessary.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3221, the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2333, STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2333), to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, April 25, 1994, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, April 25, 1994, at page 8455.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from New York is opposed to the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] opposed to the conference report?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] opposed to the conference report?

Ms. SNOWE. I am opposed, and I would like to be allocated the customary one-third of the time for debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time will be divided three ways.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2333. The bill before you today provides basic authorization for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the operating expenses of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Peace Corps. The bill provides no authorization for foreign assistance programs. These will be the subject of the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act. The bill before us is, as we sometimes call it, the bureaucracy bill.

The conference agreement has, in budget terms, adheres in its authorization levels to the limitations and assumptions of the fiscal year 1995 House-passed congressional budget resolution. This means that the bill before us authorizes, in the aggregate, less than the administration has requested in terms of new appropriations. For fiscal year 1995, the conference agreement authorizes over $400 million less than the bill passed by the House last year, and some $150 million less than 1993 appropriated levels. This is simply a reflection of the reality that the days are long gone when we could add things to authorization bills without showing the appropriations committee how we intend to pay for them.

The funding provisions of the bill itself are austere, to say the least. The administration's budget request constitutes a hard freeze to many accounts, made reductions to some others, and zeroed out still others entirely. The conference agreement accepts most of these cuts, and preserves provisions which will constrain the Foreign Service bureaucracy in the one area in which abuses have become egregious: personnel. The bill includes statutory personnel ceilings similar to those enacted in annual Defense Authorization Acts, which will reduce the size of the Senior Foreign Service by 10 percent over 2 years.

One centerpiece of the draft bill, in my opinion, is its provision for organizational flexibility. For the State Department, the bill as drafted provides a degree of much-needed organizational and managerial flexibility. It author-

izes all subcabinet appointments the Department has formally requested, and allows the Secretary to shuffle and reshuffle positions, bureaus, and offices in any way he sees fit. With a few exceptions, the bill would repeal all statutory micromanagerial provisions which preserve existing positions and organizations at State. It evidences our willingness, in a time of extreme fiscal constraint, to allow the executive branch to organize itself in the most efficient way possible, subject to notification.

In title II of H.R. 2333, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995, we are providing the resources required by the U.S. Information Agency to carry out its broad range of public diplomacy programs. For purposes of clarification, I want to note that for the fiscal year 1994, we are specifically authorizing the appropriations enacted earlier in Public Law 103-121.

For that year, under the heading of Salaries and Expenses, section 201(a)(1), we have provided $487,988,000, which includes $14,500,000 allowed by the Appropriations Committee under the Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs account to meet some of the administrative and other support costs for those exchange programs.

Inasmuch as some of the fiscal year 1994 support costs were already under Salaries and Expenses and all such costs are in the Salaries and Expenses request for fiscal year 1995, we have placed all such costs in the Salaries and Expenses heading for both years to provide overall comparability. Thus, we have authorized the $14,500,000 for fiscal year 1994 to be used for exchange program support although we have included it in a different category from the appropriations legislation.

Among major policy issues, title VII of the conference agreement contains the Arms Control and Non-Proliferation Act of 1994, a close cousin of H.R. 2155, a bill originally introduced by Congressman LANTOS and myself. This important policy initiative, long overdue, permits the revitalization of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ACDA. ACDA has played a vital role in pursuit of important national objectives in arms control and disarmament. With the end of the cold war, ACDA's mission is no less important.

Indeed, halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction has moved to the top of our national security objectives. The revitalization of ACDA will place that Agency in a leadership position in our international nonproliferation activities. The act recognizes the Director of ACDA as the principal advisor in the executive branch on matters relating to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament. ACDA has the lead in the U.S. effort to extend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty when it comes up for renewal next year; ACDA has the lead in the negotiations currently underway in Geneva to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. ACDA led the successful negotiations on the Chemical Weapons Convention, a global treaty outlawing chemical weapons, and now is in charge of leading the U.S. Government's implementation of the accord. I look forward to ACDA's continuing revitalization so that once again that proud Agency will assume the role envisioned for it when it was created by Congress more than 30 years ago.

Title III of this bill—The United States International Broadcasting Act—constitutes a consolidation of our nonmilitary international broadcasting activities. Under a new Broadcasting Board of Governors our broadcast services will reorganize and reorient their activities to meet the challenges of the post-cold-war world, utilize new technologies, and save millions of taxpayer dollars over the next few years.

This title also authorizes Radio Free Asia which will significantly enhance and improve our ability to deliver accurate news and information to the people of China and others living under oppressive Asian regimes.

This bill also reauthorizes the Lautenberg-Berman amendment. This provision facilitates the granting of refugee status for certain historically persecuted groups such as Jews and Evangelical Christians from the former Soviet Union. The potential for political extremism and the growth in antiminority sentiment in the former Soviet Union are vivid illustrations of why this legislation remains as vital and necessary as ever.

I want to mention briefly two other provisions of this bill. The first is the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. This legislation, first passed last year after the September handshake on the White House lawn which many of us were privileged to witness, allowed the President to waive certain provisions of law restricting United States contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization for a limited period of time. We now extend the President's authority to continue to waive those provisions for 6-month increments until July 1, 1995, so long as he can certify that it is in the U.S. national interest to do so and that the PLO continues to abide by all its commitments made in September 1993.

Mindful of Yassir Arafat's reticence to condemn the recent acts of Palestinian terror and violence in Israel and the territories—a reticence which stands in stark contrast to the heartfelt and anguished response of Yitzhak Rabin after the Hebron massacre—we have toughened the standard required for Presidential certification. We express our expectation that future waivers will be conditioned on the PLO's renunciation of the Arab economic boycott of Israel and its efforts to dismantle the boycott, and on its renunciation of individual acts of terrorism and violence. We also require that the President's written policy justification in exercising his waiver authority include a report on the PLO's response to such acts, what it has done regarding the Arab boycott, and on the status of the PLO office in the United States.

I also want to mention other provisions of the bill dealing with the Arab boycott and diplomatic relations with Israel. The bill expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State make the issue of Israel's diplomatic status a priority and urge countries which receive United States assistance to establish immediately full diplomatic relations with Israel. Currently, some 30 countries receiving United States aid do not have diplomatic ties with Israel. It also prohibits the sale or lease of any defense articles or services by the United States to any country or international organization that is known to have sent letters to United States firms requesting compliance with the secondary or tertiary Arab boycott of Israel. The President may waive this provision for 1 year only if he certifies to Congress that such a waiver is in our national security interest or that it will promote the objective of ending the boycott. This important provision will provide teeth to our common goal of finally putting a stop to this reprehensible discrimination.

A word now on the motion to recommit soon to be offered by the gentlelady from Maine. I strongly oppose this motion, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do likewise.

The gentlelady from Maine has represented the issue at hand in terms of the status of the United States embargo against Vietnam. With all due respect, neither the gentlelady's motion, nor the provision it addresses, will affect United States trade with Vietnam in any way. The President has already lifted the embargo on Vietnam. The provision to which the gentlelady objects is no more than sense-of-the-Senate—not the Congress and not the House—language which at this point amounts only to an endorsement of the President's action.

What the gentlelady's motion will do, however, is to produce an intolerable procedural situation: Either the House will have to stay in session—and the Senate recalled—to redo what we're doing now, or the State Department and the other agencies with expenditures authorized by this bill will have to shut down, worldwide, until we do our business, at a cost to the taxpayers of at least $2 million a day. Regardless of where Members stand on the issue of the Vietnam embargo, either of these outcomes should be unacceptable.

This motion is unusual. We are not talking here about a provision voted

down by the House and picked up later in conference from the Senate. In fact the House has not voted on this issue. Nor is it being asked to do so now. Once again, this is sense-of-the-Senate language. In practical terms, the gentlelady's motion will not accomplish her objective. In conference last week, the Senate insisted on its position and the House conferees voted to accept it. Recommitting the report to conference is unlikely to change that equation.

□ 1530

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

I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2333, the State Department, USIA, and Related Agencies Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. This conference report authorizes the basic operations of the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I am pleased to report that the measure before us, returns to the House floor with an authorization level that is $436 million below the House-passed bill for fiscal year 1995. We also provide a key authority for the State Department to collect and retain fees for issuing machine readable nonimmigrant visas and to use such fees to cover the costs of providing consular services and upgrading visa processing systems. I strongly support the modernization of the visa processing systems and the implementation of an upgrade of all overseas visa lookout operations. These systems are vital to establishing a more secure system of entry into this country.

We also authorize the administration's request for flexibility to reorganize the State Department. However, the reorganization plan submitted for approval by Congress eliminated the Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism. I strongly objected to this proposal, and sought to restore the primacy of this issue within the Department by retaining the office. I was supported in this effort by a 357 to 2 vote by the House on a motion to instruct the conferees to retain my amendment contained in the House bill which maintained the independent and high-level Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism reporting directly to the Secretary of State. The will of the House prevailed and a favorable resolution was reached by the conferees. The Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism will be retained for an additional 12 months.

I reluctantly agreed to a compromise on this issue, even after a very strong House recorded vote, which was necessary because of very strong, and in my opinion misguided, State Department opposition to my amendment.

I especially want to thank our distinguished chairman Mr. HAMILTON, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BERMAN, for working to help accommodate my serious concerns about doing away at this time, with this vital office, particularly after the terrorist bombing of the Trade Center in New York. This attack made it clear that the threat of international terrorism, especially to Americans has not diminished. Rather than lowering our guard, we must strengthen our defenses against this evil.

Under the compromise proposal we will retain the Counterterrorism Office with the same responsibilities, functions and status that it held on January 20, 1993, when President Clinton took office. I am urging the State Department to give that office the strong, tough and hardline antiterrorism leadership it needs as well as to provide the necessary resources to do the job. I also ask that the Department clearly live up to the letter and intent of my amendment not to merge the narcotics and counterterrorism functions during this critical period.

Chairman HAMILTON has also agreed in the interim to have hearings along with Mr. BERMAN in the Foreign Affairs Committee. We need to take testimony from the counterterrorism experts early next year. We should for example, explore the links between drugs and terrorism if any, that could justify a merger of the counterterrorism functions into the antinarcotics account as the State Department desired.

I am including, at the end of my remarks and as part of this statement an OpEd piece from the Washington Times from April 20, 1994, captioned "Keeping Counter-terrorism a Serious Priority" by Peter Flory. Mr. Flory, along with other experts he cites in this piece, makes a persuasive and compelling case that the House position was, and is, correct. But more importantly, he concludes that this debate about State Department organization, truly involves much more than boxes on an organizational chart; it involves American security and American lives in the years to come. I commend it to my colleagues and all those concerned about the international terrorism threat which America faces today.

The scope of the bill was broadened in the Senate to include several foreign policy provisions. Many of these policy provisions were retained by the conference committee and will strengthen our foreign policy objectives.

This is true for the Hyde provision expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should terminate the arms embargo for Bosnia. In addition, inclusion of Senator GLENN's Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, will strengthen nonproliferation sanctions on companies and Governments that knowingly promote the spread of nuclear weapons through sales, transfers or financing.

On a bipartisan basis, the conferees designed stringent new U.N. management and peacekeeping reforms. In response to overwhelming concern about the weak U.N. management practices, the proliferation of U.N. peacekeeping missions, and the rapid increase in U.S. financial obligations for peacekeeping this year, the legislation sets up a carrot and stick approach to force discipline on the United Nations. We require a withholding of assessments to the regular U.N. budget and of the fiscal year 1994 supplemental authorization until an independent office of inspector general is established and an IG is appointed. We have also included a cap of 30.4 percent on current U.S. payments for U.N. peacekeeping which is below the increased assessment imposed by the United Nations last year. Beginning in fiscal year 1996 the bill prohibits the United States from paying more than 25 percent for any U.N. peacekeeping operation.

Furthermore, we require monthly consultations with Congress on participation of U.S. Armed Forces in peacekeeping operations and other important changes in ongoing operations. There is a requirement for written prior notification on votes in the Security Council to establish new peacekeeping operations. And, we will be able to reduce U.S. peacekeeping costs by allowing U.S. excess defense articles to be provided to the United Nations and credited against the U.S. peacekeeping assessment.

Another key initiative in this bill is the consolidation of our international broadcasting activities. This reorganization of broadcasting is projected to save in the future approximately $100 million a year, and increases flexibility to determine broadcasting priorities. The bill also preserves the independent status of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and creates a new independent Radio Free Asia [RFA]. The objective of RFA is to increase broadcasting into the closed Asian societies where independent news and information is not available to the people. I support the effort to increase our access to these countries through our international broadcasting system. I also support the continuation of broadcasting to Cuba under this reorganization.

Another special concern to me is our policy toward Tibet. I am pleased that this conference report contains three provisions specifically directed toward improving and increased exchanges with, access to, and information about Tibet.

Mr. Chairman, also contained in this conference report are two important provisions pertaining to American involvement with the Palestine Liberation Organization as the Middle East peace negotiations continue. Section 728 of the Senate bill amends the PLO Commitments Compliance Act to strengthen the reporting requirement by adding the PLO commitment letters to Israel and Norway, and the Septem-

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 6) 46

ber 13, 1993, Declaration of Principles Agreements as elements to be included in the State Department's reports to Congress.

Because presidential certification of the PLO, as required by the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, occurs every 6 months, the reporting requirements in the PLO Commitments Compliance Act is extended from every 120 days to every 6 months. This permits Congress to conduct the necessary oversight prior to presidential certification. Most of the changes to the PLO Commitments Compliance Act proposed by the State were welcome and will strengthen congressional oversight of the act.

In conference, the Senate agreed to maintain an original reporting requirement of a statement of whether the PLO has repealed provisions in its covenant which call for Israel's destruction, as well as a statement which specifically discusses the PLO's position on the unrest in the territories. I support the conference agreement as pertains to the PLO Commitments Compliance Act, and urge my colleagues to accept it.

The Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, [MEPFA], which the Senate considered in the title X, contained a number of provisions that were removed from the conference agreement. Through the MEPFA, Congress grants the President a waiver authority for a period of time, during which the President can waive four laws banning or severely restricting PLO involvement with the United States. Most prominent among the laws is the prohibition against the PLO having an office in the United States. The current waiver, which spans 6 months, expires on July 1, 1994.

In title X, the Senate proposed to permanently transfer the waiver authority from Congress to the President. The President would have eternal authority to waive the laws pertaining to the PLO as long as he certified that the PLO was in compliance and made his certification known to Congress every 6 months. As adopted by the Senate, the proposal would have only permitted Congress to disagree with the President through a joint resolution of disapproval, leaving Congress with no oversight of the four laws covered by the MEPFA.

Congress remains deeply concerned about the PLO for many reasons. Accordingly, it is the intent of Congress that further extensions of the waiver authority be considered only on a periodic basis. Congress does not intend to shirk its constitutional responsibility by relieving itself of this crucial oversight function. The conference agreement removed the joint resolution proposal from the bill, and returned to the existing structure of the act. The conference agreement extends the President's waiver authority for 1 year only, until July 1, 1995, primarily because consideration of an extension during an election year made an additional 6 month waiver impractical.

As adopted by the conferees, the act includes two congressional expectations. One currently exists in law but was not included in the Senate version. The second expectation is new. Conditional for extending the waiver authority, the President must take into account whether the PLO renounces the Arab League boycott of Israel, urges the nations of the Arab League to end the boycott, and cooperates with United States efforts to do so. The second congressional expectation notes that any extension exercised by the President be contingent upon the PLO, through Chairman Arafat, condemning individual acts of terrorism and violence against Israelis and Jews committed by Palestinians in furtherance of Palestinian political aims.

Also new to the act is a reporting requirement, stipulated prior to Presidential certification, which details the PLO's reaction and response to individual acts of terrorism and violence, its actions concerning the Arab League boycott of Israel, and the status of any PLO office in the United States.

As ranking republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I find that the State Department's reporting about the PLO office will be of great assistance in determining whether future Presidential waivers should be adopted. It is therefore anticipated that the report discuss—but not be limited solely to—whether a PLO office is being established and when it will begin functioning, its location, staffing levels, administrative and nonadministrative structure, funding, diplomatic status, as well as an outline of the issues that those affiliated with the office will be working on. It would be even more helpful if, in advance of preparing the reports, the State Department met with interested Members of Congress, including myself, to discuss those items that should be included in the report.

Overall, I would have preferred to adjust the MEPA waiver date to April 1, 1995. Yet July 1, 1995, is the alternative the conference committee agreed upon. In addition, the committee of conference agreed to the inclusion of the phase "in good faith" regarding PLO compliance with the implementation of the Declaration of Principles. This was at the request of the Department of State. While not a perfect measure, it is adequate for the current task, and I support its inclusion in the conference agreement.

Lastly, the conference report includes a Sense of Senate provision that the President should lift the trade embargo against Vietnam and that the two countries should move toward normalization of relations. This provision will be the subject of a motion to recommit by the gentlelady from Maine.

I recognize the active role the gentlelady from Maine has taken in steering this bill through subcommittee and enabling the measure to make it through conference. I also understand the strong views she holds on opposing this Senate provision. The resolution of the POW/MIA issue is of great importance to me, and has been for many years. I intend to support the gentlelady's motion to recommit with instructions to delete this provision. But, I also want to emphasize that I intend to support the conference report on final passage and urge my fellow Republicans to also vote favorably on final passage. The measure before us has an overwhelming number of important reforms—both in the management and the foreign policy sectors—and there are new authorities necessary for these agencies to improve their efficiency and effectiveness.

With respect to lifting of sanctions, I commend the gentlelady from Maine for offering the motion to recommit and I rise in strong support of it. The Vietnam provision in this conference report commends Vietnam for its supposed cooperation with the United States on resolving the fate of American POW/MIA's and recommends to the President that he lift the embargo. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the Vietnamese Government continues to stonewall on providing us information on our missing servicemen.

Earlier this year, a letter was sent to the President signed by 70 former American POW's from the Vietnam war, including our colleague, SAM JOHNSON, urging him not to lift the embargo. The reason these distinguished 70 veterans gave was lack of cooperation from the Vietnamese and our loss of leverage.

Our ex-POW's said to the President that cooperation from the Vietnamese is not at all about access to crash or burial sites. It is about getting answers from the Vietnamese about those hundreds of men they held behind at the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of their February 3, 1994, open letter to the President from 70 former POW's opposing the lifting of the embargo against Vietnam will be included at the end of my remarks.

The Vietnam provision in this conference report ignores this critical matter entirely. Let me repeat, the provision ignores United States Intelligence assessments accepted and reinforced by more recently-acquired information that officials of Communist Vietnam and Laos have not provided any information about hundreds of men we know they still held after the war. Accordingly, the provision is grossly inaccurate and rubs salt in the wounds of those who served in Vietnam and were held in the camps.

For this reason, not on single major veteran or POW/MIA family group supports the provision.

Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I wrote to the Secretary of State concerning a February 18 New York Times article reporting that the State Department had urged Russian officials not to release anymore information about Vietnam's holding our men after the war. I requested from the Secretary copies of all cables referenced in the New York Times article and an explanation of the events surrounding the story. On March 24, a month later, I received a reply from Assistant Secretary Wendy Sherman stating that the cables are classified and that my request for them is being taken into consideration. I wrote again on March 30. It has been another month and I still have not seen copies of those cables. What is there to hide?

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have the necessary security clearances to read classified material. What sort of an answer is that to a request initiated in response to an article in a daily newspaper? Until we get to the bottom of these unanswered questions and those I raised earlier in my statement I'm afraid our veteran and POW/MIA family organizations are not going to have much faith in their government when it comes to the issue of our missing men.

Accordingly, I support the Snowe motion to recommit.

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

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 20, 1994]

KEEPING COUNTER-TERRORISM A SERIOUS PRIORITY

(By Peter Flory)

Six Americans are killed and more than 1,000 injured in the World Trade Center bombing. The bombers are found guilty, while others await trial for plotting to destroy New York City landmarks and murder American officials. Saddam Hussein tries to assassinate former President Bush—compelling President Clinton to fire his first Tomahawks in anger. Meanwhile, the bombings in Israel underscore the vulnerability of the Middle East peace process, a critical U.S. interest; the unpredictable and murderous North Korean government is under pressure; and Salman Rushdie and Iranian dissidents are hunted down around the world. Finally, in our most important piece of unfinished business, the Libyan bombers of Pan Am 103 have yet to be brought to justice.

In a nutshell, this seems like an odd time to put the "Terrorism" file in the "Solved" folder, or assume that terrorism is no longer a threat to American lives and interests. But that is what the State Department has been trying to do, by proposing to downgrade and marginalize its senior counter-terrorism official, the coordinator for counter-terrorism. This may sound like bureaucratic line-drawing of interest only to Beltway insiders, but it could have tragic consequences in the real world. This unwise policy could weaken American security and endanger American lives.

House-Senate conferees are now completing action on the State Department authorization bill, H.R. 2333. The House version of the bill contained an amendment by Rep. Benjamin Gilman of New York which would have retained the independent counter-terrorism office (known in bureaucratese as S/CT) with the focus and clout to do its job. The Senate bill contained the State Department proposal, cynically modified to preserve some of the trappings, though not the substance, of bureaucratic effectiveness. On Monday, the House voted by an overwhelming 357-2 to instruct its conferees to insist on the Gilman amendment. Conferees reportedly agreed yesterday to a compromise formula that retains the counter-terrorism office in its present form for one year, allowing Congress to hold thorough hearings on the issue.

The State Department plan to eliminate the counter-terrorism office is flawed for several reasons.

First, it seems to assume that terrorism is no longer a serious threat. As recounted above, it is. While the number of terrorist attacks is generally declining, the audacity of terrorists and their choice of targets—a former U.S. president and the World Trade Center—are in some ways more alarming than ever. As long as the United States remains actively engaged in the world—as it clearly must—there will be governments and groups committed to the use of violence to attack U.S. interests and further their own political goals. And they will note that while Iraq challenged the United States by conventional military means and was devastated, Iran, Libya and Syria have never adequately paid for their roles in terrorist attacks that killed many more Americans than died in Desert Storm.

Second, there is no efficiency or symbiosis gained by lumping the narcotics, crime and terrorism functions together, as the State Department would like. In particular, linking counter-terrorism to counter-narcotics is a superficial and flawed approach. True, some Latin American narcotics traffickers have used terrorism and some terrorists, like Peru's Shining Path, have sold drugs. But the over-whelming majority of terrorist attacks against American interests is political in nature. Lumping these related functions together will eviscerate our counter-terrorism policy. It will also needlessly undermine our counter-narcotics efforts, say the former deputy director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, John P. Walters, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters William J. Olson.

Third, the proposed multi-function office is a blueprint for bureaucratic impotence. The measures required to fight terrorism are never popular with vested interests, whether in our own or other countries' bureaucracies. So first, a strong U.S. policy requires leadership at home. Since 1986, the State Department has served as the lead counter-terrorism agency. This requires that the department's Office of Counter-Terrorism have sufficient clout with the regional and economic bureaus within State, and with other agencies in Washington, many of which may have their own priorities.

Then the policy has to be implemented abroad, with terrorist states themselves, and with other governments who sometimes let their own commercial and regional interests in countries like Iran and Iraq undermine a united diplomatic front against terrorist states.

A successful example was the critical role of the counter-terrorism coordinator in spearheading the Pan Am 103 policy. The conventional wisdom at the State Department was that the United States, Britain and France would never persuade the U.N. Security Council to condemn Libya's role in the bombing. But we did—in a unanimous vote. Then they said we'd never get sanctions against Libya. Wrong again, but only because S/CT energized the State Department to make it happen.

Today, as the Wall Street Journal has reported, an oil embargo against Libya would be the perfect occasion for another such effort. With Libyan-grade oil from other sources abundant and cheap, now is the time to push the Europeans to cut their dependence on Libyan oil and impose the only kind of sanctions left that might force Col. Moammar Gadhafi to hand over the murderers of 270 innocent people, including 189 Americans. But even if the administration follows up on its campaign rhetoric in this regard, neither the European foreign ministries nor the Libyans will be impressed by the proposed new bureaucratic lineup.

Here is what the State Department proposal would do. Until now, the head of the counter-terrorism office, the government's senior full-time counter-terrorism official, reported directly to the secretary of state, and with assistant secretary rank, could demand respect in Washington and foreign capitals. State wants to lower the job to deputy assistant secretary rank and put it at the bottom of a long and cumbersome reporting chain.

First, the incumbent would report to a new assistant secretary who is also responsible for narcotics and international crime, and who in practice would be largely consumed by the day-to-day budgetary, administrative, interagency, diplomatic and congressional demands of the counter-narcotics portfolio. This official will report, in turn, to an under-secretary—whose other global responsibilities include international population control, environmental matters, refugees, human rights, democratization, labor, oceans policy and crime—who will report to the secretary.

This long, cumbersome chain would fool no one, least of all terrorists and foreign governments. It could only undermine our ability to pursue an effective counter-terrorism policy, especially in crisis situations, and send a signal that the United States had decided terrorism is no longer a priority issue.

This kind of mistake has been made before, for it was into a similar bureaucratic morass that America's counter-terrorism policy had fallen in the early 1980s. Recognizing the need for better high-level coordination, President Reagan in 1985 directed the State Department to upgrade the terrorism position to ambassador-at-large, with direct access to the secretary of state. It worked. The policy was taken seriously, by other agencies and governments.

Terrorism is not a partisan issue. In fact, this proposed reorganization plan was drafted in the Bush administration. Then, as now, it was a bad idea, one that could be costly to American security and American lives in the years to come.

AMERICAN DEFENSE INSTITUTE,
Alexandria, VA, February 3, 1994.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON FROM FORMER POW'S

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are deeply troubled by news reports that you may have an announcement to make on the trade embargo against Hanoi in a matter of days. You have also been quoted as saying that there are many distinguished veterans who think the embargo should be lifted. As former

American POWs of the Vietnam War, we urge you, in the strongest possible terms, not to take further steps to restore economic or diplomatic relations with Hanoi until you can certify that the Communist government there is being fully forthcoming in telling us what they know about our fellow POWs and MIAs who did not make it home with us in 1973.

Mr. President, all of us who were held as POWs in North Vietnam know first-hand that there are no limits to what the Vietnamese will do to show they are "cooperating" with the United States to account for our missing comrades. We consider ourselves experts at distinguishing between propaganda and results. As Dr. Kissinger once stated, Hanoi's leaders are duplicitous and they will stop at nothing to achieve their goals.

Some of our fellow POWs died in captivity in Vietnamese prisons. Yet they have not been accounted for. Some of our crewmates became missing during the same incidents which we survived. They too have not been accounted for. Some were captured and never heard from again. They have not been accounted for. Finally, a great many of our comrades never returned from Laos, even though we know they survived their incidents. North Vietnam controlled Laos during the war, and yet they still have not accounted for a single POW captured and held in Laos during the war.

There are those in Congress who are urging you to lift the embargo as a means to get more information. Mr. President, such a recommendation is nothing but a submission to blackmail by Hanoi. Do not let yourself be manipulated on this issue. The only way to get Hanoi to unilaterally provide what they are withholding is to be firm. Do you really think that those of us who made it home would have been released if the U.S. hadn't flexed its muscle during the December, 1972 bombing campaign? Of course not. And while we certainly do not recommend military action, we do recommend that the sanctions continue until the Communists in Hanoi decide to be fully forthcoming in accounting for our fellow POWs and MIAs.

Mr. President, we sacrificed precious years of our lives while in captivity. We survived because we believed our country would hold true to principle despite the disruptions at home. Please do not let us down by abandoning any hope we have of firmly convincing Hanoi to account for the remaining POWs and MIAs who came into their possession or control during the war. And please do not tell us that crash site excavations and fragmentary archival documents should be the measure of success in judging Vietnam's cooperation to date. We know better.

Sincerely,

U.S. Congressman Sam Johnson, USAF, POW 16 April 66–73; Adm. James B. Stockdale, POW 9 Sept. 65–73; Col. Orson Swindle, USMC, (Ret.), POW 11 Nov. 66–73; Bg. Robinson Risner, USAF (Ret.), POW 16 Sept. 65–73; Capt. Eugene "Red" McDaniel, USN (Ret.), POW 19 May 67–73; Col. Larry Barbay, USAF (Ret.), POW 20 July 66–73; Col. Jerry Marvel, USMC (Ret.), POW 24 Feb. 68–73; LCol. Myron Young, USAF (Ret.), POW 6 July 66–73; Cdr. Dale Osborne, USAF (Ret.), POW 23 Sept. 68–73; Col. Rudolf Zuberbuhler, USAF (Ret.), POW 12 Sept. 72–73; LCol. Keith Lewis, USAF (Ret.), POW 5 Oct. 72–73; LCol. James Padgett, USAF (Ret.), POW 11 May 72–73; Col. Bob White, USAF (Ret.), POW 24 Nov. 69–73; LCol. John Alpers, USAF (Ret.), POW 5 Oct. 72–73; Capt. Cole Black, USN (Ret.), POW 21 June 66–73; Capt. Moon Mullen, USN (Ret.), POW 6 Jan. 67–73; Capt. James L. Hutton, USN (Ret.), POW 16 Oct. 65–73; Capt. Bill Stark, USN (Ret.), POW 19 May 67–73; Capt. Harry Jenkins, USN (Ret.), POW 13 Nov. 65–73; Col. James Young, USAF (Ret.), POW 6 July 66–73; LCol. Konard Trautman, USAF (Ret.), POW 5 Oct. 67–73; Col. Laird Gutterson, USAF (Ret.), POW 23 Feb. 68–73.

Col. Ted Guy, USAF (Ret.), POW 22 MAR 68–73; Mr. Mike Bongs, Civ, POW 28 Jan 68–73; Col. Lee Ellis, USAF (Ret.), POW 7 Nov 67–73; Col. Jay Jensen, USAF (Ret.), POW 18 Feb 67–73; Maj. Jose Anzaldua, USMC, (Ret.), POW 23 Jan 70–73; Mr. Larry Stark, Civ, POW 1 Feb 68–73; Col. Bert Campbell, USAF (Ret.), POW 1 July 66–73; Capt. Irv Williams, USN, (Ret.), POW 24 Apr 67–73; Maj. John Parsels, USA (Ret.), POW 5 Feb 70–73; Col. A.J. Myers, USAF (Ret.), POW 1 Jun 66–73; Col. Steve Long, USAF (Ret.), POW 28 Feb 69–73; Col. Jack Van Loan, USAF (Ret.), POW 20 May 67–73; Col. Bill Baugh, USAF (Ret.), POW 21 Jan 67–73; Col. Don Burns, USAF (Ret.), POW 2 Dec 66–73; Col. Art Burer, USAF (Ret.), POW 21 Mar 66–73; Col. Thomas Klomann, USAF (Ret.), POW 20 Dec 72–73; Col. Ken Cordier, USAF (Ret.), POW 2 Dec 66–73; Capt. Jim Bell, USN, (Ret.), POW 16 Oct 65–73; Maj. Mark Smith, USA (Ret.), POW 7 Apr 72–73; Maj. Dennis L. Thompson, USA (Ret.), POW 7 Feb 68–73; Col. Bob Jeffrey, USAF (Ret.), POW 20 Dec 65–73; Col. Julian Jayroe, USA (Ret.), POW 19 Jan 67–73; Capt. Ross Terry, USN, (Ret.), POW 9 Oct 66–73; and LCol. Hank Barrows, USAF (Ret.), POW 19 Dec 72–73.

Col. Wes Schiernan, USAF (Ret.), POW 28 Aug 65–73; Col. Fred Flom, USAF (Ret.), POW 8 Aug 66–73; Capt. Gordon Nagagawa, USN, (Ret.), POW 21 Dec 72–73; Col. Terry Uyeyama, USAF (Ret.), POW 18 May 69–73; Col. Frank D. Lewis, USAF (Ret.), POW 28 Dec 72–73; Col. Gobel James, USAF (Ret.), POW 15 July 68–73; Lt. Bill Robinson, USAF (Ret.), POW 20 Dec 65–73; Col. Ralph W. Galati, USAF (Ret.), POW 16 Feb 72–73; Capt. Ev Sothwick, USN, (Ret.), POW 14 May 67–73; Col. Ken Wallingford, USA (Ret.), POW 7 Apr 72–73; Mr. Harry Ettmueller, USA, POW 3 Feb 68–73; Mr. John A. Dearing, USMC, POW 3 Feb 68–73; MSG. Donat J. Gouin, USA (Ret.), POW 3 Feb 68–73; Col. James O. Hivner, USAF (Ret.), POW 5 Oct 65–73; Col. James L. Lamar, USAF (Ret.), POW 6 May 66–73; Col. Thomas M. Madison, USAF (Ret.), POW 15 May 66–73; Capt. Render Crayton, USN, (Ret.), POW 7 Feb 66–73; Capt. Brian Woods, USN, (Ret.), POW 18 Sept 68–73; Col. Jim Bedinger, USAF (Ret.), POW 22 Nov 69–73; Capt. Jim Hickerson, USN, (Ret.), POW 22 Dec 67–73; Capt. Dave Carey, USN, (Ret.), POW 31 Aug 67–73; Capt. Rob Doremus, USN, (Ret.), POW 24 Aug 65–73; Capt. Reid McCleary, USN, (Ret.), POW May 67–73; and S/SGT. John Sexton, USA, POW 12 Aug 69–73.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I will concentrate my remarks on a motion I will offer to recommit the conference report for the purpose of removing section 521. Following general debate, my motion will call for the removal of a Senate provision which praises the Communist Government of Vietnam for cooperation in accounting for American POW's and MIA's, despite continued stonewalling on this issue that goes back years.

Obviously, I am deeply disappointed by this conference report. For 9 years I have been proud to serve as the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on International Operations, which drafts the State Department Authorization Act. Until now, this bill has always been a genuine bipartisan product that I have never been unable to support. Today, that is no longer true.

Section 512 is a Senate provision that praises the Government of Vietnam for its supposed cooperation in accounting for American POW's and MIA's. It calls for an immediate lifting of the economic embargo and normalization of relations. It even goes so far as to claim human rights progress is underway in Vietnam. This is in a country where the people are routinely persecuted and incarcerated by the Government for all forms of unsanctioned religious and political expression.

Mr. Speaker, to adopt the conference report without first removing this Senate provision would break our faith with America's veterans and with the POW/MIA families. But most important, it would break faith with all those who gave their lives or never returned from Vietnam. These noble Americans gave everything they had to prevent the genocide and oppression that swept through Indochina after the fall of Saigon.

President Clinton has repeatedly stated that the United States economic embargo against Vietnam would remain in effect until Hanoi significantly increased its cooperation in the fullest possible accounting of American POW's and MIA's. But that has not occurred. And now we are being asked to lend our own support to a misguided decision by accepting this Senate provision that reaffirms the administration's policy of lifting the trade embargo. I don't believe that is a correct policy and I won't support it.

Maintaining the trade embargo was the only real "stick" the United States Government had to compel Hanoi to cooperate on the POW/MIA issue. In reality, Vietnam's level of cooperation has not fulfilled even the most modest expectations. Lifting the trade embargo was supposed to increase Vietnamese cooperation—it has not.

In 1993, only three American remains were positively identified as a result of joint United States-Vietnamese efforts. This was the worst year ever for the identification of remains. Moreover, American search teams had no freedom of action to investigate either: Unearthed wartime remains; United States aircraft wreckage; live sighting reports; or interviews of witnesses without being accompanied by Vietnamese officials.

In fact, earlier this month an American search team headed by a former Member of Congress along with the daughter of an MIA and a representative of a Vietnam veteran's organiza-

tion were denied access to Vietnamese prisons where hundreds of Americans may have been held. One of those prison sites has been identified in declassified U.S. intelligence documents as a prison camp where 200 Americans were held captive in 1972, but none of those American POW's were repatriated in 1973.

Additionally, the executive director of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, Ann Griffiths, recently returned from another of her many trips to Vietnam. In her trip report, she described the new, postembargo attitude of the Vietnamese Government. Ms. Griffiths described a Vietnam Government attitude of complacency—they proudly paraded this Senate provision as proof of their past cooperation, without acknowledging their ongoing responsibilities to continue to help resolve our MIA cases.

The Vietnamese Government has apparently decided that unilateral actions on its part are no longer necessary. They now feel that continued bilateral cooperation is the key to resolving the MIA issue. The Vietnamese Government is content to wait for us to tell them what to do next, instead of moving forward on their own.

In its trip report, the National League of Families note that the most senior personnel on the U.S. full accounting joint task force "appear to have an assigned role to create perceptions, despite evidence to the contrary, that Vietnam is fully forthcoming." If this is true, then it means that the joint task force is more concerned with making it look like lifting the embargo was not a mistake than trying to get Vietnam to be more forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, if today we declare this kind of behavior to be Vietnamese cooperation, then I fear that we will never achieve a full accounting of our POW's and MIA's. By removing this Senate provision we will put both the administration and the Vietnamese Government on notice that until full and complete cooperation is achieved, no steps should be taken toward establishing diplomatic relations.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for the motion to recommit. We must not go on record praising Vietnam for its years of stonewalling on American POW's and MIA's. The Vietnamese Government hasn't lived up to its part of the bargain since the embargo has been lifted. We must show that the House of Representatives stands with the families of the POW's and MIA's, as well as with all major human rights groups who have uniformly denounced the human rights situation in Vietnam. And finally, we must signal to the administration that we expect genuine and substantial progress in both these areas before any consideration is given to establishing formal diplomatic ties.

Vote to keep faith with our veterans and the POW/MIA families. Vote for human rights in Vietnam. Vote for the motion to recommit.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, April 25, 1994.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: During the week of April 25 the house will consider the approval of H.R. 2333, the State Department Authorization Act for FY 1995. That bill has been passed by both Houses of Congress, has been referred to joint conference committee and the report has now been returned to the House and Senate for final passage.

While the intent of the Act is necessary, language has been included that alludes to significant cooperation by the government of Vietnam for its accounting of American POWs and MIAs, and endorses the end of the economic blockade on Vietnam. The American Legion finds this language disingenuous, inappropriate and has no legitimacy in fact.

In reality, Vietnam's cooperation on the resolution of the POW/MIA issue has not fulfilled reasonable expectations. In 1993 only two American remains were positively identified as a result of joint U.S.-Vietnamese efforts. Moreover, American search teams have had no freedom to investigate either unearthed wartime remains, U.S. aircraft wreckage, live sighting reports, or interviews of witnesses without being accompanied by Vietnamese officials. Furthermore, investigations by U.S. teams have not been pursued with full vigor, e.g., live sighting report investigations are nearly nonexistent and valid research suggestions from veterans' groups have been ignored.

The Legion understands that the language represents the sense of the Senate and is non-binding. However, adoption of the provisions that address a significant increase in cooperation and "substantial and tangible progress" are a distortion of reality and a revision of the history of this painful issue. To include this language in any bill approved by the Congress of the United States could forestall any future action to seek a full and complete accounting of American POWs and MIAs and would be an obstacle to any action to reimpose sanctions against Vietnam should events warrant.

I urge you to keep faith with the POWs and MIAs, their families and members of the military services and recommit this bill back to conference committee to eliminate those provisions that Americans will find objectionable and erroneous.

Sincerely,

BRUCE THIESEN,
National Commander.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA,
Washington, DC, April 27, 1994.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I understand that tomorrow, the House will consider final approval of H.R. 2333, the State Department Authorization Bill for 1995. Now is not the time to signal the Vietnamese leadership that the Congress of the United States is satisfied with the results thus far obtained. To the contrary, a helpful signal would be for H.R. 2333 to contain language which calls on Vietnam to move now, unilaterally, to repatriate remains and provide relevant documents which would account for hundreds of missing Americans.

Included in the text, as amended, is inaccurate language praising Vietnam's POW/MIA cooperation. A National League of Families delegation just returned from Vietnam. When confronted with U.S. documentation, supplied by the League, Vietnamese officials acknowledged that they could do more, unilaterally, to cooperate.

Please stand with the POW/MIA families and our nation's veterans by supporting Representative Olympia Snowe's efforts to remove this misleading language. You can signal Vietnam that the House of Representatives wants the fullest possible accounting without further delay. You can urge Vietnam to honor its commitments to the families and the President to follow through on the League delegation's findings.

Unwarranted praise at this crucial point could impede all we have worked to achieve in terms of accountability.

Sincerely,

ANN MILLS GRIFFITHS,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
Washington, DC.

REPORT ON NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES TRIP TO VIETNAM, LAOS AND CAMBODIA—VIETNAM: MARCH 22–24, 1994

The U.S. Government's current approach of commending Vietnam for full POW/MIA cooperation despite evidence to the contrary has signaled Vietnam that unilateral actions on their part are not expected nor required to achieve their political and economic objectives. After a series of meetings with very senior Vietnamese officials, the League delegation's consensus is that the leadership of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is quite confident of its position. The "new environment" post-embargo-lift, though cited by SRV officials as a basis for renewed energy to continue and increase both unilateral and joint efforts, has not yet brought increased results in terms of accountability.

While pledging that their long-standing humanitarian policy of full cooperation would continue regardless of what the U.S. may decide regarding further steps forward, recent U.S. moves were cited as having improved the climate throughout Vietnam which would help ensure continued bilateral cooperation. The underlined rhetoric says it all. Vietnam asserts full cooperation in the past, which is provably untrue, while also asserting that the embargo lift will ensure continued bilateral cooperation which is as yet achieving little accountability. Again, since the embargo was lifted on February 3, 1994, results do not demonstrate any shift in Vietnam's behavior, rather more of the same. Unless U.S. policy is changed to focus on pursuing unilateral SRV actions, the League delegation does not foresee any real basis for optimism that results, in terms of accountability, will increase significantly.

Quoting recent U.S. Government accolades as evidence that satisfactory progress is being made, Vietnam's rhetoric paralleled that heard in the early to mid-80's. SRV officials initially asserted that they are cooperating fully, providing all relevant archival documents as they are located, withholding no remains or live POWs, and are deeply concerned about their own 300,000 "MIAs," a subject they dropped in the mid-1980's and refurbished in the early 1990's. The League provided SRV officials a book containing U.S. data on why more documents and remains are expected from unilateral SRV actions. The Vietnamese admitted that more can be done and committed to increase unilateral and bilateral efforts; however, the delegation is not optimistic in view of the SRV's longstanding record of breaking agreements and failing to honor pledges.

Confronted with League-provided U.S. Government facts on last known alive and remains discrepancy cases, SRV officials claimed that the "easy cases" had already been solved, a statement not supported by the evidence. Nevertheless, they pledged to continue efforts to resolve the discrepancy cases, noting that many of the cases have been repeatedly investigated by the JTF-FA. We noted that many of these investigations point to Vietnam's unilateral ability to solve the cases.

In response to League requests for specific documents believed available by the U.S. Government, SRV officials pledged to initiate rapid steps to locate and provide the requested documents. Senior Vietnamese officials were generally receptive to considering a simultaneous two-track approach, to include unilateral efforts on Vietnam's part while continuing the process underway with JTF-FA, i.e. field activities and joint research.

JTF-FA's efforts in Vietnam are positive in some areas, i.e. the Priority Case Investigation Team (PCIT), but the League delegation has serious concerns in others. We found dedicated, talented individuals in, or on loan to, Detachment 2 who are pursuing the current policy-approved JTF-FA operational approach, while searching for alternatives to obtain greater results. We maintain that the team would be better served without the removal of experienced personnel. The JTF process in Vietnam appears geared toward initial surveys and investigations of all cases, with little focus on achieving real accountability and no focus on pursuing unilateral SRV efforts. This focus signals Vietnamese officials that there is no need or desire on the U.S. part for unilateral SRV efforts. Smooth logistics execution of field activities and public relations appear to be of paramount importance. These problems beg correction by policy-level U.S. Government officials.

The highly publicized Joint Document Center appears constructed more for propaganda value than substance; however, there are some talented personnel intent on greater access and results. Here again, publicly expressed opinions by U.S. officials are reflected in statements by Vietnamese counterparts. This is a serious problem; it alleviates the burden on Vietnam for unilateral provision of archival documents and further research efforts.

The most senior personnel at JTF-FA Detachment 2 appear to have an assigned role to create perceptions, despite evidence to the contrary, that Vietnam is fully forthcoming. This approach is not only unwarranted, but detracts from objective evaluation of Vietnamese knowledgeability. A consistent theme from some in JTF is that long-held U.S. Government expectations concerning Vietnam's knowledge and ability to unilaterally provide accountability were likely based on invalid assumptions. This leads to their faulty conclusion that accountability must be a lengthy process from which little can reasonably be expected of the SRV in terms of unilateral actions.

In view of evidence available to the U.S. Government, the approach on archival documents/research should be based on the assumption that more are available and can be provided with political will on the part of the SRV leadership. If the Vietnamese do not provide expected documents, credible explanations should be provided as to why. Such an approach would be consistent with U.S. policy on the live prisoner issue.

As a result of our trip, we are working on specific recommendations for the U.S. Government, based on a two-track approach, which we believe will motivate Vietnam to provide more unilaterally and give greater credibility to the President's public statements of commitment and expectations, post-embargo.

LAOS: MARCH 25-28, 1994

Bilateral POW/MIA efforts in Laos are encouraging, despite greater obstacles, i.e. nearly 85% of all of the 504 U.S. losses occurred in areas then under Vietnamese control, and remoteness of areas of loss, as well as displacement of potential witnesses along the border with Vietnam.

The basis for the League delegation's positive assessment included the Lao Government's history of seriousness in implementing POW/MIA commitments made to the United States. It was evident from discussions that during the "run-up" to U.S. lifting of the embargo with Vietnam, Lao cooperation on the POW/MIA issue was downplayed and characterized inaccurately, likely to generate a perception of greater Vietnamese cooperation. In the context of POW/MIA accountability, any comparison between Laos and Vietnam is irrelevant and misplaced.

With high level guidance, the Foreign Ministry is clearly the "designated hitter," assisted actively by the Ministry of National Defense, with the Interior Ministry in a supportive role, but excluded from joint field activities.

The Lao Government's commitment to continue and increase their POW/MIA efforts was made clear, as was willingness to consider suggestions provided by the League in advance of the trip. The Foreign Ministry spelled out the Lao Government's approved method for handling aspects of the POW/MIA process, such as "trilateral" cooperation between Laos, Vietnam and the U.S. It was made clear that permitting Vietnamese witnesses to participate in field operations in Laos was a second step, to follow initial receipt of information from Vietnamese witnesses for use by the U.S. and Laos in the bilateral effort. The lack of SRV responses to Lao and U.S. requests for documents helpful to the POW/MIA accounting effort in Laos is a source of frustration which continues to impede results.

On joint field activities, the Lao defined the need to pursue the effort province by province, expanding excavation teams as necessary to ensure remains recovery is achieved as rapidly as possible. The Lao priority is to exhaust all possibility of results in each area before extending field operations beyond their government's relatively limited resources. Overall JTF-FA strategy is clearly not in consonance with Lao desires on how to proceed; however, Vientiane-based JTF-FA personnel appear to recognize the need to tailor an approach necessary to facilitate field operations in Laos.

Despite the greater problems faced by Laos and the U.S. in terms of accounting for Americans missing in Laos, including lack of information and records from Vietnam, there is an apparent dedication to achieving valid answers on individual cases. This is aided by the Lao policy that actions (though sometimes slow) speak louder than words.

Another positive, but until now unpublicized, development in Laos is the ongoing archival film project. Lao and American personnel are working together to review film footage, albeit thus far without significant results in terms of accountability. Whether governmental or private, a small amount of assistance to the Lao Government for preservation and location of additional film is crucial to expanding this aspect of the bilateral effort. The practical definitions provided by the Lao regarding the approved manner in which the POW/MIA accounting process could proceed were understood and accepted by the U.S. Ambassador to Laos and the Detachment 3 Commander. Policy level endorsement and direction to JTF-FA headquarters on implementation are needed.

Accountability is anticipated more reliably in Laos on those cases under Lao control; but, clearly without full provision of war time data and records by Vietnam, the majority may not be resolved except by serendipity.

U.S. Ambassador to Laos Victor Tomseth was extremely helpful during the League visit. His policy-level interface with Lao officials has been and is extremely important, and it is clear that he is well liked and respected by the Lao leadership which is gratified by his ability to speak their language. The delegation found the Vientiane-based JTF-FA Commander sensitive to the Lao environment and the differences between Vietnam and Laos in the context of POW/MIA. Unfortunately, as in most JTF assignments, LTC Mike Kendall, USA, an active duty military officer, will depart soon. Bill Gadoury, one of the few "old hands" still in JTF-FA, will remain; his knowledge of the issue and Lao culture, as well as language capability, are vital to the effort.

CAMBODIA: MARCH 28-29, 1994

The accounting effort in Cambodia is proceeding with the full support of the newly established Royal Cambodian Government, but without necessary provision of records and data from Vietnam. Cambodian officials were extremely supportive and made commitments to pursue every suggestion and take any action deemed potentially helpful to account for missing Americans.

Of particular interest was the commitment of the Defense Ministry to raise with their Vietnamese counterparts the need for SRV provision of records to help account for the 78 Americans still unaccounted for in Cambodia. This step was implemented immediately based on suggestions provided by the League.

Second Prime Minister Hun Sen, with a history of helpfulness since 1986, also offered full support and pledged to raise the need for SRV archives directly to his Vietnamese counterpart, Prime Minister Vo Van Kiet, during the latter's official visit immediately following the League delegations' departure. During the war, both Prime Minister Kiet and SRV President Le Duc Anh were senior commanders in the areas of Cambodia where most Americans were lost. (Reportedly, Prime Minister Hun Sen made the request of SRV Prime Minister Kiet who agreed to respond.)

JTF-FA Detachment 4 has an excellent working relationship with Cambodian officials. There is a discernable understanding between officials of both governments which enhances bilateral ability to pursue accounting efforts under difficult circumstances. Suggestions made by the League, many of which were made earlier by the Defense POW/MIA Office, were well received by all involved, including the need for an oral history program and unilateral Cambodian efforts to locate potential witnesses who served in the border areas of Vietnam and Cambodia during the war. Implementation by both countries will demonstrate seriousness.

Noting that even documents such as birth certificates were destroyed during the Khmer Rouge regime, Cambodian officials

agreed to the League delegation's request to permit investigation of a military archive in Phnom Penh in an effort to locate possible POW/MIA related material.

Ambassador-designate Charles Twining is obviously held in high esteem by all Cambodian officials with whom the League delegation met. The U.S. role in achieving a political settlement was noted repeatedly, as was continuing U.S. assistance in overcoming current problems.

THAILAND: MARCH 20–21, 29, 1994

The League delegation's focus during stopovers in Thailand was to meet with U.S. officials directly related to POW/MIA, particularly those in the Defense Intelligence Agency's Stony Beach team, headquartered in Bangkok. With his many years of background and direct involvement in POW/MIA matters, U.S. Ambassador to Thailand David Lambertson provided not only valuable insights, but tremendous support for the League delegation. The discussion with State Department officer Scot Marciel, assigned in Hanoi and temporarily in Bangkok, regarding the current situation in Vietnam was also enlightening, and his assistance in facilitating meetings in Vietnam was most helpful.

The Stony Beach briefing was informative and professional; however, their debriefing operations continue to be circumscribed by direction of Commander, JTF-FA. The League delegation continues to hold the view that greater in-country participation by the Stony Beach linguists and investigation specialists would enhance valid results from field operations.

NOTE OF APPRECIATION: Although the League has differences on approach and policy, principally with regard to Vietnam, the League delegation received tremendous logistics support from the JTF-FA Detachments and personnel in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Stony Beach (DIA) was extremely supportive and helpful in Bangkok. The courtesy and assistance were most helpful and deeply appreciated.

Participants in the League delegation were Chairman of the Board Sue Scott, Executive Director Ann Mills Griffiths and Board Member Colleen Shine. All are family members of Americans still missing from the Vietnam War.

During the League delegation's trip to Thailand, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, meetings were held with the following individuals.

Vietnam: Prime Minister Vo Van Kiet; Deputy Minister of Defense Nguyen Thoi Bung; Deputy Minister of Interior Le Minh Huong; Deputy Chief of the National Assembly Foreign Relations Committee Van Phac; Deputy Foreign Minister Le Mai; Director of the Vietnam office for Seeking Missing Persons (VNOSMP) Vu Chi Cong; Members of the VNOSMP from Defense, Interior and Foreign Ministries; Commander, U.S. Joint Task Force Full Accounting (JTF-FA) MG Thomas Needham, USA; LTC John Cray, USA, JTF-FA Detachment 2 Commander; U.S. Archival Research Chief Robert Destatte; Other Members of the JTF-FA MIA Office in Hanoi.

Laos: Deputy Prime Minister Khamphoui Keoboualapha; Foreign Minister Somsavat Lensavad; Vice Foreign Minister Soubanh Srithirath; Former Lao Ambassador to the U.N. Saly Khamsy; Assistant to the Foreign Minister Linthong Phetsavanh; Director of Foreign Relations Department, Ministry of National Defense, COL Sy Inthavong; Deputy Director Department of Europe/Americas, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ouan Phommachack; U.S. Ambassador to Laos Victor Tomseth; Deputy Chief of Mission Allen Barr; LTC Mike Kendall, USA, Commander of Detachment 3, JTF-FA; Other Members of the JTF-FA and Embassy staff.

Cambodia: His Excellency Hun Sen, Second Prime Minister; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Interior Sar Kheng; Generals Tea Chamrath and Tea Banh, Ministers of National Defense; Special Representative of First Prime Minister Prince Ranariddh Mr. Nady Tan; Mr. Uch Kiman, Acting Foreign Minister; Dr. Chem Widhya, Secretary General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; MG Men Than Ly, Director of Interpol, Ministry of Interior; MG Ou Kim Nouen, External Relations, Ministry of Defense; COL Chandy Mucharang, Ministry of National Defense; Mr. Theam Chuny, Director of Americas Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation; COL Chum Soyath, Ministry of Interior; U.S. Ambassador-Designate to Cambodia Charles Twining; Deputy Chief of Mission Mr. James Bruno; JTF-FA Detachment 4 Commander Major Tony Lowe; Other JTF-FA members.

Thailand: Lao Ambassador to Thailand Bounkeut Sangsomsak; U.S. Ambassador to Thailand David Lambertson; Deputy Chief of Mission Matt Dailey; Chief, Stony Beach POW/MIA Office, George Scearce; Defense Attache COL Ed Corcoran, USA; Mr. Ken Urquhart, Stony Beach; LTC Dave Geraldson, USAF, Chief, JTF-FA Detachment 1.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2333, particularly the provisions of section 515(6), urging the President of the United States to pressure the Government of Thailand to prosecute those responsible for the trafficking, forced labor, and physical and sexual abuse of Thai and Burmese women and children in Thailand. I commend my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee for recognizing the significance of human rights violations against women.

I was appalled and disgusted to discover that the Government of Thailand has permitted the trafficking of women, who are then used as sex slaves. Recent credible reports have indicated that thousands of Burmese women and girls are being led into Thailand with false promises of employment, only to be forced to work in brothels under conditions which include sexual and physical violence, debt bondage, exposure to HIV, passport deprivation, and illegal confinement. In addition, members of the Thai police are often actively involved in this barbarism. This is a practice the U.S. Government must not support or fund and we must work to stop it.

In too many places around the world, gross human rights violations against women occur and the world community has for too long ignored them. I am pleased that with this bill, the first steps in recognizing this particular horror have been made. Now we must do whatever we can to make sure it doesn't continue. This is an issue of fundamental human rights.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report contains authorizations for both the United Nations' general budget, the United Nation's peacekeeping for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995. It also contains an authorization for a fiscal 1994 peacekeeping supplemental totalling $670 million to pay averages.

I want to continue to make the Members aware of the impact the United Nations' ever-growing budget is having on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years, the number of peacekeeping operations has exploded to a record high—16 on-going operations. U.N. peacekeeping has evolved beyond the traditional role of ensuring the implementation of a truce, to imposing that truce with an international militia of which we are assessed 32 percent of this total cost. U.S. dollars and U.S. manpower are being put on the line in great numbers, in settings that are remote, at best, to this Nation's security interests.

Aside from the critical policy issues that this poses for us, I want to turn your attention to the fiscal crisis this is creating. Last year, the Congress provided almost half a billion to the United Nations for peacekeeping for 1994. Yet, because the United Nations, with the agreement of the United States' Mission, continued to vote for new missions, and expanded missions, the United Nations is now sending the American taxpayer a bill for over $1 billion for shortfalls for 1994 alone—a bill we may not be able to pay. This conference report authorizes these shortfalls to be paid, but let me say to my colleagues, this may be a bill we may not be able to pay.

Further, at a time when we are facing a hard freeze on discretionary spending—meaning real cuts in important domestic programs—it is difficult to justify how we can send another $1 billion to the United Nations. Moreover, it is impossible for me to ask my constituents to foot this bill when the United Nations continues to refuse to lower our share now almost 32 percent. It is impossible for me to support paying our peacekeeping arrears until the United Nations creates a strong inspector general to end the waste, fraud, and abuse plaguing the United Nations.

I am glad to see provisions to continue withholding of funds until an inspector general is created. Further, I am glad to see that the authorization places a cap of 25 percent on U.S. peacekeeping assessments beginning in fiscal 1996. However, I believe we should begin capping U.S. assessments at 25 percent immediately.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 20 years this Congress has cried for United Nations'

reform—cries which continue to fall on deaf ears. It's time we rein in the United Nations' purse strings. I am convinced it is the only action the United Nations understands. It is time we let them know Uncle Sam will not continue to foot the bill for U.N. peacekeeping until we see real reform.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we, along with the President, have the right to take young men and women from their families and put them in the uniformed services to fight the Nation's conflicts. Along with that right, we have certain obligations.

Our first obligation is to train and equip those young people well. It is to provide them with good leadership. When we take them into battle, we must do everything we can do politically to see to it that they are successful.

We have another obligation, and that obligation runs to them and to their families, and that is to account for those that fall in battle, [KIA], killed in action, [WIA], wounded in action, and those who are missing in action and who become prisoners of war.

Now, I think the services carry out that obligation fairly effectively when they have the power to do it. When young men and women are killed in action, the services act with compassion with the families, with the communication, trying to work with the friends and the family members to see to it that they adjust to death in combat, to see to it that they adjust to the missing, the absence of their member of the service who is in their family.

□ 1550

But in the case of Vietnam, that obligation shifted. Because of the closed society that North Vietnam holds, only the Government of North Vietnam really knows what happened to the thousands of Americans who to date are unaccounted for. I would suggest that there may be a difference of opinion as to how many Americans were left behind, if any. Members do not have to necessarily believe the memorandum from General Cam, the member of the North Vietnamese politburo reporting to the Soviet Union, when he said, we are keeping half of these members. My colleagues do not have to believe that. They do not have to believe that any of the 800 reported sightings are accurate.

There is, I admit, room for difference of opinion on that issue. There is no difference of opinion on the fact that the Vietnamese dragged their feet on counting. There is no difference of opinion that they at times were extremely deceitful to Americans, to the family members and to the Government members who wanted to know what had happened to Americans who were missing in action. And we are rewarding those people by lifting this embargo.

There is no doubt that this is a very important economic benefit. We are proving to our adversaries and our future adversaries that if one just waits long enough, one can count on our capitalistic tendencies to override this solemn obligation that we have to the families of the people who serve us in combat in Vietnam and in wars to come.

I think that is a dreadful mistake. The President of the United States has capitulated, and this House should not join him.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] in a colloquy to clarify some language in the conference report and joint explanatory statement relating to subsection (a) of section 525.

The conference report expresses the sense of the Congress regarding travel or exchanges for informational, educational, religious, cultural, or humanitarian purposes, or for public performances or exhibitions. I would like to ask Mr. BERMAN whether he understands this language to allow tourist travel.

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I personally believe that the right to travel is a constitutional right, and that Americans should be free to travel wherever they wish except in cases recognized in the Passport Act, where there lives or health might be in danger. It was for that reason that I offered the amendment to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act [IEEPA] which appears as the latter part of subsection (c). We did not apply those protections either to embargoes against Cuba or North Korea under the Trading With the Enemy Act, or to the existing embargoes against Iraq and Libya under IEEPA.

However, notwithstanding my personal conviction, I think it clear that the sense-of-the-Congress language in subsection (a), which originated in the Senate, and which covers activities other than those covered by subsections (b) and (c), only covers the specific purposes mentioned, namely informational, educational, religious, cultural, humanitarian, public performances, and exhibitions. It does not authorize travel for purely recreational purposes, and it would not be wise for persons to justify such travel on the basis of this provision. I do not read this language as encouraging the administration to permit such recreational travel. It would also be appropriate for the executive branch to permit travel for the purposes in subsection A either by means of well-defined general licenses or by means of specific licenses, as long as the licensing procedures were applied in a nondiscriminatory manner, and to permit rather than restrain travel for these specific purposes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, finally, I would like to seek clarification of language in the joint explanatory statement which states the committee of conference understands it to be the policy of the executive branch to undertake to remove currency restrictions on the activities enumerated in the sense of the Congress. Does this suggest that the executive branch could in no way place limits on currency transactions for travel for such purposes?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one of the principal ways in which restrictions are maintained on the activities enumerated in subsection (a), particularly on travel, are by means of currency restrictions. Hence, the language of the joint explanatory statement refers to removal of currency restrictions. That said, I believe that reasonable per diem limits on expenditures for such travel would be in order.

I should also note that the administration, while it supports the principle of free trade in ideas, has made no commitment to removing currency restrictions, but still has under review the questions of whether current restrictions serve to inhibit the travel described in subsection (a), and precisely how it will implement its commitment to free trade in ideas.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a member of our committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant of and am going to support the motion of the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] to recommit. I think it is extremely unfortunate that that Senate Vietnam language was included in the conference report. It should not have been included in the conference report. It may jeopardize the conference report.

But it is very important that the issue be brought out, and the way in which the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] has done so, I think, is extremely important. So I hope that we will support her motion to recommit.

There are a number of items within the conference report that are very important and that I think are very positive. It was a painstaking negotiation

that took place and, I think, a very serious one during the conference committee meetings.

One of the items that I would like to bring out to the attention of my colleagues, which I think is very appropriate and very timely, is a sense of the Congress resolution, a statement that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should advocate and speak a mandatory international U.N. Security Council embargo against the dictatorship of Cuba. We are in the midst this week of seeking to tighten the embargo against the 2-year old Haitian dictatorship. Just a few miles from that dictatorship is a 35-year old, ruthless totalitarian dictatorship.

Some of us here believe, and I am confident that it is the majority sentiment of Congress and we can so state today, as we did during the foreign aid authorization bill where this language was already included last year, that the time for double standards has ended and that it is time that we seek and advocate formally in the international community the application of international sanctions against not only the most brutal dictatorship in this hemisphere but one of the most brutal dictatorships in the entire world.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Members, I strongly support the motion of the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] to be offered at the end of this debate. I congratulate her for offering it. Her motion will give Members of this House the opportunity of being heard on the question of lifting the United States trade embargo with Vietnam and pursuing normal diplomatic relations with that country.

It is regrettable, indeed, that we did not have this debate prior to the President's decision to lift that embargo. We should have had it, Mr. Speaker. Suffice it to say, I am opposed to that action and I would simply ask, how has the Communist regime in Vietnam changed? What is different now?

I will tell my colleagues what has changed. With the collapse of the Soviet bloc and other changes in the Communist world, the Vietnam Communists are shopping around for trading partners and anybody else who can bail them out of the mess that they created over there.

Make no mistake about it, United States trade with Vietnam is only the prelude to Vietnamese demands for United States aid, demands for United States aid like they have been making right along. That will be the next bill out here at this rate.

The sudden and supposed willingness of the Vietnamese regime finally to come clean on the POW-MIA issue is about 15 years too late. Speaking as a former chairman of that POW-MIA task force, who went to Vietnam and begged those communists on hands and knees practically, with many of my colleagues sitting here in this room, to give us back just the remains of our soldiers, I can tell you that they refused to do it. They arrogantly turned their noses up to us.

Now some colleagues contemplate giving diplomatic relations to them when the League of Families still says the Vietnamese are not cooperating. What is the matter with this body?

Members had better recognize the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and they had better take her motion to recommit and adopt it. The new policy toward Vietnam is a disgrace to the families and to the American soldiers who have fought this battle over and over again.

Please support the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] when the time comes for her motion to recommit.

□ 1600

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, when it will be offered. I regret that my rapprochement with my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who feels passionately about this, has ended on this today, since we agreed on three other issues, which is unusual for us.

However, I feel strongly about this, as well, Mr. Speaker. This Saturday it will have been 19 years since the last helicopter left the United States Embassy in Vietnam. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to find out the truth about our POW's and MIA's. It is the highest honor we can pay.

In an effort to obtain the truth we imposed, as Members know, the trade embargo on Vietnam. The President has lifted that embargo. While we may have disagreed at that point if that was the correct step at the time, it is done. Many of the families, however, who have the most to gain, who have loved ones at stake here, support this decision. NATO supports it. The Pentagon supports it. In a bipartisan effort, many of our most distinguished veterans who serve in this institution, people like Senators JOHN KERRY and JOHN MCCAIN and BOB KERREY and the gentleman from Florida, PETE PETERSON, believe it is time to take this step.

In just one exercise since the lifting of the embargo, nine sets of remains have been returned. We were given access to do investigations in militarily sensitive areas. We were given access to 10 prison sites. Just last week another exercise began. Some of our questions are beginning to be answered. These are important steps, but we know we have much to do in the tasks that lie ahead for this country with regard to the rest of our POW's and MIA's, and we have to pursue that. We have started a new chapter. Let us not turn our clock back.

I know there are many of my fellow veterans, many in the chapter that I belong to, the Vietnam Veterans Chapter 154 in Mount Clemens, who have a different view on this, but we are making progress. We are moving ahead, and I ask that we stay with the policy. I oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], a member of our committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the motion of the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SNOWE], but I am here to speak about a part of the bill that is being sponsored by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

This past weekend a conference took place in Havana, called by Castro, between the Cuban exile community and the Cuban regime, but only those who opposed the United States embargo on Castro were invited. As expected, no major accomplishments took place, but many embarrassing moments were there for all of us to see as these so-called political exiles waited in line to grovel at Fidel's feet. Kisses and hugs were exchanged, and then Castro stabbed his political friends in the back by actually selling the videotape to the media.

This is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, given the history of lies and deceit which Castro has us accustomed to. If we look at the past 35 years of Castro's regime it is increasingly clear that democratic change is not part of Castro's vocabulary here. Instead of a dialog, we should increase political and economic pressure against Castro by further isolating him. That is why I support the part of the bill offered by Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. Speaker, instead of a dialog, we should be increasing political and economic pressure against Castro by further isolating him. The United States should be lobbying for an international embargo against Castro similar to the one implemented against other undemocratic regimes.

Let us not kid ourselves into believing that any democratic change in Cuba is possible, as long as Castro and his thugs hold power.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and the gentleman

from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody will pay attention to what I am about to read, because I think it is very, very important. We should support the recommittal motion of the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

First, while it is true the Government of Vietnam has returned about 120 remains, those remains have not been proven to be any of the names on the United States Government's roster, the so-called discrepancy list of American soldiers which the United States Government believed to have been captured during the war. Of the 120 that have been returned, it does not include the names of any of the 2,300 POW-MIA's that are unaccounted for.

Second, many POW-MIA activists believe the paramount issue at stake in Vietnam is whether the Hanoi regime continues to keep in detention living American soldiers. Former U.S. Congressman Billy Hendon was over there recently, and he wanted to go to a prison to investigate, and the Hanoi regime would not let him go into Vinh Phu Province prison, because he believes there may be some alive U.S. POW's still there.

Third, an article in the February 17 Baltimore Sun, "You'll Wish You'd Never Been Born," by Peter Jay, argues that Vietnam will have to be pried open if the United States is ever to learn the fate of the 2,300 POW-MIA's.

Former New York Times reporter John Corry, who tracked the MIA issue for the Senate Select Committee on POW-MIA Affairs, concluded, "American prisoners of war have been held continuously after Operation Homecoming and remain(ed) in captivity in Vietnam and Laos as late as 1989." that language was not included in the select committee's final report on the matter.

Corry later said that Senator KERRY, who chaired the select committee, told a POW-MIA investigator that if the above quotation was leaked, "You'll wish you had never been born."

Finally, a February 18 New York Times article, "New Doubts Cast on POW Effort," is cause for more heartburn for POW-MIA families. According to this press report, "Russian officials complained last November that State Department officials were discouraging them from releasing documents about prisoners of war in Vietnam." Our State Department was discouraging Russian officials from giving out information on POW-MIA's left behind in Vietnam. The New York Times piece also said that,

> Several Americans who used to work on Task Force Russia (established to seek information from Russia about POWs from Vietnam) said that the cable showed that some State Department officials were so eager to have that embargo lifted that they would even urge Moscow not to release documents that put Vietnam in a bad light.

We had the Ron Brown affair, and we believe that was whitewashed. We have 2,300 POW-MIA's still unaccounted for. Their families still go to bed at night not knowing what happened to their loved ones, not knowing whether they are dead, alive, in some God-forsaken prison over there, and we are normalizing relations with those cutthroats, and they will not even cooperate with people going over there. It is a whitewash, and I wish people across this country would rise up and complain to the Congressmen and Senators about what is going on.

There needs to be a complete accounting, which every single President has asked for since the Vietnam war, on our POW-MIA's, before we normalize relations with those cutthroats.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I think I probably know about as much about Vietnam as anybody in this body, with one exception, and I feel very strongly about this motion to recommit. We are doing the right thing by lifting this embargo. Twenty years is long enough. Twenty years is long enough. We have extracted maximum effort from this embargo.

Regardless of all the comments Members have heard today, and some more we are going to hear, we have made progress. We have made movement. Things have happened that we never dreamed of happening. In fact, the Russians are helping, too, as opposed to what some of our speakers have said.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do. We must move forward. None of us can keep this Nation from marching into the future, any more than we can change the history of this Nation. We have to do the right thing. The President has shown the courage to do the right thing.

It is no longer acceptable to just do retribution.

It is time for resolution. It is time to find solutions, and the Vietnamese have agreed to do that. Contrary, again, to what people have said, since the embargo has been lifted we have had additional cooperation.

Are we going to find every American that was lost in Vietnam? Absolutely not. Have we found all of those that were lost in the past wars? Absolutely not. Let us not ask for the impossible, let us ask for what is real. Let us do the fullest possible accounting. That is what we have promised the families. We are working toward that.

Lifting the embargo will enhance our search. The potential for discovery, with all of the American feet that will be in that country now, is so far greater than the 30 individuals that are in the country. I ask the Members, do not let us move backward. Take this Nation forward. Move toward resolution of this very painful issue. It is the right thing to do. Support the resolution to confirm this conference. Reject the motion to recommit.

□ 1610

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to also support the motion to recommit based on the embargo to Vietnam and the situation just described.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, and I mean that sincerely, to the prior speaker as someone who barely remembers the implications of the Vietnam war, I know quite clearly that there is a generation of Vietnam veterans that subsist and exist in my district who say that they cannot rest until they know where all the remains are, not ending an embargo toward compromise but toward resolution, and then it is time to deal with the Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak, however, for ending the arms embargo against Bosnia. Had such action been taken 2 years ago—when many in this body had originally called for—perhaps the nearly 200,000 perished Bosnians might have been able to simply defend themselves and their loved ones.

Bosnia is not just a victim of Serbia's bloody aggression against an innocent, democracy seeking, ethnic population. It is also a victim of international delaying tactics and cowardly foreign policy that ties the hands of the Bosnians by refusing to allow them to protect themselves. The empty gestures and idle threats from the West have only worsened the situation and signaled to the Bosnian Serbs that they have nothing to fear in response to their bloody aggression.

If the last 2 years are any indication, it is likely that in the wake of the bloody siege on the safe area of Gorazde, Bosnian Serbs will only transfer their terror to other unprotected Moslem enclaves. Meanwhile, the United Nations and NATO cavalry will arrive much too late, in time only to help mopup the spilled blood and transfer the displaced refugees out of their home surroundings.

Let us pray that today's vote to lift the arms embargo may prod our administration and the United Nations to aggressively pursue the same course of justice. For those who are still alive, it is not too late.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, with all the respect that I have for my colleagues on the majority side who believe that this conference report should go forward, it is not perfect. We hear speaker after speaker getting up to

support the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and most of it is based on human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, as much as I respect the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], when the 24 POW's came home and ran for office in 1974 and 1976, every one of them lost because people stupidly said, "They've been locked up for years. What do they know about what is happening in the world?" They are experts on the mind of their Communist captors, but very few had ever been to Laos, Cambodia, traveled outside of their own core area where they had been assigned to an Air Force base, or if they flew off Yankee or Dixie station, most of them had ever set foot on Vietnam soil until they bailed out of the airplane.

Mr. Speaker, this is a complex issue. Although many of the former POW's are now going back to Vietnam, good men and women of conscience come back with totally different stories. The Vietnamese are professional liars, they are master human rights violators, and the POW question remains agonizingly unresolved.

Please vote to recommit. This is not perfect.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2333. I want to thank Chairman HAMILTON and Subcommittee Chairman BERMAN for their outstanding leadership on this bipartisan bill.

This bill contains a very important measure that I sponsored to provide for the recruitment by the State Department of Americans of Hispanic descent with funds already available. I hope that the State Department and the other foreign affairs agencies will begin earnestly to rectify the problem of underrepresentation of Hispanics in their organizations.

Many talented young Hispanic-Americans are ready to serve their country. They and the country will benefit from this program. An appallingly low number of Hispanic-Americans now serve in America's Senior Foreign Service—only 10 out of more than 860, not one of which is a woman. And sadly, only 2 Ambassadors out of more than 160 worldwide are Americans of Hispanic descent. This inequity must change.

Next we are committed in this bill to maintaining intact the valuable services of both Radio and TV Marti. These services broadcast the truth to the freedom-loving people of Cuba in the best tradition of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

As the clock ticks on the Cuban dictatorship, Radio and TV Marti are more important than ever. America will have to communicate to the Cuban people her peaceful intentions during a transition to a free and independent Cuba. When the nightmare of the 35-year-old Castro dictatorship finally ends, broadcasting to Cuba will be even more important. Hopefully, the initiative of my colleague, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART to seek an international embargo on the Cuban dictatorship will help bring us closer to that day.

Finally, this bill includes two major accomplishments on peacekeeping. First, the bill requires that by 1996, the United States share of U.N. peacekeeping funds be cut by more than 6 percent. That will save America millions of dollars. Next, the bill incorporates the suggestion that the United Nations appoint an independent inspector general. And the bill goes even farther: it withholds much of the U.S. peacekeeping contribution until the United Nations appoints an inspector general.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], a member of our committee.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, title XII of this bill would have rewarded those coming to the United States illegally by allowing them to apply for permanent visas, then to remain in the United States for years as they endlessly adjudicated and appealed their cases. Access to this preferential process would have cost them, had title XII not been dropped, a mere $600.

What this section would also have done is to undermine both the quota system that has been in place for decades and the process in which the State Department screens visa applicants. That responsibility, for all practical purposes would have been shifted to the INS. The INS simply doesn't have the ability to determine if the person already in the United States is a terrorist, a felon, or otherwise excludable, and the $600 fee would not allow a proper investigation of these illegal immigrants.

I am convinced that these provisions would have seriously undermined our efforts to control illegal immigration, and would have been completely unfair to those seeking to immigrate to the United States who have patiently waited their turn. It would have precipitated a massive flow into our country of people who planned to overstay their tourist visa, or come illegally and get a visa for $600.

I remind my colleagues that we have overwhelming problems with the costs of millions of new illegal aliens annually. U.S. Embassies now receive between 7 and 8 million visa applications each year. Most of these are tourist visas that are routinely investigated and approved. Inclusion in this bill of title XII amendments would have doubled or tripled the number of illegal aliens coming each year.

These provisions that I am talking about have been deleted in the conference report. We dodged this bullet. This is a victory for keeping some sanity in our immigration process.

That said, due to provisions of this bill concerning Vietnam I am supporting Congresswoman SNOWE's motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the language contained in the report concerning Vietnam should not be a part of this bill, and that is why I am talking today.

Mr. Speaker, the House receded to language proposed by the Senate which commends Vietnam for its cooperation with American POW-MIA efforts. It also supports the President's decision to lift the embargo.

Mr. Speaker, this issue should not be tucked away in a conference report. We have not debated this issue on the floor of the House. An issue of this magnitude should not be handled in such a below-the-board fashion. The process is wrong, and I say also the substance is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, how can we say that the Vietnamese are cooperating with us about POW-MIA efforts when they have not released the records of the prisons in which our returned POW's were held? Let me make this clear.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] who was held in Vietnam in prison for 7 long years just spoke, the records for the prison in which he was held have not been made available to us by the Vietnamese Government. They are not cooperating as long as they do not release those records. As far as we know, those records will tell us what we need to know about our MIA's and POW's that may have been left behind. How can we condone lifting the embargo when they do not give us those kind of records and that kind of cooperation and they do not even permit us to go where we need to go in Vietnam to investigate?

Mr. Speaker, a few month ago we heard testimony from General Needham, the Pentagon's point man on this issue, and he confirmed that there are a number of areas his investigators cannot go in Vietnam. That is after the embargo has been lifted.

Mr. Speaker, one of the conditions of lifting the embargo was cooperation with the Vietnamese in our search for POW-MIA's. The embargo is reversible, and if anything right now because they have not permitted us to go into areas and have not released these documents, we should be talking about reimposing the embargo rather than commending Hanoi for its cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I met with Americans who were thrown out of Vietnam because they wanted to visit a prison just north of Hanoi. Let us get that. Yesterday I met with Americans who wanted to go someplace in Vietnam to investigate POW-MIA's, and they were not permitted to go to those

areas. Would that be called cooperation? The attitude in Vietnam is not of cooperation but it is one of doing as little as possible without making it obvious that they are not cooperating.

Mr. Speaker, last December I visited Cambodia to watch our joint task force at work in the field. Our troops were doing a wonderful job and they were searching for a POW camp along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in thick jungle. That whole effort would have been unnecessary had we had cooperation from the Vietnamese. They knew exactly where that camp was, yet our guys were sloshing away in the jungles, beating themselves up to find a camp. That is not cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, on another side issue, I asked the President personally to make Hanoi's abuse of human rights a factor in deciding the lifting of the embargo. He did not do that. Now we are asked to congratulate Hanoi for their POW–MIA cooperation as several American citizens at this moment sit in prison in Vietnam for trying to organize a democracy conference.

I ask for my fellow colleagues to support the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE]. They are not cooperating with us. It is still a dictatorship. They are laughing at us in Hanoi.

□ 1620

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement, and wish to discuss one important aspect of it.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes an amendment that tracks legislation that I introduced early in this session.

My bill, the Arab Boycott Arms Sales Prohibition Act, would bar United States weapons sales to countries that participate in the Arab boycott of Israel.

I am pleased Congressman TOM LANTOS offered a version of my bill as a successful amendment to the foreign aid bill which passed the House, and that this language is included in the bill that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, the economic boycott has always been one of the most pernicious weapons in the Arab arsenal against Israel.

And since this discriminatory policy also targets firms that do business with Israel, United States companies have lost countless jobs and untold dollars.

It is particularly noteworthy that Kuwait and Saudi Arabia—two countries for whom American soldiers lost their lives only 3 years ago—still participate in the boycott.

The well-publicized account of Kuwait's ban of the film "Schindler's List"—because Stephen Spielberg is Jewish—is but one illustration of the backwardness of this policy.

Arab countries which still blacklist American firms cannot be rewarded.

The provision in the conference agreement represents a solid step forward in our efforts to end the boycott.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in somewhat of an unusual position in differing with people I have tremendous respect for and that I rarely differ with. I do however, have grave reservations about the issue of the call for lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Moslems.

It might appear this is an easy vote, give the Bosnian Moslems the right to arm themselves and fight. If it were that easy, I would be supporting it. I predict that while it may not seem to be difficult today, in the future many may find this vote haunting them. There are too many uncertainties. And from past experience, I do not believe the administration has the answers.

This resolution does not make it clear what we are to do if there is no support from our allies in the United Nations. Are we to "go it alone"? Do we unilaterally provide arms? Even if the United Nations agrees, where are the weapons to come from? How long will it take to supply them and train them to fight? And, who trains them? I would predict it will take a minimum of 60 to 90 days to deliver the arms and train for their use. The more independent the role the United States takes in this arming, the more American sons and daughters are placed in Bosnia and in harm's way.

What happens if—in recognizing the potential problems of the Moslems being armed—the Serbs launch an all out preemptive strike in an attempt to end the conflict prior to the Moslems' ability to strike back? What happens to the Americans who we have stationed there in their new role? What do we do then?

Some military leaders on the scene have observed that an end to the arms embargo months ago would have been a different story. But ending that embargo now would create havoc.

The Easier Ways Fallacy: Lift the arms embargo on the Muslims and/or turn the whole problem back to the Europeans. To a growing number in Congress, it may seem easier for us to lift the arms embargo than to involve ourselves in the fighting. This may, indeed, prove desirable if the current efforts fail. But it isn't easy; it offers no quick fix. We would have a moral obligation to ensure that the Bosnian side actually receives the heavy weapons it needs, whether across Serbian-controlled terrain from Croatia or airlifted above Serbian surface-to-air missiles. We would also have to ensure the Bosnians the time needed to train on the new weaponry. Since the Serbs would have every incentive to pre-empt, we might have to use air power to prevent larger-scale attacks. In short, lifting the arms embargo, if we're not cynical about it, could involve us even more deeply than air strikes alone.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have never lost their resolve for peace and freedom. But they do expect that before our soldiers are placed in danger, every possibility has been predetermined and plans have been made. I do not see that in this case.

Several years ago when the House considered the authority to go to war in the gulf. I did not cast my vote blindly as a noninterested bystander. At that time, my son went to work every day in a Marine uniform and it was almost certain he would go to the gulf. I supported that effort then and today I am totally convinced that was the right decision.

I do not share the same conviction regarding American involvement in Bosnia today. Until we know the specific result of our actions and until we have planned for the potential reactions to our actions I would not vote to send my son to Bosnia, and my friends and I will not vote to send yours.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, DUNCAN HUNTER was right when he spoke here a couple of minutes ago. By agreeing to the conference report in its present form, we send a signal that we are prepared to sell out, that we are ready to abandon our principles when there is a business reason for doing so.

We are also demonstrating how far removed so many of us in Congress are from the people that we represent. You know, when President Clinton lifted the Vietnam embargo several weeks ago, there was a hue and cry within my district and many other districts that were exceeded only by the hue and cry that followed passage of the Clinton tax package a couple of months ago.

If it is the sense of Congress that lifting the Vietnam embargo is correct, then Congress is out of touch. The embargo has been lifted.

By including embargo language in the conference report, some in Washington are attempting to give the President the political cover that he needs to cover the fact that he made the wrong decision. The conference report should not be used for that purpose.

Support the motion to recommit. Let us not abandon those who are missing in Vietnam.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Department of State, U.S. Information Agency and other foreign af-

fairs agencies authorization bill for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995. The authorization levels contained in the bill for fiscal year 1994 will cover the amounts appropriated for the State Department, USIA, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act. In addition, the authorization amounts contained in the conference report for fiscal year 1995 for the State Department and the other foreign affairs agencies, generally conform with the appropriations requests for the Department and these agencies in the President's 1995 budget.

There is one provision of the conference report, however, that is of concern to our Appropriations Subcommittee. Section 101(b)(2)(B) of the conference report states that of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the State Department's diplomatic and consular programs, $11.5 million is authorized to be available for fiscal year 1994 and $11.9 million is authorized to be available for fiscal year 1995 only for administrative expenses to carry out the purposes of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act.

This provision has a significant and serious impact on the State Department. For fiscal year 1994, the provision will require that $11.5 million already provided for State Department operations in the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act be transferred to the Migration and Refugee Assistance Program for administrative expenses of the program. Expenses of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Program normally are funded in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. The State Department has already had to absorb $60 million worth of unanticipated costs and this transfer of $11.5 million will just add to the burden. With respect to the fiscal year 1995 provision, no matter how much funding our Committee includes for State Department operations in the fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill, the first $11.9 million will be available only for transfer to the Migration and Refugee Assistance Program for its administrative expenses.

I have talked with the gentleman from California about this provision, and he has assured me he does not plan to include this or any similar provision in any future State Department authorization bill. I appreciate the gentleman's consulting with me on this matter and his assurance that this provision will not be repeated in any future State Department authorization bills. I also want to assure the gentleman that we will work with him and his committee to try to secure an adequate level of funding for the State Department for fiscal year 1995.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the bill's manager, Mr. HAMILTON, and rise today in support of the provision of the pending conference committee report which urges the lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, in keeping with that country's right to self-defense. In the absence of adequate measures to maintain international peace and security, continued application of the embargo, imposed by the United Nations Security Council prior to the armed attack on Bosnia and Herzegovina, undermines that Government's right of self-defense and, therefore, contravenes article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The continued imposition of an arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, which faces a well-armed aggressor, is reprehensible and should be ended without further delay.

The Helsinki Commission has followed developments in the former Yugoslavia closely and both Senator DECONCINI and I have advocated resolute action, under United States leadership, to stop the genocide in Bosnia. Through its inaction and half-hearted measures, the international community has allowed the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina to deteriorate to the point it has reached today. Hundreds of thousands of civilians have perished over the past 2 years. Over 2 million have been driven from their homes through a policy of ethnic cleansing, resulting in the worse humanitarian crisis in Europe since World War II. Despite a flurry of diplomatic initiatives and countless cease-fire agreements, aggression, and genocide continue.

While I applaud President Clinton's initiative to secure NATO cover for the so-called safe havens in Bosnia and Herzegovina, there is broad recognition that air strikes alone may not succeed in stopping the conflict completely. For over a year now I have advocated a strike and lift approach in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Clearly, this two-staged approach is preferable to trying anyone of them alone.

The Bosnians have demonstrated their determination and courage to fight, against all odds, to defend their country and all that it stands for—which—Mr. Speaker, is a Government that respects the principle of equal rights for all peoples regardless of ethnicity, religion, or race. The current embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina has seriously impeded their ability to secure the necessary means to defend themselves against force that seeks to build a new nation upon the principle of ethnic exclusivity. It is apartheid European style.

And let's be clear that this is not a classic war in which opposing military forces directly engage each other.

This is the massacre, daily, of innocent civilians huddled in overcrowded and undersupplied enclaves by some brazen thugs lobbing shells from the mountains above.

Two years into the conflict, they continue to do this because no one on the ground has the means, thanks to this embargo, to stop them and the international community has lacked the will. This must change.

As a matter of principle, Bosnia has the right to its own self-defense. It is time that the United States uphold that right by unilaterally lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, a sovereign and independent State.

If it means going alone—lifting it unilaterally, then we must or we shall simply share in the collective guilt of watching as a Nation dies.

It is time for us to act. It is time for us to say if we will not take action at least we will allow an independently recognized Nation of the international community to defend itself.

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

Mr. HOYER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Maryland, for his eloquent statement.

I cannot think of anything we could do to correct this horrendous situation that has gone on in Europe and in Bosnia than to let the people defend themselves, the right to determine their own destiny, and I thank the gentleman for his forceful statement on this issue.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority whip.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York, for whom I have great respect, for yielding this time to me.

There are two points I would like to make. No. 1, the very many strong reasons to support this bill, you just heard one discussion, the question of getting Congress on record in support of lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia. We have heard some talk about human rights in Vietnam. Let me tell you about human rights in Vietnam.

This bill creates Radio Free Asia, a surrogate radio that would be broadcasting into authoritarian and totalitarian, government-controlled states in Southeast Asia, providing an independent basis for information. That is going to do more to promote the notion of pluralism, of democracy, of free markets, than any other thing we could possibly do. That is in this bill, language toughening up the test for the PLO's commitment to the peace process. You have heard about the Arab boycott.

In one other area I want to make specific reference: In reorganizing international broadcasting, we take the Voice of America charter and we include those standards in a broader charter for all our broadcasting, including the requirement for a balanced and comprehensive projection of U.S. thought and institutions reflecting the diversity of U.S. culture and society.

I suggest this bill has so many good reasons to vote for it, and I urge the body to do so.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit H.R. 2333, the State Department Authorization Act. My distinguished colleagues, OLYMPIA SNOWE and BEN GILMAN, have clearly exposed the Senate language that wrongly claims the Government of Vietnam has increased its cooperation over the last 3 years on POW/MIA issues. I commend them for challenging this pernicious fiction. It does not belong in our Nation's laws.

We must continue to insist on the full accounting of all POW/MIA's and on the highest priority efforts to resolve all cases. The Clinton administration has made a serious mistake in relying on the good faith of the Communist dictators of Vietnam. Such reliance is grossly misplaced, given their long history of human rights abuses, broken commitments, and cynical dealings with these very issues.

I urge my colleagues not to provide the Government of Vietnam the political cover it seeks so that economic and diplomatic relations with our country can be normalized. It would be an enormous disservice to the families who only want to know the fates of their loved ones. Support the motion to recommit H.R. 2333.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that materials from the National League of Families and the American Legion be inserted into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the gentlewoman from Maine's [Ms. SNOWE] motion to recommit. This is the first opportunity this body has had to vote on this issue, and I commend my colleague from Maine for challenging the other body.

You know, to commend Vietnam for being an enemy, for being a Communist nation, is plain wrong. The decision of President Clinton to lift the trade embargo on Vietnam was ill-timed and, I think, deceptive. United States policy clearly stated at that time that certain actions were to have been taken by the Vietnamese in order for the embargo to be lifted. Servicemen still missing in action were not accounted for. We had guaranteed that to our servicemen, to our Nation, and to their families.

While the President might claim that the Vietnamese provided more than 21,000 documents, photos, and artifacts since 1992, only 1 percent pertained to missing Americans. Think about that. One percent. The bottom line is the Vietnamese did not hold up their end of the bargain, and we allowed them to get away with it. Just like most U.S. foreign policy decisions as of late, and it made us look weak and sent that message to the world.

More importantly, the President betrayed the trust of the American people. He promised during the campaign that there would be "no normalizing of relations with any nation that is at all suspected of withholding any information on the POW-MIA issue. POW-MIA families relied upon the President and now have nothing left to hold onto. Ironically, those in the administration who pushed for lifting the embargo were never personally involved either through direct captivity or through family members, and that includes those members of both the Defense and State Departments.

I was moved by the words of CBS anchorman Dan Rather, who said:

> Politicians break campaign promises all the time. But this time the President's hand wasn't forced. He did this on his own initiative.

Dan Rather goes on to say:

> This reporter wonders: Did it occur to President Clinton that night, February 3, to go to the Wall?

That is the POW Wall.

> It's only a short walk from the White House to the Wall, the Vietnam Memorial, where 58,000 Americans' names are carved in the Garden of Stone. Those Americans may have gone to the wrong war, but they went for the right reason.

Out of respect for those who served and a lack of that respect from the executive branch, we here in this body must do what we can to insure a full accounting of those who fought to protect this country and our rich freedoms which we so often take for granted.

Vote "yes" to recommit.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

Would the gentleman state, though, the fact that we lifted the embargo, and we did not normalize relations with Vietnam? That is a major difference in this context in which we are presenting this. We lifted the embargo, we are not normalizing relations with Vietnam. If, in fact, the Vietnamese go back on their cooperative efforts, we will reimpose the embargo. The President has stated that. It is the policy of this Nation.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I concur with what the gentleman from Florida says, but he also said he would not lift the embargo until we had the full accounting.

So how can we believe what we hear?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I will confine my remarks to the issue of the motion to recommit. I do oppose the motion to recommit. I have the greatest respect for the gentlewoman from Maine, and I think we have listened to the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas, both of them POW's, both of them veterans who have a different point of view. A few years ago I had an opportunity to go with five of my colleagues, all of us Vietnam war veterans, to Vietnam, and I think all of us came back, some with different opinions, but most of us committed to the idea that we need to move toward lifting the embargo as we have now done at this point.

I will yield to no one in my concern about a full accounting for our MIA's, our missing-in-action, and that was the point that we all made when we were in Vietnam meeting with officials in Danang, Hanoi, in Saigon, and in other parts of Southeast Asia. But the point is that we will have the best opportunity to have progress on this issue if we continue to work with the Vietnamese, if we continue to make progress in other areas, including trade. Just since lifting the embargo, we have had substantial improvement, and I believe those improvements can be best continued by doing this. This is not an issue of closing doors, of healing; this is simply an issue of continuing progress on a full accounting for our MIA's. And that is why I would vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to know exactly what to do on the issue. Many of us go with gut feelings. A lot of us have spent time in Vietnam, some have been on the ground, like my colleague on the other side, and Mr. JOHNSON as well. But I support the motion to recommit, and I will tell you why.

I have a lot of Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian-Americans in my district, and to a man, and to a family, they have asked me, please, do not support MFN and do not lift the embargo.

Many of them have issues of human rights just like the same rights we had in China. They have asked us to not do it. I think when you take a look at what the Vietnamese are doing today, waving the Senate resolution, saying, "Look, we are, we are adhering to the MIA issue and trying to solve it," I do not think if we brought three or four people back alive today that we would resolve that, and I do not think we would ever resolve the MIA issue. But I do believe North Vietnam—Vietnam, there is no such thing as North Viet-

nam anymore—that Vietnam could do a lot better job in the accounting of our missing-in-action.

□ 1640

The same day I was shot down, Mr. Speaker, Commander Blackburn was shot down, and his son used to ask me about once a month; said, "DUKE, tell me about my dad," and it was the same questions, same answers every day. Well, just 2 years ago they brought Commander Blackburn's body back, but I know it had been like a 1,000-pound weight had been lifted off that boy's back.

Mr. Speaker, we owe that resolve to those families. Vietnam has not been contributing to the issue. I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 3 minutes remaining to close debate.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say a word of appreciation to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for their work on the conference report. We have some disagreement, of course, on the motion to recommit, but very, very good work has been done by them and others on this report.

The first point I want to make is to oppose the motion to recommit. The effect of the motion to recommit would be to require the reopening of the conference committee to secure approval of the removal of the Kerry provision.

The Senate is going out of session. The State Department authorization runs out on April 30. So, the practical effect, if the motion to recommit is adopted, is simply to shut down the State Department and embassies all over the world, doing enormous damage to the United States international presence, Mr. Speaker.

Not only would the State Department shut down, but every embassy in the world would have to shut down. There would be no communication between Washington and our negotiators in the Middle East or our negotiators in Bosnia. Officers, like those in the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Commerce Department and all others, would have to quit. The practical effect of approving the motion to recommit, with the Senate out, is to simply shut down the foreign operations of the United States.

That is a very important thing to remember.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] is unnecessary because the language she objects to is nonbinding on Members of the House. It is Senate language.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] threatens to bring the Government operations around the world to a conclusion on a nonbinding recommendation. The conference report does not commit any Member of the House of Representatives to any position with respect to the Vietnam embargo. The language is not sense-of-the-Congress language. It is sense-of-the-Senate language, and that passed the Senate by about a 3-to-1 margin in January.

Mr. Speaker, it is not appropriate for Members of the House, through this motion to recommit, to tell the Senate what position they should take. We are simply respecting the right of the Senate to express its view on the Vietnam embargo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second point I want to make simply is that this is a very, very important bill. It has many features to it, and I hope Members will vote their approval of the conference report after opposing the motion to recommit.

The most important thing to say with regard to funding is that we are $400 million below the amount in the House bill, and we are $150 million below the 1993 appropriated level. So, it is a tight, fiscally responsible bill.

And the other point I want to make in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that we provide in this bill leverage to get the kind of reforms we need in the United Nations. We all recognize the importance in the United Nations in peace keeping through withholding the U.S. contributions. We are going to force the United Nations to make the kinds of changes that we think are necessary to make it more effective.

I urge opposition to the motion to recommit, and I urge approval of the conference report.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, although I voted against the House version of the State Department Authorization Act last June, I am pleased to say that the conference report is improved from that original bill, and I will support it. The conference version is $434.2 million less than the House version of this bill. It sets the United States share of United Nations peacekeeping operations at 25 percent, less than the current 31 percent. It keeps funding for the counterterrorism office. Especially noteworthy is the provision expressing the sense of Congress that the President should lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and allow the Bosnian people to defend themselves from Serb attack.

There is one aspect of the bill that I do not support, and that is the language stating that the government of Vietnam has cooperated with the efforts of the United States to account for missing servicemen. The bill also calls for lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. The Senate added this language to the bill last January, and President Clinton used their vote on it to justify his order lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam.

The House was never given the opportunity to vote on the wisdom of lifting the embargo, so I have not been able to vote on this important issue before now. I have always felt that the United States should not grant Vietnam the privilege of normalized relations before the fate of every single missing American is known. We should not surrender the only leverage and incentive we have to encourage the Vietnamese to be even more forthcoming. Therefore, I will vote to recommit this bill with instructions to remove the language praising and rewarding Vietnam.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me and I urge members to support this conference report, which I believe moves the United States boldly into the post-cold war period.

I am particularly supportive of the provision in this conference report that create an authorization for Radio Free Asia. Representative BENTLEY and I sponsored a bill in the 103d Congress that would create Radio Free Asia. I am very pleased that this conference report implements the intent of that bill and creates a separate Radio Free Asia which would be a grantee of a newly formed Board for Broadcasting, which would make grants to all the independent radios. I believe that the independence of Radio Free Asia is essential in its successful operation and I support this approach.

As you know, Asia has half of the world's population and some of the fastest growing economies. It also has some of the world's worst political situations, like the terribly repressive situation in Burma that sees the Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest, and some of the last holdouts of communism, North Korea and the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has a great national interest in promoting human rights and democracy in China, North Korea, Burma, other Asian nations. Free nations are historically less aggressive and more cooperative internationally. Free nations also tend to have greater respect for the fundamental freedoms on which our own Nation is founded. Human rights are universal. We have a moral responsibility to promote human rights in every nation on Earth.

Some Asian nations are closed to information including news of the changes in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the strengthening of democratic institutions and free markets around the globe as well as their own domestic news. Information is tightly controlled by dictators and authoritarian governments because they know the power of information to liberate people. Radio Free Asia proposes sharing information with every man and every woman in these closed societies.

The Washington Post today reports growing unrest among China's peasant population. The vast majority of China's people live in the interior of the country, away from the reach of Hong Kong's broadcast signals or other outside influences. They must rely on news provided them by the government in Beijing or Voice of America broadcasts on general issues, mostly regarding the United States. Imagine if Shi Jingxuan and his wife, Pan Fuying, who were beaten by local authorities in their village after criticizing the Communist Party Secretary in Yuanzhuang, knew the truth. Imagine if they knew that not only did 400 villagers on tractors and bicycles ride into the county seat in Anhui Province to protest

local corruption, but that police had dispersed 3,000 protesters hundreds of miles away, outside Guangzho, 2 weeks ago, who were angry about land confiscation without proper compensation. Simply knowing that they are not alone would give a tremendous burst to the democracy movement in China.

The 1992 Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China said broadcasting to communist nations in Asia was "desirable, feasible, and in the national interest" and I agree.

With the uncertainty of the China MFN situation, the United States needs alternatives to promote human rights and democracy in China. Radio Free Asia will be a cost-effective way to promote the democratic spirit, much the same as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty helped liberate Eastern Europe.

After intense debate on this issue in the Senate, it was determined that an authorization level of $30 million would create the leanest Radio Free Asia possible while still meeting the goals set out for it.

This conference report also requires review of Radio Free Asia's effectiveness after 3 years. I believe this is a very sound requirement and I am confident that the review will find that funding RFA is a good investment for our country.

I believe that this is a very important issue and I urge all members to support the conference report.

I would particularly like to thank the chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee, Mr. BERMAN, for his efforts regarding Radio Free Asia. I have been working closely with him for the past several years to make Radio Free Asia a reality and I want to thank him for his invaluable advice and assistance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House includes a number of provisions which are commendable and deserve our support. Many initiatives on which I have been active over the years are addressed in this legislation:

Calling for the termination of the United States arms embargo of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the subsequent provision of military assistance to Bosnia;

Establishing a Radio Free Asia which would broadcast accurate and timely information, news, and commentary to the People's Republic of China, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, North Korea, Tibet, and Vietnam;

Withholding of a percentage of assessed funds from the United Nations until the United Nations has established an independent Office of Inspector General to conduct and supervise objective audits, inspection, and investigations of U.N. programs;

Continued funding for broadcasting to Cuba, and promotes the idea that the President should seek a mandatory international U.N. Security Council embargo against Cuba;

Insisiting that the Secretary General of the United Nations comply with article 100 of the U.N. Charter, restricting the Secretary General or any of his staff from seeking or receiving instructions from any government or authority external to the United Nations. This provision was added in response to the Secretary General's decision last year to prohibit Chinese dissident Shen Tong from meeting with the press corps at the United Nations;

Creating a permanent Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism within the Department of State; and

Reiterating the President's Executive order of May 28, 1993, which outlined the human rights conditions for granting most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China in 1994, including compliance with bilateral agreement on prison labor, and overall significant progress in taking steps to adhere to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the release and accounting for those who are imprisoned or detained for nonviolent expression of political and religious beliefs, ensuring humane treatment of prisoners by allowing human rights organization access to the prisons, protecting Tibet's distinctive religious and cultural heritage and permitting radio and TV broadcasts to China. The Executive order also calls on the administration to abide by commitment to fair, nondiscriminatory trade practices and adherence to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

Having outlined each of these positive provisions I must, for the record, state my profound disappointment that the conference committee dropped one of the key humanitarian provisions which had been added by the Senate. I was supportive of the Senate amendment which prohibits the Attorney General from deporting nationals of the People's Republic of China who demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that upon their return to the PRC they will be forced to abort their baby or will be subjected to forced sterilization. In addition, the amendment would have required the Attorney General to grant asylum to those Chinese nationals who demonstrate that they have experienced severe harm because of their refusal to comply with China Government coercive population control directives.

It is my understanding that conferees agreed to drop most of the language which came under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. For this reason, the Senate amendment was dropped.

Mr. Chairman, President Clinton and others in his administration have repeatedly expressed concern that the coercive tactics of the Chinese regime are "really very abhorrent" in the words of Secretary of State Warren Christopher. But, when the time comes to protect those individuals who face the long and cruel arm of China's policies, Mr. Clinton and his appointees administer an unsympathetic asylum policy.

Mr. Chairman, I want the record to indicate clearly my disappointment that the Congress is unable to reiterate its support for granting asylum and protecting those who are the victims of China's coercive policy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2333, the State Department Authorization Act, which contains landmark legislation to help stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Today, the United States and the international community face a frightening array of emerging nuclear threats, including North Korea, the breakup of the former Soviet Union, the India-Pakistan rivalry on the subcontinent, and Iran and Iraq. The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994, introduced by Senator GLENN, will help the United States combat these proliferation threats in several important ways.

First, it imposes sanctions on individuals, companies, banks, and countries that contribute to the global spread of nuclear weapons. India, Pakistan, and Israel all developed nuclear weapons with substantial foreign assistance. The United Nations inspections of Iraq showed that Saddam Hussein relied heavily on help from foreign companies for his secret bomb program. China has provided Pakistan with a nuclear weapons design, and other important assistance, and has questionable nuclear contacts with Iran.

The sanctions in H.R. 2333 will stop these illicit nuclear transfers. Foreign companies promoting proliferation will face a ban on procurement contracts with the U.S. Government. Banks will face a ban on doing business in the United States. Countries that substantially contribute to proliferation face a wide array of sanctions, including a cutoff in foreign aid, loss of arms sales, and a ban on loans and exports to the country.

Under current law, there are sanctions for companies and countries that contribute to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons or ballistic missiles. H.R. 2333 fills an important gap by imposing tough sanctions for nuclear proliferation as well.

The next step is to expand these sanctions to include an import ban on the products of companies and countries that promote proliferation. In 1992, the House passed my amendment to impose such an import ban. Hopefully there will be an opportunity to enact import sanctions later in this Congress.

Second, the bill sets forth 24 measures to strengthen International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] safeguards. These proposals were drawn from legislation originally introduced by myself and Senator GLENN in the 102d Congress. As the United Nation's nuclear watchdog, the IAEA is responsible for ensuring that countries are complying with the Nonproliferation Treaty. Historically, the international community has not given the IAEA the support it needs to function completely effectively. As a result, the Agency failed to detect Saddam Hussein's elaborate clandestine program, despite its regular safeguard and inspection activities. But lessons were learned from the Iraq experience, and the IAEA has developed a more activist approach to its safeguard responsibilities. It was the IAEA that uncovered evidence that North Korea had produced more plutonium than it had officially declared, giving it a potential nuclear weapons capability. The Agency deserves a great deal of credit for doggedly pursuing full access to all of North Korea's nuclear facilities, as the NPT requires. The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act establishes a broad agenda for strengthening the IAEA further. The Clinton administration should aggressively pursue these proposals.

Finally, the bill requires the administration to submit an annual report summarizing nuclear dual-use exports that have been approved. This will help improve oversight of U.S. nuclear export controls and will give an early warning if large numbers of nuclear exports are going to countries that are suspected of building nuclear weapons.

This legislation is an important milestone in U.S. efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation,

strengthening policy in three key areas: Sanctions, export controls, and IAEA safeguards. As a next step, Congress and the President should build on each of these policy areas. We should expand the sanctions to include import sanctions. We should strengthen the nuclear export control licensing process to give the Department of Defense and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency a larger role in approving licenses. Finally, the IAEA should receive enough funding so that it can undertake the reforms H.R. 2333 recommends.

The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 will help stop the global spread of nuclear weapons. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who is the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the gentlemen from California, Mr. BERMAN and Mr. LANTOS, who are both distinguished chairmen of Foreign Affairs Subcommittees, deserve great credit for their support and leadership on this important legislation, as do the gentleman from the other body, Senators GLENN, PELL, and HELMS. When President Clinton signs H.R. 2333, he will have further fulfilled his campaign promise to strengthen and improve U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. SNOWE

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. SNOWE moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2333 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to disagree to section 521 (relating to relations with Vietnam) in the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 209, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—195

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Lancaster
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—209

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Whitten
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—29

Barlow
Bryant
Calvert
Clay
Condit
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
English
Frost
Goodlatte
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Huffington
Inhofe
Istook
Kyl
Laughlin
Lloyd
Murphy
Murtha
Pickett
Quinn
Rush
Slattery
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Wheat

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. POSHARD, EMERSON, and LANCASTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, because of a family illness I was unavoidably absent during rollcall vote Nos. 146 and 147.

On rollcall vote No. 146 regarding the Iraqi Claims Act, had I been present I would have voted "aye." On rollcall vote No. 147, the motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 2333, State Department authorization, had I been present I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chairman will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, April 26, 1994, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 4013, as amended, de novo; H.R. 4250, as amended, de novo.

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

□ 1710

VETERANS HEALTH PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The unfinished business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4013, 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 Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4013, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All subsequent roll call votes will be 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 118, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—282

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Carr
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Knollenberg
Kreidler
Lancaster
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Weldon
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—118

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Ballenger
Barca
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Beilenson
Berman
Bunning
Cantwell
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Combest
Cox
Crane
DeLay
Dellums
Dickey
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Durbin
Eshoo
Fawell
Fazio
Fingerhut
Ford (TN)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gephardt
Geren
Glickman
Grams
Hancock
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hyde
Inslee
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lambert
LaRocco
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Mann
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McMillan
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Orton
Packard
Pelosi
Penny
Petri
Porter
Ramstad
Reed
Reynolds
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rostenkowski
Roth
Royce
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skaggs
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wolf
Wyden
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—32

Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bryant
Calvert
Clay
Condit
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
English
Frost
Goodlatte
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Huffington
Inhofe
Istook
Kyl
Laughlin
Lloyd
Meyers
Murphy
Murtha
Pickett
Quinn
Rush
Slattery
Thornton
Vucanovich
Wheat

□ 1729

Messrs. ROBERTS, McCLOSKEY and PORTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So (two-thirds having voted thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, as passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with necessary flexibility in staffing the Veterans Health Administration.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Thursday April 28 and missed rollcall votes 146, 147, 148. But had I been here, I would have voted in support of H.R. 3221, the Iraqi Claims Act; I would have voted against the motion to recommit H.R. 2333, State Department Authorization; and I would have voted in support of H.R. 4013, to exempt the Veterans Administration Work Force from proposed reductions for 5 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Thursday, April 28 and missed roll call votes 146, 147, and 148. But had I been here, I would have voted in support of H.R. 3221, the Iraqi Claims Act; I would have voted against the motion

to recommit H.R. 2333, State Department authorization; and I would have voted in support of H.R. 4013, to exempt the Veterans' Administration work force from proposed reductions for 5 years.

□ 1730

HUMAN SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4250, as amended, and on which the ordering of the yeas and nays has been vacated by unanimous consent.

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. MARTINEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4250, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Head Start Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981; and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2000) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2000

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

TITLE I—HEAD START PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Head Start Act Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 637 (42 U.S.C. 9832) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5);

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(9) The term 'poverty line' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.";

(3) by adding after paragraph (11) the following new paragraphs:

"(12) The term 'family literacy services' includes activities including interactive literacy activities between parents and their children, training for parents on techniques for being the primary teacher of their children and full partners in the education of their children, parent literacy training, and early childhood education.

"(13) The term 'Indian tribe' means any tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community of Indians, including any Native village described in section 3(c) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(c)) or established pursuant to such Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.";

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (11), (5), (6), (4), and (10), respectively; and

(5)(A) by transferring paragraph (4), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraph after paragraph (3);

(B) by transferring paragraphs (5) and (6), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraphs after paragraph (4), as so redesignated; and

(C) by transferring paragraph (10), as so redesignated, and inserting the paragraph after paragraph (9), as so redesignated.

SEC. 103. SERVICES.

Section 638(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 9833(a)(1)) is amended by striking "health, nutritional, educational, social, and other services" and inserting "health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, and other services".

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 639 (42 U.S.C. 9834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking all that follows "subchapter" and inserting "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

"(b) From the amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available—

"(1) $35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to—

"(A) carry out the Head Start Transition Project Act; and

"(B) carry out activities authorized under section 642(d); and

"(2) not more than $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out longitudinal research under section 649(e).".

SEC. 105. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) ALLOCATION AND USE OF FUNDS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—Section 640(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(2) by striking "(3)(C)" and all that follows through "quality improvement activities:" and inserting the following:

"(3)(A)(i) In order to provide assistance for activities specified in subparagraph (C) directed at the goals specified in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall reserve, from the amount (if any) by which the funds appropriated under section 639(a) for a fiscal year exceed the adjusted prior year appropriation, a share equal to the sum of—

"(I) 25 percent of such excess amount; and

"(II) any additional amount the Secretary may find necessary to address a demonstrated need for such activities.

"(ii) As used in clause (i), the term 'adjusted prior year appropriation' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a) for the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to reflect the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) during such preceding fiscal year.

"(B) Funds reserved under this paragraph (referred to in this paragraph as 'quality improvement funds') shall be used to accomplish any or all of the following goals:

"(i) Ensuring that Head Start programs meet or exceed performance standards pursuant to section 641A(a)(1)(A).

"(ii) Ensuring that such programs have adequate qualified staff, and that such staff are furnished adequate training.

"(iii) Ensuring that salary levels and benefits are adequate to attract and retain qualified staff for such programs.

"(iv) Using salary increases to improve staff qualifications, and to assist with the implementation of career development programs, for the staff of Head Start programs.

"(v) Improving community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments for such programs.

"(vi) Ensuring that the physical environments of Head Start programs are conducive to providing effective program services to children and families.

"(vii) Making such other improvements in the quality of such programs as the Secretary may designate.

"(C) Quality improvement funds shall be used to carry out any or all of the following activities:";

(3) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(vii) Such other activities as the Secretary may designate."; and

(4) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated in paragraph (1)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "for the first, second, and third fiscal years for which funds are so reserved"; and

(ii) in subclause (II), by inserting "and Indian and migrant Head Start programs," after "States,";

(B) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii);

(C) in clause (iv)—

(i) by striking "To be expended" and all that follows, through "reserved, funds" and inserting "Funds";

(ii) by striking "clause (ii)" the first place it appears and inserting "clause (i)";

(iii) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence, ", for expenditure for activities specified in subparagraph (C)"; and

(iv) by striking the second sentence;

(D) in clause (vi), by striking "paragraphs (2), (4), and (5)" and inserting "paragraph (2) or (4)"; and

(E) by striking clause (v) and redesignating clauses (iv) and (vi) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively.

(b) FUNDS SET-ASIDE.—Section 640(a) (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "through (5)." and inserting "through (4), and subject to paragraphs (5) and (6).";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "1990" and inserting "1994"; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "(including payments for all costs (other than compensation of Federal employees) of reviews of Head Start agencies and programs under section 641A(c), and of activities related to the development and implementation of quality improvement plans under section 641A(d)(2))" after "Secretary";

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking "paragraph (5)" each place it appears and inserting "paragraph (4)";

(4) by striking paragraph (4), and redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (7), respectively;

(5) in paragraph (4), as redesignated in paragraph (4), by striking "The" and inserting "Subject to section 639(b), the"; and

(6) by adding after paragraph (4), as redesignated in paragraph (4), the following new paragraphs:

"(5)(A) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraph (4), the Secretary shall reserve such sums as may be necessary to award the collaboration grants described in subparagraph (B).

"(B) From the reserved sums, the Secretary may award a collaboration grant to each State to facilitate collaboration regarding activities carried out in the State under this subchapter, and other activities carried out in, and by, the State that are targeted to low-income children and families.

"(C) A State that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall—

"(i) appoint an individual to serve as a State liaison between—

"(I) agencies and individuals carrying out Head Start programs in the State; and

"(II) agencies and entities carrying out programs serving low-income children and families;

"(ii) involve the State Head Start Association in the selection of the individual, and involve the association in determinations relating to the ongoing direction of the collaboration;

"(iii) ensure that the individual holds a position with sufficient authority and access to ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) is effective and involves a range of State agencies; and

"(iv) ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) involves coordination of Head Start services with health care, welfare, child care, education, and national service activities, and activities relating to children with disabilities.

"(D) As used in this paragraph, the term 'low-income', used with respect to children or families, shall not be considered to refer only to children or families that meet the low-income criteria prescribed pursuant to section 645(a)(1)(A).

"(6) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4), the Secretary shall use, for grants for programs described in section 645A(a), a portion of the combined total of such amounts equal to 3 percent for fiscal year 1995, 4 percent for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and 5 percent for fiscal year 1998, of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a).".

(c) CONSIDERATIONS FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAM EXPANSION.—Section 640(g) (42 U.S.C. 9835(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(g)" and inserting "(g)(1)"; and

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

"(2) For the purpose of expanding Head Start programs, in allocating funds to an applicant within a State, from amounts allotted to a State pursuant to subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

"(A) the quality of the applicant's programs (including Head Start and other child care or child development programs) in existence on the date of the allocation, including, in the case of Head Start programs in existence on the date of the allocation, the extent to which such programs meet or exceed performance standards and other requirements under this subchapter;

"(B) the applicant's capacity to expand services (including, in the case of Head Start programs in existence on the date of the allocation, whether the applicant accomplished any prior expansions in an effective and timely manner);

"(C) the extent to which the applicant has undertaken community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments involving other community organizations serving children and families;

"(D) the numbers of eligible children in each community who are not participating in a Head Start program; and

"(E) the concentration of low-income families in each community.

"(3) In determining the amount of funds reserved pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2) to be used for expanding Head Start programs under this subchapter, the Secretary shall take into consideration, to the extent appropriate, the factors specified in paragraph (2).".

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 640(h) (42 U.S.C. 9835(h)) is amended by striking "Each Head Start program may" and inserting "Financial assistance provided under this subchapter may be used by each Head Start program to".

(e) COMPENSATION.—Section 640 (42 U.S.C. 9835) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) Any agency that receives financial assistance under this subchapter to improve the compensation of staff who provide services under this Act shall use the financial assistance to improve the compensation of such staff, regardless of whether the agency has the ability to improve the compensation of staff employed by the agency who do not provide Head Start services.".

SEC. 106. REPORT.

Section 640A (42 U.S.C. 9835a) is repealed.

SEC. 107. DESIGNATION.

(a) INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—Section 641(b) (42 U.S.C. 9836(b)) is amended by inserting after "Indian reservation" the following: "(including members of Indian tribes living near the reservation)".

(b) DESIGNATION OF AGENCIES—Section 641(c) (42 U.S.C. 9836(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (2) through (4);

(2) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting "(subject to paragraph (2))" before ", the Secretary shall give priority"; and

(B) by striking "unless" and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following: "unless the Secretary makes a finding that the agency involved fails to meet program, financial management, and other requirements established by the Secretary.";

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2);

(4) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "except that, if" and inserting "If"; and

(B) by striking "subparagraph (A)" and inserting "paragraph (1)";

(5) by striking "Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph" and inserting the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection"; and

(6) by aligning the margins of paragraph (2) with the margins of paragraph (3).

(c) CONSIDERATIONS IN DESIGNATING NEW HEAD START AGENCIES.—Section 641(d) (42 U.S.C. 9836(d)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking all that precedes "then the Secretary" and inserting "If no entity in a community is entitled to the priority specified in subsection (c),";

(2) by striking the second sentence;

(3) in the third sentence—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "and subject to the preceding sentence"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"(4) the plan of such applicant—

"(A) to seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

"(B) to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

"(C) to offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)) to such parents—

"(i) family literacy services; and

"(ii) parenting skills training;

"(D) at the option of such applicant, to offer (directly or through referral to local entities) to such parents—

"(i) parental social self-sufficiency training;

"(ii) substance abuse counseling; or

"(iii) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children; and

"(E) to provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) in which such parents may choose to become involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);";

(4) in paragraph (7), by inserting "and" after the semicolon;

(5) by striking paragraph (8); and

(6) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (8).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 641 (42 U.S.C. 9836) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (f); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

SEC. 108. MONITORING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE.

The Act is amended by inserting after section 641 (42 U.S.C. 9836) the following new section:

"SEC. 641A. QUALITY STANDARDS; MONITORING OF HEAD START AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.

"(a) QUALITY STANDARDS.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation standards applicable to Head Start agencies, programs, and projects under this subchapter, including—

"(A) performance standards with respect to services required to be provided, including health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, and other services;

"(B) administrative and financial management standards;

"(C) standards relating to the condition and location of facilities for such agencies, programs, and projects; and

"(D) such other standards as the Secretary finds to be appropriate.

"(2) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under this subsection shall establish the minimum levels of overall accomplishment that a Head Start agency shall achieve in order to meet the standards specified in paragraph (1).

"(3) CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING STANDARDS.—In developing the regulations required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

"(A) consult with experts in the fields of child development, early childhood education, family services, administration, and financial management, and with persons with experience in the operation of Head Start programs;

"(B) take into consideration—

"(i) past experience with use of the standards in effect under this subchapter on the date of enactment of this section;

"(ii) changes over the period since the date of enactment of this Act in the circumstances and problems typically facing children and families served by Head Start agencies;

"(iii) developments concerning best practices with respect to child development, children with disabilities, family services, program administration, and financial management; and

"(iv) projected needs of an expanding Head Start program; and

"(C)(i) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, review and revise as necessary the performance standards in effect under 651(b) on the day before the date of enactment of this section; and

"(ii) ensure that any such revisions in the performance standards will not result in the elimination of or any reduction in the scope or types of health, education, parental involvement, nutritional, social, or other services required to be provided under such standards as in effect on November 2, 1978.

"(4) STANDARDS RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS TO DELEGATE AGENCIES.—In developing standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall describe the obligations of a Head Start agency to an agency (referred to in this subchapter as the 'delegate agency') to which the Head Start agency has delegated responsibility for providing services under this subchapter and determine whether the Head Start agency complies with the standards. The Secretary shall consider such compliance during the review described in subsection (c)(1)(A) and in determining whether to renew financial assistance to the Head Start agency under this subchapter.

"(b) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with representatives of Head Start agencies and with experts in the fields of child development, family services, and program management, shall develop methods and procedures for measuring, annually and over longer periods, the quality and effectiveness of programs operated by Head Start agencies (referred to in this subchapter as 'performance measures').

"(2) DESIGN OF MEASURES.—The performance measures developed under this subsection shall be designed—

"(A) to assess the various services provided by Head Start programs and, to the extent the Secretary finds appropriate, administrative and financial management practices of such programs;

"(B) to be adaptable for use in self-assessment and peer review of individual Head Start agencies and programs; and

"(C) for other program purposes as determined by the Secretary.

"(3) USE OF MEASURES.—The Secretary shall use the performance measures developed pursuant to this subsection—

"(A) to identify strengths and weaknesses in the operation of Head Start programs nationally and by region; and

"(B) to identify problem areas that may require additional training and technical assistance resources.

"(c) MONITORING OF LOCAL AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to determine whether Head Start agencies meet standards established under this subchapter with respect to program, administrative, financial management, and other requirements, the Secretary shall conduct the following reviews of designated Head Start agencies, and of the Head Start programs operated by such agencies:

"(A) A full review of each such agency at least once during each 3-year period.

"(B) A review of each newly designated agency immediately after the completion of the first year such agency carries out a Head Start program.

"(C) Followup reviews including prompt return visits to agencies and programs that fail to meet the standards.

"(D) Other reviews as appropriate.

"(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS.—The Secretary shall ensure that reviews described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)—

"(A) are performed, to the maximum extent practicable, by employees of the Department of Health and Human Services who are knowledgeable about Head Start programs; and

"(B) are supervised by such an employee at the site of such Head Start agency.

"(d) CORRECTIVE ACTION; TERMINATION.—

"(1) DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines, on the basis of a review pursuant to subsection (c), that a Head Start agency designated pursuant to section 641 fails to meet the standards described in subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

"(A) inform the agency of the deficiencies that shall be corrected;

"(B) with respect to each identified deficiency, require the agency—

"(i) to correct the deficiency immediately; or

"(ii) at the discretion of the Secretary (taking into consideration the seriousness of the deficiency and the time reasonably required to correct the deficiency), to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2) concerning a quality improvement plan; and

"(C) initiate proceedings to terminate the designation of the agency unless the agency corrects the deficiency.

"(2) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

"(A) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—In order to retain a designation as a Head Start agency under this subchapter, a Head Start agency that is the subject of a determination described in paragraph (1) (other than an agency able to correct a deficiency immediately) shall—

"(i) develop in a timely manner, obtain the approval of the Secretary regarding, and implement a quality improvement plan that specifies—

"(I) the deficiencies to be corrected;

"(II) the actions to be taken to correct such deficiencies; and

"(III) the timetable for accomplishment of the corrective actions specified; and

"(ii) eliminate each deficiency identified, not later than the date for elimination of such deficiency specified in such plan (which shall not be later than 1 year after the date the agency received notice of the determination and of the specific deficiency to be corrected).

"(B) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start agency a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.

"(3) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide training and technical assistance to Head Start agencies with respect to the development or implementation of such quality improvement plans to the extent the Secretary finds such provision to be feasible and appropriate given available funding and other statutory responsibilities.

"(e) SUMMARIES OF MONITORING OUTCOMES.—The Secretary shall publish annually, following the end of each fiscal year, a summary report on the findings of reviews conducted under subsection (c), and on the outcomes of quality improvement plans implemented under subsection (d), during such fiscal year.".

SEC. 109. TRANSITION COORDINATION WITH SCHOOLS AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT.

Section 642 (42 U.S.C. 9837) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), to read as follows: "(4) seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children, and to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;";

(B) in paragraph (5), by inserting "and" after the semicolon;

(C) by striking paragraph (6);

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs: "(5) offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)), to parents of participating children, family literacy services and parenting skills training; (6) at the option of such agency, offer (directly or through referral to local entities), to such parents, parental social self-sufficiency training, substance abuse counseling, or any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children; (7) provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in paragraphs (4) through (6) in which such parents may choose to be involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);";

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "schools that will subsequently serve children in Head Start programs,"; and

(3) by adding after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Each Head Start agency shall carry out the actions specified in this subsection, to the extent feasible and appropriate in the

circumstances (including the extent to which such agency is able to secure the cooperation of parents and schools) to enable children to maintain the developmental gains achieved in Head Start programs and to build upon such gains in further schooling.

"(2) The Head Start agency shall take steps to coordinate with the local educational agency (as defined in section 1471(12) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2891(12)) serving the community involved and with schools in which children participating in a Head Start program operated by such agency will enroll following such program, including—

"(A) developing and implementing a systematic procedure for transferring Head Start program records for each participating child to the school in which such child will enroll;

"(B) establishing channels of communication between Head Start staff and their counterparts in the schools (including teachers, social workers, and health staff) to facilitate coordination of programs;

"(C) conducting meetings involving parents, kindergarten or elementary school teachers, and Head Start program teachers to discuss the developmental and other needs of individual children; and

"(D) organizing and participating in joint transition-related training of school staff and Head Start staff.

"(3) In order to promote the continued involvement of the parents of children that participate in Head Start programs in the education of their children upon transition to school, the Head Start agency shall—

"(A) provide training to the parents—

"(i) to inform the parents about their rights and responsibilities concerning the education of their children; and

"(ii) to enable the parents to understand and work with schools in order to communicate with teachers and other school personnel, to support the school work of their children, and to participate as appropriate in decisions relating to the education of their children; and

"(B) take other actions, as appropriate and feasible, to support the active involvement of the parents with schools, school personnel, and school-related organizations.

"(4) The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education shall assess the results of the activities funded under the Head Start Transition Project Act (42 U.S.C. 9855 et seq.) and shall work together to provide technical assistance to enable communities to implement proposed practices emerging from the activities, to improve the Head Start programs and programs of the schools.".

SEC. 110. FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 644 (42 U.S.C. 9839) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking "guidelines, instructions,";

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "640(a)(3)(A)(v)" and inserting "640(a)(3)(C)(v)"; and

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

"(3) Upon a determination by the Secretary that suitable facilities are not otherwise available to Indian tribes to carry out Head Start programs, and that the lack of suitable facilities will inhibit the operation of such programs, the Secretary, in the discretion of the Secretary, may authorize the use of financial assistance, from the amount reserved under section 640(a)(2)(A), to make payments for the purchase of facilities owned by such tribes. The amount of such a payment for such a facility shall not exceed the fair market value of the facility."; and

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

"(g)(1) Upon a determination by the Secretary that suitable facilities (including public school facilities) are not otherwise available to Indian tribes, rural communities, and other low-income communities to carry out Head Start programs, that the lack of suitable facilities will inhibit the operation of such programs, and that construction of such facilities is more cost effective than purchase of available facilities or renovation, the Secretary, in the discretion of the Secretary, may authorize the use of financial assistance under this subchapter to make payments for capital expenditures related to facilities that will be used to carry out such programs. The Secretary shall establish uniform procedures for Head Start agencies to request approval for such payments, to and shall promote, to the extent practicable, the collocation of Head Start programs with other programs serving low-income children and families.

"(2) Such payments may be used for capital expenditures (including paying the cost of amortizing the principal, and paying interest on, loans) such as expenditures for—

"(A) construction of facilities that are not in existence on the date of the determination;

"(B) major renovation of facilities in existence on such date; and

"(C) purchase of vehicles used for programs conducted at the Head Start facilities.

"(3) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction or renovation of facilities to be used to carry out Head Start programs shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a et seq., commonly known as the 'Davis-Bacon Act').

"(h) In all personnel actions of the American Indian Programs Branch of the Head Start Bureau of the Administration for Children and Families, the Secretary shall give the same preference to individuals who are members of an Indian tribe as the Secretary gives to a disabled veteran, as defined in section 2108(3)(C) of title 5, United States Code. The Secretary shall take such additional actions as may be necessary to promote recruitment of such individuals for employment in the Administration.".

SEC. 111. PARTICIPATION.

Section 645 (42 U.S.C. 9840) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "may provide" and all that follows and inserting "shall be permitted to provide more than 1 year of Head Start services to eligible children in the State."; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) An Indian tribe that—

"(A) operates a Head Start program;

"(B) enrolls as participants in the program all children in the community served by the tribe (including a community with a near-reservation designation, as defined by the Bureau of Indian Affairs) from families that meet the low-income criteria prescribed under subsection (a)(1)(A); and

"(C) has the resources to enroll additional children in the community who do not meet the low-income criteria;

may enroll such additional children in a Head Start program, in accordance with this subsection, if the program predominantly serves children who meet the low-income criteria.

"(2) The Indian tribe shall enroll the children in the Head Start program in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary may specify by regulation promulgated after consultation with Indian tribes.

"(3) In providing services through a Head Start program to such children, the Indian tribe may not use funds that the Secretary has determined, in accordance with section 640(g)(3), are to be used for expanding Head Start programs under this subchapter.".

SEC. 112. INITIATIVE ON FAMILIES WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Act is amended by adding after section 645 (42 U.S.C. 9840) the following new section:

"SEC. 645A. PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this section for—

"(1) programs providing family-centered services for low-income families with very young children designed to promote the development of the children, and to enable their parents to fulfill their roles as parents and to move toward self-sufficiency; and

"(2) provision of training and technical assistance to entities carrying out programs, and evaluation of programs, that were supported under the Comprehensive Child Development Act (42 U.S.C. 9881 et seq.), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) SCOPE AND DESIGN OF PROGRAMS.—In carrying out a program described in subsection (a), an entity receiving assistance under this section shall—

"(1) provide, either directly or through referral, early, continuous, intensive, and comprehensive child development and family support services that will enhance the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development of participating children;

"(2) ensure that the level of services provided to families responds to their needs and circumstances;

"(3) promote positive parent-child interactions;

"(4) provide services to parents to support their role as parents and to help the families move toward self-sufficiency (including educational and employment services as appropriate);

"(5) coordinate services with services provided by programs in the State and programs in the community to ensure a comprehensive array of services (such as health and mental health services);

"(6) ensure formal linkages with local Head Start programs in order to provide for continuity of services for children and families;

"(7) in the case of a Head Start agency that operates a program and that also provides Head Start services through the age of mandatory school attendance, ensure that children and families participating in the program receive such services through such age; and

"(8) meet such other requirements concerning design and operation of the program described in subsection (a) as the Secretary may establish.

"(c) PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE.—Persons who may participate in programs described in subsection (a)(1) include—

"(1) pregnant women; and

"(2) families with children under age 3 (or under age 5, in the case of children served by an entity specified in subsection (e)(3));

who meet the income criteria specified for families in section 645(a)(1).

"(d) ELIGIBLE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—To be eligible to receive assistance under this section, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Entities that may apply to carry out activities under this section include—

"(1) entities operating Head Start programs under this subchapter;

"(2) entities that, on the day before the date of enactment of this section, were operating—

"(A) Parent-Child Centers receiving financial assistance under section 640(a)(4), as in effect on such date; or

"(B) programs receiving financial assistance under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, as in effect on such date; and

"(3) other public entities, and nonprofit private entities, capable of providing child and family services that meet the standards for participation in programs under this subchapter and meet such other appropriate requirements relating to the activities under this section as the Secretary may establish.

"(e) TIME-LIMITED PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4) of section 640(a), the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in accordance with paragraphs (2) through (4).

"(2) PARENT-CHILD CENTERS.—The Secretary shall make financial assistance available under this section for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 to any entity that—

"(A) complies with subsection (b); and

"(B) received funding as a Parent-Child Center pursuant to section 640(a)(4), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this section, for fiscal year 1994.

"(3) COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—

"(A) In the case of an entity that received a grant for fiscal year 1994 to operate a project under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, the Secretary—

"(i) shall make financial assistance available under this section, in a comparable amount and scope to the assistance provided for fiscal year 1994, for the duration of the project period specified in the grant award to such entity under such Act; and

"(ii) shall permit such entity, in carrying out activities assisted under this section, to serve children from birth through age 5.

"(B) In the case of an entity that received a grant for fiscal year 1989 to operate a project under the Comprehensive Child Development Act, the Secretary shall make assistance available under this section for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 to any entity that complies with subsection (b).

"(4) EVALUATIONS, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall make financial assistance available under this section as necessary to provide for the evaluation of, and furnishing of training and technical assistance to, programs specified in paragraph (3)(A).

"(f) SELECTION OF OTHER GRANT RECIPIENTS.—From the balance remaining of the portion specified in section 640(a)(6), after making grants to the eligible entities specified in subsection (e), the Secretary shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis to applicants meeting the criteria specified in subsection (d) (giving priority to entities with a record of providing early, continuous, and comprehensive childhood development and family services).

"(g) DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants to eligible applicants under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure an equitable national geographic distribution of the grants; and

"(2) award grants to applicants proposing to serve communities in rural areas and to applicants proposing to serve communities in urban areas.

"(h) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—

"(1) GUIDELINES.—Not later than September 30, 1994, the Secretary shall develop program guidelines concerning the content and operation of programs assisted under this section—

"(A) in consultation with experts in early childhood development, experts in health, and experts in family services; and

"(B) taking into consideration the knowledge and experience gained from other early childhood programs, including programs under the Comprehensive Child Development Act.

"(2) STANDARDS.—Not later than December 30, 1994, the Secretary shall develop and publish performance standards for programs assisted under this section, and a grant announcement based on the guidelines developed under paragraph (1).

"(3) MONITORING, TRAINING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND EVALUATION.—In order to ensure the successful operation of programs assisted under this section, the Secretary shall use funds from the balance described in subsection (f) to monitor the operation of such programs, evaluate their effectiveness, and provide training and technical assistance tailored to the particular needs of such programs.".

(b) CONSOLIDATION.—In recognition that the Comprehensive Child Development Centers Act has demonstrated positive results, and that its purposes and functions have been consolidated into section 645A of the Head Start Act, the Comprehensive Child Development Centers Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 9801 note) and the Comprehensive Child Development Act (42 U.S.C. 9881 et seq.) are repealed.

SEC. 113. APPEALS, NOTICE, AND HEARING.

(a) MEDIATION AND HEARING FOR DISPUTES WITH DELEGATE AGENCIES.—Section 646(a) (42 U.S.C. 9841(a)) is amended—

(1) at the end of paragraph (2), by striking "and";

(2) at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(4) the Secretary shall develop and publish procedures (including mediation procedures) to be used in order to—

"(A) resolve in a timely manner conflicts potentially leading to adverse action between—

"(i) recipients of financial assistance under this subchapter; and

"(ii) delegate agencies or Head Start Parent Policy Councils; and

"(B) avoid the need for an administrative hearing.".

(b) TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION NOT STAYED PENDING APPEAL.—Section 646 (42 U.S.C. 9841) is further amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(b) In prescribing procedures for the mediation described in subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall specify—

"(1) the date by which a Head Start agency engaged in a conflict described in subsection (a)(4) will notify the appropriate regional office of the Department of the conflict;

"(2) a reasonable period for the mediation;

"(3) a timeline for an administrative hearing, if necessary, to resolve the conflict; and

"(4) a timeline by which the person conducting the administrative hearing shall issue a decision based on the hearing.

"(c) In any case in which a termination, reduction, or suspension of financial assistance under this subchapter is upheld in an administrative hearing under this section, such termination, reduction, or suspension shall not be stayed pending any judicial appeal of such administrative decision.

"(d)(1) The Secretary shall by regulation specify a process by which an Indian tribe may identify and establish an alternative agency, and request that the alternative agency be designated under section 641 as the Head Start agency providing services to the tribe, if—

"(A) the Secretary terminates financial assistance under section 646 to the only agency that was receiving financial assistance to provide Head Start services to the Indian tribe; and

"(B) the tribe would otherwise be precluded from providing such services to the members of the tribe.

"(2) The regulation required by this subsection shall prohibit such designation of an alternative agency that includes an employee who—

"(A) served on the administrative staff or program staff of the agency described in paragraph (1)(A); and

"(B) was responsible for a deficiency that—

"(i) relates to the performance standards or financial management standards described in section 641A(a)(1); and

"(ii) was the basis for the termination of financial assistance described in paragraph (1)(A);

as determined by the Secretary after providing the notice and opportunity described in subsection (a)(3).".

SEC. 114. GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 648 (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended—

(1) in the section heading to read as follows:

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING";

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "Head Start programs, including" and inserting "Head Start programs, in accordance with the process, and the provisions for allocating resources, set forth in subsections (b) and (c). The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements,";

(3)(A) by redesignating the final sentence of subsection (a), as amended by paragraph (2), as subsection (e);

(B) by transferring such subsection to the end of the section; and

(C) by indenting such subsection and aligning the margins of such subsection with the margins of subsection (d);

(4) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

"(b) The process for determining the technical assistance and training activities to be carried out under this section shall—

"(1) ensure that the needs of local Head Start agencies and programs relating to improving program quality and to program expansion are addressed to the maximum extent feasible; and

"(2) incorporate mechanisms to ensure responsiveness to local needs, including an ongoing procedure for obtaining input from the individuals and agencies carrying out Head Start programs.

"(c) In allocating resources for technical assistance and training under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) give priority consideration to activities to correct program and management de-

ficiencies identified through reviews pursuant to section 641A(c) (including the provision of assistance to local programs in the development of quality improvement plans under section 641A(d)(2));

"(2) address the training and career development needs of classroom staff (including instruction for providing services to children with disabilities) and nonclassroom staff, including home visitors and other staff working directly with families, including training relating to increasing parent involvement and services designed to increase family literacy and improve parenting skills;

"(3) assist Head Start agencies and programs in conducting and participating in communitywide strategic planning and needs assessment;

"(4) assist Head Start agencies and programs in the development of sound management practices, including financial management procedures; and

"(5) assist in efforts to secure and maintain adequate facilities for Head Start programs.".

SEC. 115. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Head Start Act is amended by inserting after section 648 (42 U.S.C. 9843) the following new section:

"SEC. 648A. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) CLASSROOM TEACHERS.—

"(1) DEGREE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that not later than September 30, 1996, each Head Start classroom in a center-based program is assigned one teacher who has—

"(A) a child development associate (CDA) credential that is appropriate to the age of the children being served in center-based programs;

"(B) a State-awarded certificate for preschool teachers that meets or exceeds the requirements for a child development associate credential;

"(C) an associate, a baccalaureate, or an advanced degree in early childhood education; or

"(D) a degree in a field related to early childhood education with experience in teaching preschool children and a State-awarded certificate to teach in a preschool program.

"(2) WAIVER.—On request, the Secretary shall grant a 180-day waiver of the requirements of paragraph (1) with respect to an individual who—

"(A) is first employed after September 30, 1996, by a Head Start agency as a teacher for a Head Start classroom;

"(B) is enrolled in a program that grants any credential, certificate, or degree specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1); and

"(C) will receive such credential under the terms of such program not later than 180 days after beginning employment as a teacher with such agency.

"(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not grant more than one such waiver with respect to such individual.

"(b) MENTOR TEACHERS.—

"(1) DEFINITION; FUNCTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'mentor teacher' means an individual responsible for observing and assessing the classroom activities of a Head Start program and providing on-the-job guidance and training to the Head Start program staff and volunteers, in order to improve the qualifications and training of classroom staff, to maintain high quality education services, and to promote career development, in Head Start programs.

"(2) REQUIREMENT.—In order to assist Head Start agencies in establishing positions for mentor teachers, the Secretary shall—

"(A) provide technical assistance and training to enable Head Start agencies to establish such positions;

"(B) give priority consideration, in providing assistance pursuant to subparagraph (A), to Head Start programs that have substantial numbers of new classroom staff or that are experiencing difficulty in meeting applicable education standards; and

"(C) encourage Head Start programs to give priority consideration for such positions to Head Start teachers at the appropriate level of career advancement in such programs.

"(c) FAMILY SERVICE WORKERS.—In order to improve the quality and effectiveness of staff providing in-home and other services (including needs assessment, development of service plans, family advocacy, and coordination of service delivery) to families of children participating in Head Start programs, the Secretary, in coordination with concerned public and private agencies and organizations examining the issues of standards and training for family service workers, shall—

"(1) review and, as necessary, revise or develop new qualification standards for Head Start staff providing such services;

"(2) promote the development of model curricula (on subjects including parenting training and family literacy) designed to ensure the attainment of appropriate competencies by individuals working or planning to work in the field of early childhood and family services; and

"(3) promote the establishment of a credential that indicates attainment of the competencies and that is accepted nationwide.

"(d) HEAD START FELLOWSHIPS.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may establish a program of fellowships, to be known as 'Head Start Fellowships', in accordance with this subsection. The Secretary may award the fellowships to individuals, to be known as 'Head Start Fellows', who are staff in local Head Start programs or other individuals working in the field of child development and family services.

"(2) PURPOSE.—The fellowship program established under this subsection shall be designed to enhance the ability of Head Start Fellows to make significant contributions to programs authorized under this subchapter, by providing opportunities to expand their knowledge and experience through exposure to activities, issues, resources, and new approaches, in the field of child development and family services.

"(3) ASSIGNMENTS OF FELLOWS.—

"(A) PLACEMENT SITES.—Fellowship positions under the fellowship program may be located (subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C))—

"(i) in agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services administering programs authorized under this subchapter (in national or regional offices of such agencies);

"(ii) in local Head Start agencies and programs;

"(iii) in institutions of higher education;

"(iv) in public or private entities and organizations concerned with services to children and families; and

"(v) in other appropriate settings.

"(B) LIMITATION FOR FELLOWS OTHER THAN HEAD START EMPLOYEES.—A Head Start Fellow who is not an employee of a local Head Start agency or program may be placed only in a fellowship position located in an agency or program specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A).

"(C) NO PLACEMENT IN LOBBYING ORGANIZATIONS.—Head Start Fellowship positions may not be located in any agency whose primary purpose, or one of whose major purposes, is to influence Federal, State, or local legislation.

"(4) SELECTION OF FELLOWS.—Head Start Fellowships shall be awarded on a competitive basis to individuals (other than Federal employees) selected from among applicants who are working, on the date of application, in local Head Start programs or otherwise working in the field of child development and children and family services.

"(5) DURATION.—Head Start Fellowships shall be for terms of 1 year, and may be renewed for a term of 1 additional year.

"(6) AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES.—From amounts appropriated under this subchapter and allotted under section 640(a)(2)(D), the Secretary is authorized to make expenditures of not to exceed $1,000,000 for any fiscal year, for stipends and other reasonable expenses of the fellowship program.

"(7) STATUS OF FELLOWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, Head Start Fellows shall not be considered to be employees or otherwise in the service or employment of the Federal Government. Head Start Fellows shall be considered to be employees for purposes of compensation for injuries under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code. Head Start Fellows assigned to positions located in agencies specified in paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall be considered employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the purposes of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, and for purposes of any administrative standards of conduct applicable to the employees of the agency to which they are assigned.

"(8) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

"(e) MODEL STAFFING PLANS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate public agencies, private agencies, and organizations and with individuals with expertise in the field of children and family services, shall develop model staffing plans to provide guidance to local Head Start agencies and programs on the numbers, types, responsibilities, and qualifications of staff required to operate a Head Start program.".

SEC. 116. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, EVALUATION.

Section 649 (42 U.S.C. 9844) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 649. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT; GENERAL PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall carry out a continuing program of research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, in order to—

"(A) foster continuous improvement in the quality of the Head Start programs under this subchapter and in their effectiveness in enabling participating children and their families to succeed in school and otherwise; and

"(B) use the Head Start programs to develop, test, and disseminate new ideas and approaches for addressing the needs of low-income preschool children (including children with disabilities) and their families and communities, and otherwise to further the purposes of this subchapter.

"(2) PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop, and periodically update, a plan governing the

research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section.

"(b) CONDUCT OF RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, in order to conduct research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section—

"(1) may carry out such activities directly, or through grants to, or contracts or cooperative agreements with, public or private entities;

"(2) shall, to the extent appropriate, undertake such activities in collaboration with other Federal agencies, and with non-Federal agencies, conducting similar activities;

"(3) shall ensure that evaluation of activities in a specific program or project is conducted by persons not directly involved in the operation of such program or project;

"(4) may require Head Start agencies to provide for independent evaluations;

"(5) may approve, in appropriate cases, community-based cooperative research and evaluation efforts to enable Head Start programs to collaborate with qualified researchers not directly involved in program administration or operation; and

"(6) may collaborate with organizations with expertise in inclusive educational strategies for preschoolers with disabilities.

"(c) CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION.—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) consult with—

"(A) individuals from relevant academic disciplines;

"(B) individuals who are involved in the operation of Head Start programs and individuals who are involved in the operation of other child and family service programs; and

"(C) individuals from other Federal agencies, and individuals from organizations, involved with children and families, ensuring that the individuals described in this subparagraph reflect the multicultural nature of the children and families served by the Head Start programs and the multidisciplinary nature of the Head Start programs;

"(2) whenever feasible and appropriate, obtain the views of persons participating in and served by programs and projects assisted under this subchapter with respect to activities under this section; and

"(3) establish, to the extent appropriate, working relationships with the faculties of institutions of higher education, as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)), located in the area in which any evaluation under this section is being conducted, unless there is no such institution of higher education willing and able to participate in such evaluation.

"(d) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES.—The research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this subchapter shall include components designed to—

"(1) permit ongoing assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the programs under this subchapter;

"(2) contribute to developing knowledge concerning factors associated with the quality and effectiveness of Head Start programs and in identifying ways in which services provided under this subchapter may be improved;

"(3) assist in developing knowledge concerning the factors that promote or inhibit healthy development and effective functioning of children and their families both during and following participation in a Head Start program;

"(4) permit comparisons of children and families participating in Head Start programs with children and families receiving other child care, early childhood education, or child development services and with other appropriate control groups;

"(5) contribute to understanding the characteristics and needs of population groups eligible for services provided under this subchapter and the impact of such services on the individuals served and the communities in which such services are provided;

"(6) provide for disseminating and promoting the use of the findings from such research, demonstration, and evaluation activities; and

"(7) promote exploration of areas in which knowledge is insufficient, and that will otherwise contribute to fulfilling the purposes of this subchapter.

"(e) LONGITUDINAL STUDIES.—In developing priorities for research, demonstration, and evaluation activities under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to longitudinal studies that—

"(1) examine the developmental progress of children and their families both during and following participation in a Head Start program, including the examination of factors that contribute to or detract from such progress;

"(2) examine factors related to improving the quality of the Head Start programs and the preparation the programs provide for children and their families to function effectively in schools and other settings in the years following participation in such a program; and

"(3) as appropriate, permit comparison of children and families participating in Head Start programs with children and families receiving other child care, early childhood education, or child development services, and with other appropriate control groups.

"(f) OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS.—The Secretary shall take necessary steps to ensure that all studies, reports, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds under this subchapter shall become the property of the United States.".

SEC. 117. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND EVALUATIONS.

Section 650 (42 U.S.C. 9845) is repealed.

SEC. 118. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 651 (42 U.S.C. 9846) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through subsection (f) and inserting:

"SEC. 651. REPORTS.":

(2) by striking "(g)";

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking "evaluations conducted under section 641(c)(2)" and inserting "monitoring conducted under section 641A(c)"; and

(4)(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (11);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) a summary of information concerning the research, demonstration, and evaluation activities conducted under section 649, including—

"(A) a status report on ongoing activities; and

"(B) results, conclusions, and recommendations, not included in any previous report, based on completed activities.".

(b) REDESIGNATION.—Section 651 is redesignated as section 650.

SEC. 119. REPEALS.

Sections 651A and 652 (42 U.S.C. 9846a and 9847) are repealed.

SEC. 120. STUDY OF BENEFITS FOR HEAD START EMPLOYEES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study regarding the benefits available to individuals employed by Head Start agencies under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) PREPARATION.—The Secretary shall prepare a report, containing the results of the study, that—

(A) describes the benefits, including health care benefits, family and medical leave, and retirement pension benefits, available to such individuals;

(B) includes recommendations for increasing the access of the individuals to benefits, including access to a retirement pension program; and

(C) addresses the feasibility of participation by such individuals in the Federal Employees' Retirement System under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit the report to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 121. AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY OF HEAD START PARTICIPANTS.

The National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 9(b)(6) (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(6))—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "a member of";

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by inserting "a member of" after "(i)"; and

(II) by striking "or" at the end of the clause;

(iii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting "a member of" after "(ii)"; and

(II) by striking the period at the end of the clause and inserting "; or"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) enrolled as a participant in a Head Start program authorized under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), on the basis of a determination that the child is a member of a family that meets the low-income criteria prescribed under section 645(a)(1)(A) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9840(a)(1)(A)).".; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "food stamps or aid to families with dependent children" and inserting "food stamps, aid to families with dependent children, or enrollment or participation in the Head Start program on the basis described in subparagraph (A)(iii)"; and

(2) in section 17(c) (42 U.S.C. 1766(c)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) A child shall be considered automatically eligible for benefits under this section without further application or eligibility determination, if the child is enrolled as a participant in a Head Start program authorized under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), on the basis of a determination that the child is a member of a family that meets the low-income criteria prescribed under section 645(a)(1)(A) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9840(a)(1)(A)).".

SEC. 122. READY TO LEARN PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Section 4702(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 3161a(b)(1)) is amended by striking ", nongovernmental entity" and inserting "entity (including public telecommunications entities)".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 4706(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 3161e(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1993" and inserting "$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1995"; and

(2) by striking "for fiscal year 1994." and inserting "for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997.".

SEC. 123. STATE DEPENDENT CARE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 670A of the State Dependent Care Development Grants Act (42 U.S.C. 9871) is amended by striking "are authorized to be appropriated" and all that follows and inserting "is authorized to be appropriated $13,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 124. REAUTHORIZATION OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1985.

Section 606 of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 10905) is amended by striking "$1,500,000" and all that follows and inserting "to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995.".

SEC. 125. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT.—Section 133(a) of the Head Start Transition Project Act is amended by striking "639(c)" and inserting "639(b)".

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 1924(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-5(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by striking "sections 652 and 673(2)" and inserting "section 673(2)".

SEC. 126. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this title.

(b) APPLICATION.—The requirements of this title and the amendments made by this title shall not apply to Head Start agencies and other recipients of financial assistance under the Head Start Act until October 1, 1994.

TITLE II—COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Community Services Block Grant Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.).

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION AND REPEAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 672 (42 U.S.C. 9901(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated $525,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.".

(2) REPEAL.—Section 408 of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 9910b) is repealed.

(b) STATE ALLOCATIONS.—Section 674 (42 U.S.C. 9903) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b) and (c) as subsections (b), (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated), the following new subsection:

"(a) Of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year pursuant to section 672(b), the Secretary may reserve not less than one-half of 1 percent and not more than 1 percent for training, technical assistance, planning, and evaluation activities related to programs or projects carried out under this Act. Such activities may be carried out by the Secretary directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.".

(c) APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) FORM AND ASSURANCES.—Section 675(a) (42 U.S.C. 9904(a)) is amended by inserting "or significant amendments thereof" before "shall contain assurances".

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 675(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(1)) is amended by striking "use the funds available under this Act" and inserting "ensure that, at its discretion and consistent with agreements with the State, each recipient of funds available under this Act will use such funds".

(3) ASSURED ACTIVITIES.—Section 675(c)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting "homeless individuals and families, migrants, and" before "the elderly poor".

(4) STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 675(c)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) if less than 100 percent of the allotment is expended under subparagraph (A), provide assurances that with respect to the remainder of the allotment a reasonable amount shall be used for—

"(i) providing training and technical assistance to those entities in need of such assistance and such activities will not be considered administrative expenses;

"(ii) coordinating State-operated programs and services targeted to low-income children and families with services provided by eligible entities funded under this Act, including outposting appropriate State or local public employees into entities funded under this Act to ensure increased access to services provided by such State or local agencies;

"(iii) supporting statewide coordination and communication among eligible entities;

"(iv) administrative expenses at the State level, including monitoring activities, but not more than $55,000 or 5 percent of its allotment under section 674; and

"(v) considering the distribution of funds under this Act within the State to determine if such funds have been targeted to the areas of highest need.".

(5) TRIPARTITE BOARD.—Section 675(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)(3)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "selected by the community action agency or nonprofit private organization and" after "board will be";

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

(C) by striking the comma after "provide assurances that" and inserting "(A)"; and

(D) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ", and (B) in the case of a public organization receiving funds under this subtitle, such organization either establish—

"(i) a board of which at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served; or

"(ii) another mechanism specified by the State to assure low-income citizen participation in the planning, administration, and evaluation of projects for which such organization has been funded;".

(6) REGULATIONS.—The next to last sentence of section 675(c) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)) is amended by striking "may not" and inserting "shall by regulation".

(d) COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY PLAN.—Section 675(c) (42 U.S.C. 9904(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A) as items (aa) through (cc), respectively;

(B) by realigning the margin of the sentence beginning with "For purposes of" so as to align with subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking "For purposes of" and inserting "(A) For purposes of";

(D) by striking "(A) a statewide" and inserting "(i)(I) a statewide";

(E) by striking "(B) the failure" and inserting "(ii) the failure";

(F) by inserting immediately before paragraph (12) the following:

"(B) for purposes of making a determination with respect to a termination, the term 'cause' includes the material failure of an eligible entity to comply with the terms of its agreement and community action plan to provide services under this subtitle;".

(2) in paragraph (12) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraphs:

"(13) secure from each eligible entity as a condition to its receipt of funding under this Act a community action plan (which shall be available to the Secretary for inspection) that includes—

"(A) a community needs assessment (including food needs);

"(B) a description of the service delivery system targeted to low-income individuals and families in the service area;

"(C) a description of how linkages will be developed to fill identified gaps in services through information, referral, case management, and followup consultations;

"(D) a description of how funding under this Act will be coordinated with other public and private resources; and

"(E) a description of outcome measures to be used to monitor success in promoting self-sufficiency, family stability, and community revitalization; and

"(14) provide assurances that cost and accounting standards of the Office of Management and Budget shall apply to a recipient of funds under this Act.".

(e) PUBLIC INSPECTIONS OF PLANS.—Section 675(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 9904(d)(2)) is amended by inserting "or revision" after "Each plan".

(f) AUDITS.—The last sentence of section 675(f) (42 U.S.C. 9904(f)) is amended by inserting before "to the legislature" the following: "to the eligible entity at no charge,".

SEC. 203. DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.

(a) TRAINING AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 681(a) (42 U.S.C. 9910(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceeding paragraph (1), by striking "to provide for—" and inserting "to provide for";

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (3);

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "(2) ongoing" and inserting "ongoing";

(B) by striking "including special emphasis programs for" and inserting "with special emphasis on"; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F); and

(4) by inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(1) a Community Initiative Program, awarded on a competitive basis, to fund private, nonprofit community development corporations for the purposes of planning and carrying out community and economic development activities in economically distressed areas and in rural areas, as described in subsection (c);

"(2) grants to eligible entities for the development and implementation of innovative approaches to deal with critical needs or problems of low-income individuals that are common to a number of communities, including grants to provide opportunities for leadership development, community involvement and education success to disadvantaged persons between the ages of 14 and 25; and

"(3) grants to support the design, development, and widespread availability of interactive information technology among the nationwide network of Community Service Block Grant eligible entities, State administrators, national associations and organizations, and program recipients to promote electronic communication and access to program information that would enhance the effective delivery of social services.".

(b) COMMUNITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—Subsection (b) of section 681 (42 U.S.C. 9910) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) COMMUNITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Economic development activities under this section shall be designed to address the economic needs of low-income individuals and families by creating employment and business development opportunities.

"(B) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall exercise the authority provided under subparagraph (A) in consultation with other relevant Federal officials.

"(C) GOVERNING BOARDS.—Each community development corporation receiving funds under this section shall be governed by a board that shall consist of residents of the community and business and civic leaders and shall have as a principal purpose planning, developing or managing low-income housing and community development projects.

"(D) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—In providing assistance or entering into other arrangements under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the geographic distribution of funds among States and the relative proportion of funding among rural and urban areas.

"(E) RESERVATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, the Secretary may reserve not to exceed 1 percent for each fiscal year to make grants to private nonprofit organizations or to enter into contracts with private nonprofit or for profit organizations to provide technical assistance to aid community development corporations in developing or implementing projects funded under this section and to evaluate projects funded under this section.

"(2) RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Rural community development activities under this section shall include—

"(A) grants to private, nonprofit corporations that provide assistance to rural low-income families in home repair and in planning and developing low-income rural rental housing units; and

"(B) grants to multistate, regional private, nonprofit organizations that provide training and technical assistance to small, rural communities in meeting their community facility needs.".

SEC. 204. COMMUNITY FOOD AND NUTRITION.

Subsection (d) of section 681A (42 U.S.C. 9910a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1998, to carry out this section.".

SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall take effect on October 1, 1994.

TITLE III—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Amendments of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

Subsection (a) of section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this title, to States to assist low-income households, particularly those that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, primarily in meeting their immediate home energy needs and, where appropriate, to reduce the energy needs and costs of such households and thereby improve their capacity to meet such needs in the future.".

SEC. 303. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.—Section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "this title" and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting "this title, $2,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1995 through 1999."; and

(2) in the last sentence of subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "July 1" and inserting "October 1"; and

(B) by striking "for which" and inserting "following the year in which".

(b) INCENTIVE PROGRAM FOR LEVERAGING NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—Subsection (d) of section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 2607A, $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 and 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1997 through 1999.".

SEC. 304. EMERGENCY FUNDS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2602 (42 U.S.C. 8621) as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for payments under this title, in addition to amounts appropriated for distribution to all the States in accordance with section 2604 (other than subsection (g)), $600,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1999, to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection are hereby designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such funds shall be made available only after the submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President (for all or a part of the appropriation pursuant to this subsection) that includes a designation of the amount requested as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.".

(b) HOME ENERGY.—Section 2603 (42 U.S.C. 8622(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (2), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

"(1) The term 'energy burden' means the expenditures of the household for home energy divided by the income of the household."; and

(3) by inserting before paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

"(3) The term 'highest home energy needs' means the home energy requirements of households that include members of vulnerable populations, including very young children and the frail elderly."

(c) ALLOTMENT OF EMERGENCY FUNDS.—Section 2604 (42 U.S.C. 8623) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding subsections (a) through (f), the Secretary may allot amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(d) to one or more than one State. In determining to which State or States additional funds may be allotted, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which a State was affected by the emergency or disaster, the availability to an affected State of other resources under this or any other program, and such other factors as the Secretary determines relevant.".

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZED USES OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) use the funds available under this title to—

"(A) conduct outreach activities and provide assistance to low income households in meeting their home energy costs, particularly those that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, consistent with paragraph (5);

"(B) intervene in energy crisis situations;

"(C) provide low-cost residential weatherization and other cost-effective energy-related home repair; and

"(D) plan, develop, and administer the State's program under this title including leveraging programs,

and the State agrees not to use such funds for any purposes other than those specified in this title;".

(b) ENCOURAGED REDUCED HOME ENERGY NEEDS.—Section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: "(except for the costs of the activities described in paragraph (16))";

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

"(16) subject the use of such funds to the requirements of paragraph (9)(A) if it uses such funds to provide services that encourage and enable households to reduce their home energy needs and thereby the need for energy assistance, including needs assessments, counseling, and assistance with energy vendors.".

SEC. 306. TARGETING OF ASSISTANCE TO HOUSEHOLDS WITH HIGH HOME ENERGY BURDENS.

(a) HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—Section 2605(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(2)(B)) is amended by striking the matter following clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"except that a State may not exclude a household from eligibility in a fiscal year solely on the basis of household income if such income is less than 110 percent of the poverty level for such State, but the State may give priority to those households with the highest home energy costs or needs in relation to household income;".

(b) OUTREACH ACTIVITIES.—Section 2605(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(3)) is amended by

striking "are made aware" and inserting "and households with high home energy burdens, are made aware".

(c) ASSISTANCE LEVELS.—Section 2605(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(5)) is amended by inserting "or needs" after "highest energy costs".

(d) STATE PLAN.—Section 2605(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (H), respectively; and

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

"(E) describes any steps that will be taken (in addition to those necessary to carry out the assurance contained in paragraph (5) of subsection (b)) to target assistance to households with high home energy burdens;".

SEC. 307. REMOVAL OF CONSTRAINT ON SECRETARIAL PROGRAM GUIDANCE.

Section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is amended by striking the first flush sentence immediately following paragraph (14).

SEC. 308. CLARIFICATION OF AUDIT REQUIREMENT.

Section 2605 (42 U.S.C. 8624) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(10), by striking "and provide that" and all that follows and inserting "and provide that the State will comply with the provisions of chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Single Audit Act');"; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking "at least every two years" and all that follows and inserting "in accordance with chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.".

SEC. 309. USE OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WEATHERIZATION RULES TO ACHIEVE PROGRAM CONSISTENCY.

Section 2605(c)(1)(D) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)(D)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", including any steps the State will take to address the weatherization and energy-related home repair needs of households that have high home energy burdens, and describes any rules promulgated by the Department of Energy for administration of its Low Income Weatherization Assistance Program which the State, to the extent permitted by the Secretary to increase consistency between federally assisted programs, will follow regarding the use of funds provided under this title by the State for such weatherization and energy-related home repairs and improvements".

SEC. 310. MATTERS TO BE DESCRIBED IN ANNUAL APPLICATION.

Section 2605(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 8624(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated by section 306(d) of this Act)—

(A) by striking "and (13)" and inserting "(13), and (15)"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end thereof; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated by section 306(d) of this Act), the following new subparagraph:

"(G) states, with respect to the 12-month period specified by the Secretary, the number and income levels of households which apply and the number which are assisted with funds provided under this title, and the number of households so assisted with—

"(i) one or more members who has attained 60 years of age;

"(ii) one or more members who were disabled; and

"(iii) one or more young children; and".

SEC. 311. REPORT OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION.

Section 2607(a) (42 U.S.C. 8628(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Each State shall notify the Secretary, not later than 2 months prior to the close of a fiscal year, of the amount (if any) of its allotment for such year that will not be obligated in such year, and, if such State elects to submit a request described in subsection (b)(2), such State shall submit such request at the same time. The Secretary shall make no payment under paragraph (1) to a State for a fiscal year unless the State has complied with this paragraph with respect to the prior fiscal year.".

SEC. 312. MISCELLANEOUS AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TREATMENT OF HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 2605(b)(7)(D) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(7)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) ensure that the provision of vendored payments remains at the option of the State in consultation with local grantees and may be contingent on vendors taking appropriate measures to alleviate the energy burdens of eligible households, including providing for compacts between suppliers and individuals eligible for benefits under this Act that seek to reduce home energy costs, minimize the risks of home energy crisis, and encourage regular payments by individuals receiving financial assistance for home energy costs;".

(2) INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 2607A(e) (42 U.S.C. 8626a(e)) is amended by striking "July 31, of each year" and inserting "2 months after the close of the fiscal year during which the State provided leveraged resources to eligible households, as described in subsection (b)".

(3) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 2609A(a) is amended by striking "$500,000" and inserting "$250,000".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2602(b) (42 U.S.C. 8621(b)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(other than section 2607A)" after "to carry out the provisions of this title"; and

(B) by striking the second period at the end thereof.

(2) Section 2603(2) (42 U.S.C. 8622(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking "the" in paragraph (2) and inserting "The"; and

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting a period.

(3) The sentence that immediately precedes paragraph (15) of section 2605(b) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)) is transferred so as to appear as a flush sentence immediately after paragraph (16).

(4) Section 2605(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(3)) is amended by striking "handicapped" and inserting "disabled".

(5) Section 2607A(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 8626a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ".0008 percent" and inserting "0.08 percent".

(6) Section 2610(a) (42 U.S.C. 8629(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking the semicolon after "used" and inserting a semicolon after "title"; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "handicapped" and inserting "disabled"; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof "or include young children".

SEC. 313. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments and repeals made by this title shall become effective on October 1, 1994.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 933 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12339) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 933. COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.

"(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to promote a systemic approach to prevention through the promotion of innovative funding mechanisms for networks of comprehensive family resource services provided through collaborative approaches, including public-private partnerships.

"(b) AUTHORITY.—The Commissioner shall make grants to States on a formula basis for the purpose of—

"(1) establishing and expanding statewide networks of community-based family resource programs, including funds for the initial costs of providing specific family resource services, that ensure family involvement in the design and operation of family resource programs which are responsive to the unique and diverse strengths of children and families;

"(2) promoting child abuse and neglect prevention activities;

"(3) promoting the establishment and operation of State trust funds or other mechanisms for integrating child and family services funding streams in order to provide flexible funding for the development of community-based family resource programs;

"(4) establishing or expanding community-based collaboration to foster the development of a continuum of preventive services for children and families, which are family-centered and culturally-relevant; and

"(5) encouraging public and private partnerships in the establishment and expansion of family resource programs.

"(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—A State is eligible for a grant under this section for any fiscal year if—

"(1) such State has established or maintained in the previous fiscal year—

"(A) a trust fund, including appropriations for such fund; or

"(B) any other mechanism that pools State, Federal, and private funds for integrating child and family service resources; and

"(2) such trust fund or other funding mechanism includes (in whole or in part) provisions making funding available specifically for a broad range of child abuse and neglect prevention activities and family resource programs.

"(d) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated for a fiscal year to provide grants under this section shall be allotted, among eligible States in each fiscal year so that—

"(A) 50 percent of the total amount appropriated for such fiscal year is allotted among each State based on the number of children under the age of 18 residing in each State, except that each State shall receive not less than $100,000; and

"(B) the remaining 50 percent of the total amount appropriated for such fiscal year is allotted in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total amount allocated by each such State to the State's trust fund or other mechanism for integrating family resource services in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the allotment is being determined.

"(e) EXISTING GRANTS.—A State that has a grant in effect on the date of enactment of this section under the Family Resource and

Support Program or the Temporary Child Care and Crisis Nurseries Program shall continue to receive funds under such Programs, subject to the original terms under which such funds were granted, through the end of the applicable grant cycle.

"(f) APPLICATION.—No grant may be made to any eligible State under this section unless an application is prepared and submitted to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner determines to be essential to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section, including—

"(1) a description of the agency designated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State to administer the funds provided under this section and assume responsibility for implementation and oversight of the family resource programs and other child abuse and neglect prevention activities, and an assurance that the agency so designated—

"(A) is the trust fund advisory board or an existing quasi-public organization with interdisciplinary governance that pools State, Federal, and private funds for family resource programs or integrating child and family service resources; or

"(B) with respect to a State without a trust fund mechanism or quasi-public organization that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), is an existing State agency, or other public, quasi-public, or nonprofit private agency responsible for the development and implementation of a statewide network of community-based family resource programs;

"(2) assurances that the agency designated under paragraph (1) can demonstrate the capacity to fulfill the purposes described in subsection (a), and shall have—

"(A) a demonstrated ability to work with other State and community-based agencies, to provide training and technical assistance; and

"(B) a commitment to parental participation in the design and implementation of family resource programs;

"(3) an assurance that the State has an interagency process coordinated by the agency designated in paragraph (1) for effective program development that—

"(A) does not duplicate existing processes for developing collaborative efforts to better serve children and families;

"(B) provides a written plan for the establishment of a network of family resource programs publicly available; and

"(C) involves appropriate personnel in the process, including—

"(i) parents and prospective participants in family resource programs, including respite care programs;

"(ii) staff of existing programs providing family resource services, including staff of Head Start programs and community action agencies that provide such services;

"(iii) representatives of State and local government such as social service, health, mental health, education, employment, economic development agencies, and organizations providing community services activities;

"(iv) representatives of the business community;

"(v) representatives of general purpose local governments;

"(vi) representatives of groups with expertise in child abuse prevention, including respite and crisis care;

"(vii) representatives of local communities in which family resource programs are likely to be located; and

"(viii) other individuals with expertise in the services that the family resource and support programs of the State intend to offer;

"(4) a description of the current family resource programs operating in the State, the current unmet need for the services provided under such programs, including the need for building increased capacity to provide specific family resource services, including respite care, and the intended scope of the State family resource program, the population to be served, the manner in which the program will be operated, and the manner in which such program will relate to other community services and public agencies;

"(5) evidence that Federal assistance received under this section—

"(A) has been supplemented with non-Federal public and private assistance, including a description of the projected level of financial commitment by the State to develop a family resource program; and

"(B) will be used to supplement and not supplant other State and local public funds expended for family resource programs;

"(6) a description of the core services, as required by this section, and other support services to be provided by the program and the manner in which such services will be provided, including the extent to which either family resources, centers, home visiting, or community collaboratives will be used;

"(7) a description of any public information activities the agency designated in paragraph (1) will undertake for the purpose of promoting family stability and preventing child abuse and neglect, including child sexual abuse;

"(8) an assurance that the State will provide funds for the initial startup costs associated with specific family resource services, including respite services, and a description of the services to be funded;

"(9) assurances that the State program will maintain cultural diversity;

"(10) a description of the guidelines for requiring parental involvement in State and local program development, policy design, and governance and the process for assessing and demonstrating that parental involvement in program development, operation, and governance occurs;

"(11) a description of the State and community-based interagency planning processes to be utilized to develop and implement family resource programs;

"(12) a description of the criteria that the State will utilize for awarding grants for local programs so that they meet the requirements of subsection (g);

"(13) a plan for providing training, technical assistance, and other assistance to local communities in program development;

"(14) a description of the methods to be utilized to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the family resource programs within the State;

"(15) a description of proposed actions by the State that will reduce practical and regulatory barriers to the provision of comprehensive services to families, including family resource programs; and

"(16) an assurance that the State will provide the Secretary with reports, at such time and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(g) LOCAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall use amounts received under such grant to establish local family resource programs that—

"(A) undertake a community-based needs assessment and program planning process which involves parents, and local public and nonprofit agencies (including those responsible for providing health, education, employment training, Head Start and other early childhood, child welfare, and social services);

"(B) develop a strategy to provide comprehensive services to families to meet identified needs through collaboration, including public-private partnerships;

"(C) identify appropriate community-based organizations to administer such programs locally;

"(D) provide core services, and other services directly or through contracts or agreements with other local agencies; and

"(E) involve parents in the development, operation, and governance of the program.

"(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding local grants under this section, a State shall give priority to programs serving low-income communities and programs serving young parents or parents with young children and shall ensure that such grants are equitably distributed among urban and rural areas.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

"(1) COMMUNITY REFERRAL SERVICES.—The term 'community referral services' means services to assist families in obtaining community resources, including respite services, health and mental health services, employability development and job training and other social services.

"(2) FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAM.—The term 'family resource program' means a program that offers community-based services that provide sustained assistance to families at various stages in their development. Such services shall promote parental competencies and behaviors that will lead to the healthy and positive personal development of parents and children through—

"(A) the provisions of assistance to build family skills and assist parents in improving their capacities to be supportive and nurturing parents;

"(B) the provision of assistance to families to enable such families to use other formal and informal resources and opportunities for assistance that are available within the communities of such families; and

"(C) the creation of supportive networks to enhance the childbearing capacity of parents and assist in compensating for the increased social isolation and vulnerability of families.

"(3) FAMILY RESOURCE SERVICES.—The term 'family resource services' means—

"(A) core services that must be provided directly by the family resource program under this section, including—

"(i) education and support services provided to assist parents in acquiring parenting skills, learning about child development, and responding appropriately to the behavior of their children;

"(ii) early developmental screening of children to assess the needs of such children and to identify the types of support to be provided;

"(iii) outreach services;

"(iv) community referral services; and

"(v) follow-up services; and

"(B) other services, which may be provided either directly or through referral, including—

"(i) early care and education (such as child care and Head Start);

"(ii) respite care;

"(iii) job readiness and counseling services (including skill training);

"(iv) education and literacy services;

"(v) nutritional education;

"(vi) life management skills training;

"(vii) peer counseling and crisis intervention, and family violence counseling services;

"(viii) referral for health (including prenatal care) and mental health services; and

"(ix) substance abuse treatment.

"(4) INTERDISCIPLINARY GOVERNANCE.—The term 'interdisciplinary governance' includes governance by representatives from communities and representatives from existing health, mental health, education, employment and training, child welfare, and other agencies within the State.".

"(5) RESPITE SERVICES.—The term 'respite services' means short-term care services provided in the temporary absence of the regular caregiver (parent, other relative, foster parent, adoptive parent, guardian) to children who meet one or more of the following categories:

"(A) The children are in danger of abuse or neglect.

"(B) The children have experienced abuse or neglect.

"(C) The children have disabilities, or chronic or terminal illnesses.

Services provided within or outside the child's home shall be short-term care, ranging from a few hours to a few weeks of time, per year, and be intended to enable the family to stay together and to keep the child living in the child's home and community.".

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 926(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12332(7)) is amended by inserting ", and other caretakers" after "parents".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 934 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12340) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), to read as follows:

"(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 931 such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) in subsection (d), to read as follows:

"(h) COMMUNITY-BASED FAMILY RESOURCE PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 933, $75,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998.".

(d) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION GRANTS.—Title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.) is repealed.

(2) EMERGENCY CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION SERVICES GRANTS.—Sec. 107A of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a-1) is repealed.

(3) TEMPORARY CHILD CARE AND CRISIS NURSERIES.—The Temporary Child Care for Children with Disabilities and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 5117 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 402. FEDERAL COUNCIL ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES.

Section 918 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12314) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) identify program regulations, practices, and eligibility requirements that impede coordination and collaboration and make recommendations for their modifications or elimination; and

"(7) develop recommendations for creating jointly funded programs, unified assessments, eligibility, and application procedures, and confidentiality protections that facilitate information sharing.";

(2) in subsection (o), by striking "1991 through 1994" and inserting "1995 through 1998"; and

(3) in subsection (p), by striking "1995" and inserting "1998".

SEC. 403. FAMILY RESOURCE ACT.

(a) NATIONAL CENTER.—Section 958(b)(3) of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12353(b)(3)) is amended by strike "model".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 960 of the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12355) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "$2,300,000" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "$700,000" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Martinez moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate 2000 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 4250, as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill H.R. 4250 was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2000

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 2000, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. FORD of Michigan, MARTINEZ, KILDEE, OWENS, ANDREWS of New Jersey, and SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, BAESLER, and GOODLING, Ms. MOLINARI, and Messrs. BARRETT of Nebraska, MILLER of Florida, and CASTLE.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title III of the Senate bill, and title III of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. DINGELL, SHARP, MARKEY, LEHMAN, KREIDLER, MOORHEAD, BILIRAKIS, and HASTERT.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the next week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Obviously there are no more votes today, no votes on Monday, no votes tomorrow, on Friday.

On Tuesday, May 3, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for the morning hour and then will meet at noon for suspensions, one bill, S. 2024, Airport Improvement Program, and then H.R. 3254, National Science Foundation authorization rule and general debate only.

We will hold votes until 5 o'clock on Tuesday, because we have a number of Members involved in primary elections.

Wednesday, May 4, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, 11 a.m. on Thursday, and possibly Friday:

H.R. 3254: National Science Foundation authorization, complete consideration;

H.R. 2442, Economic Development Reauthorization Act of 1994, subject to a rule;

H.R. 4296, the Assault Weapons Ban Act, subject to a rule;

S. 636, Access to Clinic Entrances conference report; and

House Concurrent Resolution 218, budget resolution for fiscal year 1995 conference report.

Other conference reports can be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 2, 1994

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calender Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTING TECHNICAL ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2333, STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2333 to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object on that resolution.

I would like to discuss it further with the chairman.

Am I to understand that the $35 million that was inadvertently left out of the conference report was the money that was voted on in the House and rejected by a vote of 243 to 181 to authorize funds for the National Endowment for Democracy?

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

It has come to my attention since the conference report was filed on Monday that there were several technical errors in the conference report. These encompass items which the conferees agreed to but were left out of the conference report inadvertently, and the resolution provides for the correction of these technical omissions.

It also covers some other matters, and in this, I will respond directly to the gentleman's question. A part of the sentence was deleted inadvertently from the visa fee section, USIA salaries and expenses, authorization for computer upgrades for the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, changing sense of the Senate regarding peace in Northern Ireland, and correcting a section number in the table of contents, and, the gentleman is quite right, the authorization for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Further reserving the right to object, I guess I would like the RECORD to truly reflect that my opposition to the National Endowment for Democracy has not changed in any way, but so that the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is not upset here, I want to assure that I do not intend to exercise this little flare to delay action.

I would just ask the chairman and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] that as the authority in the future for the National Endowment for Democracy is made that we attempt to have some meeting of the minds since there are 243 Members of this House that voted in opposition to that authorization, and that we have had this contest going on for years. So in future, the next authorization bill, we would most appreciate that the majority sense of this House be recognized when the full committee considers this authority.

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have no objections on this side.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2333) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 201(a) after paragraph (6) insert the following new paragraph:

(7) TITLE V OF PUBLIC LAW 98–164.—To carry out title V of Public Law 98–164, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1994 and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1995.

(2) In section 140(a)(2), before the period at the end of the first sentence insert ", to recover the costs of providing consular services".

(3) In section 201(a)(1), strike "$473,488,000" and insert "$487,988,000" and strike "$480,362,000" and insert "$494,862,000".

(4) In section 101(b)(2), insert the following new subparagraph (F):

"(F) $2,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1995 for computer upgrades for the Bureau of Intelligence and Research."

(5) In Section 516, strike "Senate" and insert "Congress".

(6) In the Table of Contents, strike "Sec. 249" and insert "Sec. 239" immediately before "Increasing African participation in USIA exchange programs."

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LET'S AVERT A PENDING TRAGEDY: CALL ATTORNEY GENERAL JANET RENO

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I bring to the attention of the House a pending tragedy in the People's Republic of China. Recently, the story of Alan Lin, a recent immigrant, and his young bride who still remains in the PRC, was brought to my attention.

Alan Lin is a permanent resident of the United States living and working in California. His wife, Jihong Liu, has been accepted by INS and is now awaiting her visa to enter the United States, which will take about a year. Now, Jihong Liu and Alan are expecting their first child; however, due to China's inhumane birth control regulations Jihong Liu has been told she must have an abortion. Jihong Liu was denied by the PRC Government the right to have a child based on her age; she is only 22 years old and according to Chinese rules it is necessary for a mother to be 23 years old.

Now, Alan and Jihong Liu are fighting for the life of their child, which they hope to raise as an American citizen. Alan applied to INS to have his wife admitted early into the United States under humanitarian parole. Along with 51 of my colleagues, Congressman GEORGE MILLER and I sent a bipartisan letter to encourage Attorney General Janet Reno to grant Alan's request. I have just learned that Alan's wife's expedited visa request has been rejected, and she has been forced to schedule an unwanted abortion tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, I implore you to contact the Attorney General. She can prevent this atrocity. Pick up the phone, call the Attorney General. Ask her to intervene in this life-and-death situation immediately. If you would like to help and want to know more call my office.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 4, 1994.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAME ATTORNEY GENERAL: We have recently learned of a disturbing situation and are writing to ask for your intervention. A young woman in China, awaiting her visa so she may join her husband in the United States, is in need of humanitarian parole as she is going to be "forced" by the Chinese Government to have an abortion.

Alan Wanrong Lin is a permanent resident of the United States. He lives and works in California. He is married to Jihong Liu, who

is still living in China. Jihong Liu has been accepted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to enter the United States (Petitioner A# A72-456-165; priority date—4/15/93) and is now awaiting her preference 2 visa. Jihong Liu and Alan have recently learned they are expecting their first child in about 7 months. Unfortunately, according to Chinese rules, it is preferable for the mother to be 23 years old. Jihong Liu is only 22 years of age. Now, Alan and Jihong Liu are fighting for the life of their unborn child.

When Jihong Liu applied for a birth permit, she was denied based on her age. She does not want to have an abortion, and has gone into hiding to protect her child. She is patiently awaiting the day when she may join her husband, and is looking forward to raising her child as an American citizen. We strongly encourage you to intervene in this heartbreaking situation. It is our understanding that she may qualify for humanitarian parole into the United States due to the life threatening situation she now finds herself in. She has applied for humanitarian parole through the American Embassy in Bangkok, Thailand, and we strongly urge you to act quickly in this situation. Time is of the essence, as the Chinese government will require Jihong Liu to have an abortion by the end of her third month, which is fast approaching.

We appeal to you to look favorably upon this situation. No mother should be denied the choice of having a child. Enclosed is a letter from Alan Lin to President Clinton begging for assistance. If there is anything you can do to help this young couple and their unborn child, we would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you for your consideration and prompt action in this matter.

Sincerely,

George Miller; Joe Barton; Henry J. Hyde; Marge Roukema; Tim Penny; Greg Laughlin; Jim Saxton; Dick Armey; Ileana Ros-Lehtinen; Lamar Smith; Joe McDade; Jerry Solomon; Chris Smith; Newt Gingrich; Bob Inglis; Tom DeLay; Mike Crapo; Frank R. Wolf; Dan Burton; Bob Dornan; Bob Livingston; Mike Bilirakis; Matthew G. Martinez; John Boehner; Jack Kingston; Neil Abercrombie; Tim Hutchinson; Bill Baker; Jim Slattery; Peter DeFazio; Nancy L. Johnson; Barbara F. Vucanovich; Thomas Bliley; Barney Frank; Sam Gejdenson; Nancy Pelosi; Bill Sarpalius; Dana Rohrabacher; Ernest Istook; Pete Hoekstra; John T. Doolittle; Helen Delich Bentley; Gary Ackerman; Charles T. Canady; Jennifer Dunn; Pete Stark; Peter T. King; Christopher Shays; Eleanor H. Norton; Cliff Stearns; Bill Hughes; Ben Gilman.

FUJIAN PROVINCE BIRTH CONTROL REGULATIONS—PASSED AT THE APRIL 29, 1988 SECOND MEETING OF THE SEVENTH FUJIAN PROVINCE PEOPLE'S CONGRESS STANDING COMMITTEE

Amended in accordance with the "Decisions Concerning Amendments to the Fujian Province Birth Control Regulations," from the June 28, 1991, Twenty-Second Meeting of the Seventh Fujian Province People's Congress Standing Committee.

CHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1.—These regulations have been adopted in accordance with the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, the Marriage Law of the People's Republic of China, and all pertinent national regulations, in consideration of the actual conditions in Fujian Province, so as to control population, improve the quality of the population, and make population growth suitable to economic and social growth.

Article 2.—Carrying out family planning is one of China's fundamental national policies. It shall be carried out primarily through persistent propaganda, education, and encouragement, supported by necessary economic and administrative measures.

Article 3.—It shall be the duty of both husband and wife to implement family planning. The legitimate rights and interests of citizens carrying out family planning shall be protected by the law.

Article 4.—The People's Government at all levels shall implement these regulations by reinforcing the leadership of family planning work.

CHAPTER II—BEARING CHILDREN

Article 5.—Advocate late marriage and pursue late child-bearing. Marriage by men fully 25 years of age or older and women fully 23 years of age or older shall constitute late marriage. Birth of a first child by a married woman fully 24 years of age or by a woman who conceived following a late marriage shall constitute a late birth.

Persons not meeting legal age requirements shall be prohibited from marrying or bearing children.

Unplanned births shall be prohibited.

Illegal adoption of children and giving up of children for adoption shall be prohibited.

Article 6.—In the event that a rural couple who has given birth to one child encounters actual hardship, conforms to one of the following circumstances, and has requested a second birth, that couple may give birth to one additional child.

In the event that parties who do not reconsider or start legal proceedings within the legal time limit still refuse to comply with and execute [the regulation], the organization determining tax and fines collection shall apply to the People's Court for enforcement.

NEEDED AND LONG OVERDUE IS A PEACEFUL BURIAL FOR THE ICC

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, attached to my remarks will be an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal concerning the Interstate Commerce Commission [ICC]. As most of us know, that is America's oldest regulatory agency. Last month, it celebrated its 107th birthday. At one time there was great need for the ICC. Farmers were being robbed blind by the railroads of America. Today we have deregulation and competition between railroads, competition between railroads and trucks, and competition between water and land transportation.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take a look at the ICC and how it functions. We need to rethink its mission. It has dropped from 2,000 employees in 1980 to 630 at the present time, but it is an agency of high-paid commissioners and a lot of staff still looking for a mission. The ICC is still dealing with a 14-year-old dispute as to whether the railroads were charging too much to transport corn syrup between Texas and California, when the shipping rate has already been decided by the free market.

The ICC has had little effect in the last 4 years in stopping railroads from giving up track. The railroads abandoned enough track to go round trip from Seattle to Miami and back. The length of track prevented from abandonment would not even be a round trip from Seattle to Tacoma. So much for effectiveness.

Perhaps any legitimate functions that remain should be turned over to the Department of Transportation and a few administrative law judges. That would save the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

Let us take another look at the ICC and give it a peaceful burial.

Mr. Speaker, I attach an excellent article by Daniel Pearl entitled "ICC Keeps Truckin' Though It Has Lost Much of Its Authority." It appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 27, 1994.

ICC KEEPS TRUCKIN' THOUGH IT HAS LOST MUCH OF ITS AUTHORITY

(By Daniel Pearl)

WASHINGTON—In a large, dusty room on the fourth floor of the Interstate Commerce Commission building, paper is piling up all over the place. Faded blue and green binders are stacked from floor to ceiling in 14 corridors, as well as on desks and chairs. And every day, five days a week, clerks in T-shirts haul in an estimated 16,000 more pages from the nation's trucking companies.

The papers detail how much truckers intend to charge to ship everything from alpaca wool to zirconium. At a row of desks near gray-draped windows, ICC examiners armed with pencils, yellow highlighting pens and 47-page rule manuals inspect every line of each new filing as though the nation's transportation system rides on it. If a filing, or "tariff," passes muster, it remains in the Tariff Examination Room. Then some year, it is hauled by shopping cart to the Cancelled Tariff Library.

A METAMORPHOSIS

It is a place Franz Kafka would have loved. The tariffs have little meaning. The ICC no longer has the power to regulate the shipping rates listed in the filings. So companies that have products trucked don't protest the rates. In fact, few people can decipher them. And most freight now moves in ways that don't require them.

But this paperwork is the fuel that helps keep Washington's oldest regulatory agency going. Critics say the ICC, created in 1887 to ride herd on emerging railroad monopolies, has had no important function since Congress deregulated the trucking and rail industries in 1980. But the agency has withstood attacks by everyone from Ralph Nader to Ronald Reagan. Over the past several months, attempts to cut its $45 million annual funding have failed on Capitol Hill.

It is, in short, the agency that won't die. "If we can't get rid of the ICC, I don't think we can get rid of anything," says Republican Sen. John Danforth of Missouri.

In Washington, even programs that attract widespread ridicule develop a protective shell. Lawmakers like keeping jurisdiction over independent agencies such as the ICC. Regulated companies don't want to incur a regulator's wrath, and some even feel more

secure with the ICC around. New officials at the agency become its champions. Says Gail C. McDonald, the ICC's recently appointed chairwoman: "In being here, I have found we have an important jurisdiction, and I feel the protections we provide the public are important ones."

STICKY ISSUE

Others have their doubts. "A lot of what we do is just foolish," one longtime ICC bureaucrat says.

In late 1991, for instance, the agency took up this sticky question: Should candy canes have a classification separate from candy, in a rate table that some truckers use? "A candy cane could be considered a stick of candy which has a crook in the end," argued Bob's Candies, a confectioner in Albany, GA. But a truckers' group said candy canes take up more space than other sweets. The ICC sifted through briefs, depositions and density tables. It still hasn't ruled. In the interim, Bob's says it has persuaded truckers to carry its candy canes at the candy rate.

Meantime, the ICC also is still working on a 14-year-old dispute over whether railroads were charging too much to ship corn syrup to California from Texas, even though such rates are now determined by the free market.

MAKING WORK

The agency's 630 employees (down from 2,000 in 1980) try to make their jobs relevant. They write guidebooks, such as 1992's "So You Want to Start a Small Railroad." Fran Grimmett, who has been with the ICC for more than two decades, spends three months a year compiling a list of minority- and women-owned trucking companies. She developed a computer database for the task and now surveys the businesses every year. "I think this is in response to a demand," she says, although "perhaps it didn't start out that way."

All of this activity is overseen by five ICC commissioners (at least two must be Democrats, two Republicans). With less to regulate, the job of ICC commissioner, which pays $115,000 a year, has become a leisurely one. The commission met 11 times last year, but as many sessions were canceled for lack of an agenda.

ICC commissioners can hire five staff members each, but Gregory Walden, a Republican who served as a commissioner most, of last year, says he had trouble finding enough work for two. Mr. Walden has a reputation among the ICC staff as hard-working, but says that even after researching each vote thoroughly and proofreading opinions, he had plenty of time to linger over the morning paper.

Commission staffers "are probably among the most frustrated in government service," says Frank Wilner, author of "Comes Now the Interstate Commerce Practitioner," a book about the agency.

At one time, though, the ICC had real power. It set time zones, decreed that trains could be racially segregated and blocked truckers from going into business if they couldn't prove a need for their services. Being an ICC commissioner was second in prestige only to a Supreme Court justice. In 1944, Commissioner Joseph B. Eastman talked about "sitting in dignity and looking down on the supplicants from the elevation of a judicial bench."

The pomp remains evident as one walks under the gargoyles and columns of the ICC building's facade, past busts of four former commissioners. Before ICC meetings, a clerk still intones, "All rise," as the commissioners walk single file to their places behind a long desk, with a mural of the U.S. behind them.

Most of the ICC's clout has evaporated. In the wake of the deregulation of the 1980s, the ICC now can set trucking and rail prices only in situations where competition doesn't exit, something that has become rare. The agency still reviews railroad mergers. And it still processes applications for new trucking or rail service, though it has virtually no power to turn them down. A typical ICC announcement is like the recent one about a $2,500 fine against an Allston, Mass., auto-delivery company for operating without insurance.

Most of the ICC's legal work still emerges from the tariff filing room. The tariffs are complicated because shipping rates change. While some truckers refer to mileage charts or tables, many actually spell out rates for carrying each product to each destination city from each origin city, as well as specifying the discount for each customer. Tariffs alone for Yellow Corp., a motor-carrier holding company, fill 200 binders. And the number of trucking concerns has doubled since deregulation.

Why do all those tariffs still have to be filed, when the ICC no longer regulates trucking rates? "The Interstate Commerce Act hasn't been repealed," declares Charles E. Langyher, chief of the Section of Tariffs. Tariff filings were aimed at preventing truckers from discriminating against certain customers. But now, shippers just call a rival if they don't like a trucker's prices. Mr. Langyher says nobody has made a rate-discrimination complaint in more than a decade.

IN THE SLOW LANE

ICC officials say a manufacturer considering locating a factory somewhere could use tariffs to check the local trucking rates. But the manufacturer would face a daunting array of tables, cross-references and revisions, as Cathy Stamback demonstrates by thumbing through Schneider National Inc.'s blue binders. Ms. Stamback, who works for one of six tariff-watching firms that rent space at the ICC, says that in 2½ hours she could find what the Wisconsin trucking company charges to ship printed matter to, say, Miami from Oshkosh, Wis. "Some of this belongs across the street," she says, nodding toward the Smithsonian Institution.

The folks at Schneider, like many trucking companies, would be happy if tariffs were, indeed, consigned to history. The company says it will assign four employees and pay $20,000 in filing fees this year to record its rates. To raise prices, truckers must wait at least a week after filing a tariff, a delay that could cost a bundle if fuel prices rose suddenly. But other truckers say they like the tariff-filing requirement because it keeps prices more predictable. Labor groups also support it.

Customers of those trucking companies rely on the ICC for another reason. In the past few years, many have been sued by the bankruptcy trustees of defunct trucking companies for getting lower rates than the tariffs spelled out. Tariff rates were routinely ignored in the 1980s. Richard Johnson, co-owner of a carpet wholesaler in Tampa, Fla., says he didn't even know tariffs still existed until he got two boxes full of bills last year from the trustee of BGR Transportation Co. of Calhoun, Ga.

The ICC has helped him and hundreds like him defeat the trustees' claims. Mr. Johnson says the agency decreed that the tariff that came back to haunt him was invalid in the first place because the now-defunct trucking company never filed the proper paperwork when it changed its name. While Mr. Johnson calls the ICC "filing clerks," he also hopes the agency sticks around.

Under Ms. McDonald, a Democrat, the ICC is trying to make tariffs more relevant. The agency has hired nine new inspectors to read filings. It installed three facsimile machines last month to receive copies of contracts, and it plans to start making tariffs available electronically. The agency has also halved its management ranks, cut paperwork and set up a toll-free telephone number for complaints from citizens ("We call them customers," the agency says). Last week, the commission said it would hold 36 training seminars in 29 states on a tariff law passed by Congress last year. It recently held brown-bag lunches for employees to learn what other employees do.

LOOKING HOME

Congress has an interest in keeping the ICC alive. Despite the agency's lack of real power, the ICC can help lawmakers look important to the folks back home. Members of Congress sometimes pass on complaints to the ICC about moving companies that won't pay after breaking constituents' belongings. And they demand that the ICC hold public hearings when a railroad asks for permission to abandon money-losing stretches of track.

Congressional intervention is largely for show, though. In the past four fiscal years, railroads abandoned enough track to reach Miami from Seattle and back; the track the ICC stopped railroads from giving up would barely make the round trip from Seattle to Tacoma. And the ICC imposed just one fine against an errant mover in that time. (ICC officials say that a phone call is usually enough to get a moving company to shape up, and that the agency puts conditions on many of the rail abandonments it approves.)

Lawmakers' stature depends partly on how many agencies their committees oversee. Proposals to eliminate the ICC have gone nowhere within the Senate and House committees with jurisdiction over the ICC. And when House members outside two such panels offered an amendment last fall to kill the agency's funding, 42 of the 58 committee members voted against it. Rep. John Kasich of Ohio, who co-sponsored the amendment, says a fellow Republican "told me he voted against it because I was messing with his jurisdiction."

That support also was evident at a celebration last month to mark the ICC's 107th birthday. The agency formally unveiled a bronze bust of Clyde Bruce Aitchison, a commissioner from 1917 to 1952, as an eight-man military guard presented the colors and a 20-member chorus sang "God Bless America." House Public Works and Transportation Committee Chairman Norman Mineta displayed an alarm clock that plays "I've Been Working on the Railroad." And the California Democrat told the agency he would defend it against those wanting to cut off "the funding it needs so all of you can do your very, very important jobs."

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANCASTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

VISIT OF BOTH IRISH CHURCH LEADERS TO THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1994 marks the 1,550th anniversary of the advent of Christianity in Ireland. To mark the historical significance of this date, the city of Armagh, the ancient seat of both the Catholic and Anglican primates of all Ireland, has launched a year-long celebration.

As part of this celebration, these two men of God, Cardinal Cahal B. Daly and Archbishop Robin Eames, have come to the United States for a brief visit. Their purpose is not only to mark the historical coming of St. Patrick, but to proclaim anew his mission of peace. They have joined together to ask the support of the American people and its Government for the peace process in Ireland.

I had the privilege of meeting the Cardinal and the Archbishop during their stay. They emphasized to me their strong support for the Downing Street Declaration issued by Irish Prime Minister Albert Reynolds and British Prime Minister John Major as a way forward toward peace in Northern Ireland. They talked of renewed efforts at reconciliation between their two religious traditions and of the willingness of their churches to be a part of that effort. They applauded the work of the International Fund for Ireland in creating jobs—and therefore hope—for thousands of Irish youths who might otherwise turn to violence. Lastly, and most importantly, they expressed urgency—urgency for political dialog, urgency for economic growth, urgency for an end to violence from all sides.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that other events have inevitably distracted the attention of the American press from this visit, brief though it was. I say that because I so wholeheartedly endorse the message of Archbishop Eames and Cardinal Daly, but also because I suspect that it would come as a surprise to many Americans who might have heard it otherwise. So many in Ireland, so many in Northern Ireland—not just in the churches, but throughout every walk of life—desperately want an end to the violence which is the only facet by which the average American knows Northern Ireland. They want a political settlement acceptable to both traditions and they are anxious that such a settlement be reached soon.

I include at this point the statements of the cardinal and the archbishop, both of whom are Archbishops of Armagh, expressing each's views and hopes for the year ahead.

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

(By Archbishop Robin Enmes—Archibishop of Armagh, Primate of All Ireland)

ARMAGH TOGETHER 1994/95—VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Reconciliation is not an event—it is a process. As such it has many different parts. These parts are contributed by people at landmarks. No contribution is too large or too small. The Christian concept of this process is that we are all called to do what we can, as we are and where we are, to encourage it to happen and to push forward the day when all will see it's value. That day will dawn for Ireland. No one knows how long it will take, but on one thing we can be certain—the peacemaker is the person whose efforts and whose visions are blessed by God—the person who believes it is God's will that Ireland should find peace.

The road to peace is long and hard. Lives have been lost and hearts burdened by the hurt we have inflicted on each other. Suspicion and division have soiled what could have been. Today more than ever there is a great yearning throughout this island for an end to violence. Once that comes, as come it will, the real mountain to be climbed will be the need to maintain peace, to strengthen justice and to build a society in which generations as yet unborn will live in peace.

It is to that task that we are all called. It is to that task that the spirit of St. Patrick points us. It is from this historic city of Armagh, so rich in heritage and yet reflecting so much of Irish life and experience, that the call to greater understanding, greater sharing of resources and interests and greater effort at building bridges comes. Bridges across which we can walk. This is the call which comes from Armagh Together in this 1550th year of the birth of Christianity in Ireland.

That is the message we want to bring to the United States. That is the message in which all of us of any tradition can join. The hour for this witness is now. Under God we pray that we may be equal to the needs and the opportunities of the hour.

THE CHRISTIAN "PEACE PROCESS"

(By Cardinal Cahal B. Daly)

ARMAGH TOGETHER 1994/1995—VISIT TO USA, APRIL 25–27, 1994

When peace comes to Ireland and violence ceases, and we all hope and fervently pray that this will happen soon, this will be only the beginning of a long process of learning new ways of living peacefully together with our neighbours of different religious or political convictions, with each community fully respecting the rights and the culture and the tradition and sense of national identity of the other. There are deep wounds caused by violence to both communities, which have to be healed; there are bitter memories to be overcome; on both sides there are painful wrongs to be repented of and to be forgiven; there is much guilt and remorse to be brought to Christ for the touch of His forgiving hand, we must pray for the grace to be part of this process of healing and of forgiving the past and shaping a new and more just and Christian future. We must pray for the coming of the Holy Spirit into our society and into our own lives, to renew the face of the earth, and to "complete Christ's work on earth and bring us the fulness of grace". God has promised to "do a new deed" for His people. He wants each one of us to be part of this "new deed", this new society which He wishes to create in this island of ours. He wants us to take the initiative and be the first to reach out the hand of friendship to people of the other community. We must pray for and we must be part of a fresh forward thrust in the work for unity and love between Christian Churches. This is where the Holy Spirit is calling us and all Christians at this time. In Ireland it has a special urgency.

God always loves us first. He always gets in first with His love and forgiveness. He wants us to be the people who will make the first move. The making of peace will not be finished when violence permanently ends; it will merely change into a new gear. We Christians must begin now preparing to play our full part in the peacemaking process which will continue for the rest of the lifetime of all of us now living. Armagh Together wants to be an active part of this process. St. Patrick calls all Irish Christians to this task in this year when together we celebrate Armagh's 1550th anniversary as Ireland's ecclesiastical capital and Primatial City.

A TO Z

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, why do we need to have an A-to-Z spending cut session? Why take the extraordinary time and effort needed to force the bill to the floor through a discharge petition? The answer is: because the regular procedures of this House have broken down. Members are frustrated by the stranglehold the majority leadership has over the amendment process, and they are voting with their feet by joining the A-to-Z effort.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one message we receive from our constituents loud and clear, it's: cut spending first. Yet when we review the recent history of specific spending cut proposals, we consistently find concerted efforts by the majority leadership to block or defeat these measures.

In the weeks leading up to the vote on the Penny-Kasich spending cut package, for example, our offices were bombarded with calls and letters from committee chairs, cabinet members, and every special interest under the sun. The campaign waged against this package—which would have cut a mere 1 percent of Federal spending over the next 5 years by targeting specific line items of the budget for reduction or elimination—was almost as intense as the push to pass the Clinton tax package.

Today we are hearing the same hardline language from Speaker Foley and the rest of the majority leadership. Saying that "spending has been cut to the bone," the leadership wants to prevent the A-to-Z proposal from ever reaching the floor. In fact, it appears that they have even rejected a weak compromise of a promise of a spending cut vote at a later date in favor of killing A to Z outright.

The sad fact is that for every specific spending cut amendment that makes it to the floor, there are many more that are shut out in a much less public process. The majority-dominated Rules Committee regularly blocks consideration of amendments to cut Federal spending. The Rules Committee room has become a graveyard for hundreds of responsible suggestions to save tax dollars and reduce the deficit.

Most members who bring budget-cutting amendments to the Rules Committee are not looking for special treatment, they are simply trying to exer-

cise their right to improve the legislation considered in this House. Instead of getting a fair fight—an up-or-down vote on the floor—these members' amendments are arbitrarily denied.

As a minority member of the Rules Committee I see first-hand how the process works. Last year I tried to offer specific spending cuts to replace several of the major tax increases in the President's tax bill; despite widespread interest in both spending cuts and reducing Americans' tax burden, I was prevented from bringing my proposal to the full House.

This year, I wanted to offer a package of 76 spending cuts to the budget resolution; these cuts could have saved some $285 billion over 5 years—but again the Rules Committee set up a roadblock to my request. And I was not alone; DAN SCHAEFER and TIM PENNY were prepared to offer a bipartisan substitute to the budget resolution, a substitute which again would have saved hundreds of billions, yet they too were denied to the ability to offer their proposal on the floor.

The A-to-Z special session will allow Members to offer their specific spending cuts, without interference from the Rules Committee. These cuts will not have any guarantees of passage, and many may fail. The important point is that they will receive a fair hearing on the House floor, where all of the elected Members of Congress can finally work their will.

Mr. Speaker, if the House were operating in a responsible, open manner, maybe we wouldn't need an A-to-Z session. But it's not and we do. I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition next Wednesday.

SOUTH AFRICAN ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I speak today with a great deal of emotion about a subject that I have some unique experience with. I want to speak about what I believe is the most amazing transfer of power in history. The election in South Africa has been the change from apartheid to democracy through the process of consensus rather than revolution.

Mr. Speaker, I was once a South African citizen, and I remember only too well what apartheid meant. It meant that oppression and fear ruled that beautiful land, not the rule of law. I had that experience, Mr. Speaker, and I was very fortunate.

When I grew up in South Africa as a teenager, I was able to protest against apartheid with an organization called the Black Sash, an organization of women who decided that they would stand against the horrors of apartheid. And throughout the decades, Black Sash has continued its strong, nonviolent, unrelenting vigilance for peace and justice for all South Africans. I am very proud to have been able to be one small thread in the broad, all-inclusive banner of justice which today waves freely across the entire country that is South Africa.

What happened in South Africa these last 3 days is a tribute to the human spirit, the spirit which never loses sight of the vision of freedom.

For 26 years Nelson Mandela was imprisoned; he was treated brutally, but he never, never lost his faith in nonviolence. Mr. Mandela was not alone; millions of South Africans suffered, and yet they also held to the great principle of nonviolence.

□ 1750

South Africa has been a land of horror to the majority of its people, a land of violence to the body, to the mind, to the spirit, a land where no security existed, no security for the family, for decency, for education and, indeed, for life itself.

Now violence may come in South Africa from those who are fearful that those benefits that they have enjoyed will now be only enjoyed by those who work for it, not just those who are born with it, where people are judged finally in South Africa not by their color but by their contribution.

But it is essential to realize that for decades there has been unrelenting violence toward those of African descent or those who opposed apartheid, and yet today, Mr. Speaker, we have this great opportunity, for the very first time in so many years, to say that the people of South Africa are joined together in this great experiment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are most fortunate to have lived in this year, to have seen this great opportunity for democracy and, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that tonight my heart is very, very full of joy for this great, great experience.

FIFTY YEARS AGO TODAY

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad tonight that I have got a tall Washington marine here by my side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]: once a marine, always a marine. I have in front of me a book that I understand is a series put out by the Marine Corps. I hope all the services are doing this. I found this in the El Toro ready room during our trip for former President Nixon's funeral. It's on Tarawa.

We just passed the 50th anniversary of that amazing fight. The highest casualties we had taken since Pearl Harbor happened on that day, and I find out there is a whole series of books, I say to the gentleman from New York, "Marines in World War II Commemorative Series." Take a look at that and call for the whole set, and I will let the gentleman know how to do it.

First, Mr. Speaker, before I start, last week I did a special order on crime, and I put in quotes that the people want revenge, not in the meanest sense of the word but, instead, in the context that they want to feel safe on the streets, and I put in a series of excellent articles by Ben Wattenberg and Paul Johnson, the great English writer, parliamentarian, and philosopher who wrote "Modern Times," which I understand from the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has just been updated, and, because I put in so many solid articles, I came up with a small figure here, given what the special orders cost, of $1,087. I am going to enter this in the RECORD with my special order from last week.

Mr. Speaker, I labored under the delusion, when we passed the 50th anniversary of Pearl Harbor back in December 1991, two Congresses ago, that we would be having a series of special orders during this 50-year commemorative period at least for all the highlights, for all the major battles, for Normandy's 50th anniversary coming up this June, for the Battle of the Bulge at the end of this year, for Tarawa last year, for all the horrible, slug-it-out battles that we are commemorating this week, last week, and the week before as we landed on the Admiralty Islands above New Guinea, all that incredible jungle combat with our Australian allies all across the northern coast of New Guinea, which seems to get so little coverage here in America, and it just has not happened. Except for one or two of us, Mr. Speaker, nobody remembers these 50th anniversaries as they pass.

Well, today is one that was kept secret, a great tragedy involving much friendly fire, which is one of the amendments that I hope to get passed on our defense authorization bill this year. But today, April 28, is the 50th anniversary of an incident so horrible that it was kept secret for the entire war.

I bring us this tiny little blurb from the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the million and a half people listening will remember again the debt we owe to the George Bushes of the world and to all those people that wore the uniform, especially those who suffered in combat in the dark years of 1942 and 1943; what we owe our 14,000,000 veterans who conquered Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini in unbelievable record time.

Fifty years ago today nine German torpedo boats—it doesn't say, but they were called E-boats, and they were the equivalent of John F. Kennedy's PT

109—they stumbled, dumb enemy luck, on an allied force practicing off the southern English coast for the Normandy invasion which was to come 6 weeks later. Three of our huge landing ships were torpedoed by these German E-boats, and hundreds of men in our amphibious force were killed, dozens of them by friendly fire. We lost 749 American soldiers and 197 sailors, and it was the worst single day of U.S. losses since Pearl Harbor. As I said, Tarawa was the worst battle loss, but this is a single incident, and it was kept secret until the war was over for purposes of morale.

I guess the parents of each one of these people that died never knew that 946 other people had perished the day their son died, so they thought it was just a simple training accident. They did not realize it was in combat, out in the channel, getting ready for the fantastic and successful D-Day invasion.

Mr. Speaker, little incidents like these pass at 50 years, and it reminds me of Ronald Reagan's goodbye speech to his fellow Americans 9 days before George Bush was sworn in as the 41st President. President Reagan, on January 11, 1989, told all of us that we were losing our history. We were forgetting the sacrifices that men and women made through two centuries to give us this, the world's freest, most open country and open society ever. And then, President Reagan—and I wish I had his words in front of me—spoke out to the young people of America and gave them permission to go and chew out their parents at the dinner table or the kitchen table, to say to their parents, "If you are not teaching me the history of our Nation, you should be ashamed."

Mr. Speaker, this is a kind of fascination of mine, about the size of our Nation, and I think about it at funerals, like President Nixon's—and let me just finish this one sentence, Mr. Speaker: When President Nixon was born, we barely had 100 million people. When I was born, Mr. Speaker, it was 125 million. When World War II started, it was 130 million plus. Now, we are twice our size on the date of Pearl Harbor—260 million people—and we seem to be confounded by the smallest of problems.

We are Americans. We ought to be able to do anything we set out to do, like balance the budget.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TWO-PARENT FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LONG). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Ms. Speaker, as we discuss welfare reform, we will talk about and emphasize the importance of values and the behavior of families receiving welfare assistance. However, we also need to emphasize how important strong families are to our society, be they poor, middle class, or rich.

Two-parent families are the ideal both for economic and for psychological reasons. First, a two-parent family is best adapted to provide for children. Our Nation's economy is such that in most families today, both parents are needed to work outside the home in order to make ends meets. A single-parent family, in today's economy, is at a decided disadvantage, even if that parent is not poor.

A two-parent family is also ideal for psychological reasons. Our children need the love and support of both their mother and father and to see them as positive role models to nurture and help develop them into mature, well-adjusted, contributing adults. The rise of crime on our streets today is proof that our families are failing our children.

However, in many instances two-parent families are impossible; therefore, efforts must be made to encourage strong, stable families even if there is one parent.

During the debate on welfare reform, we must be careful not to single out poor families as the demons or scapegoats on the whipping block of family values. A lack of values or the deterioration of families are evident in all sectors of American society, be they poor, middle class, or rich. Therefore, we should not pretend during these coming debates on welfare reform that only poor families suffer from a lack of values.

The challenge for us will be to encourage strong, healthy families as a national priority and empower parents on welfare to become self-sufficient and responsible.

A significant number of the families receiving welfare turn to government assistance programs as a last resort after a divorce, separation, loss of job, or the birth of a child to a single parent. These factors that lead a woman to get assistance from welfare, I can assure you, are not problems only that apply to poor women.

Regrettably, our current welfare system has not served families well. Often it has created greater dependency. Once on welfare, the average family will receive a monthly payment of $381 from the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program. Statistics show that marriage is the most likely route out of welfare. Securing a better paying job is second. There are barriers in the current system which discourage marriage and opportunity to work.

I ask that my colleagues remember why the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program was created—to support children in poor families. Let us not lose sight of the need to continue our support for poor children. We must not hold the children hostage to the contentious welfare reform arguments.

Rather, we must agree that our reforms must move families to self-sufficiency and responsibility so they can better care for their children. Many of our poor families are struggling against all odds to meet the needs of their children. The question is how best to achieve this goal of self-sufficiency and responsibility. We need to offer a helping hand to those families to help them get the training and education they need to secure decent jobs.

Consistent with the need to create a better family environment, we need to be very sensitive about what we emphasize young mothers—especially teenagers—on welfare to undertake. First, if we are expecting them to receive education and training for jobs, then we must express to them the importance of their role as a mother, by also assisting them in securing child care for their children.

We should stress the importance of the mother's presence in the home and make allowances for young single mothers to have their first priority be their child—and allow them to participate in jobs and training programs on a part-time basis.

We must also recognize that many young mothers need more than just financial assistance. They need moral support and in many cases parenting training to prepare them for their role as a mother. Teenage parents—mother and father—must be taught to be responsible for their children.

Again, I want to emphasize the importance of strong families to our social fiber. And in this vein, I want to urge my colleagues to work with me to tear down the impediments to two-parent families that are inherent in the current welfare system and work to make the system supportive of our poor families and children.

Finally, and simply stated, family values mean providing for a positive family environment where children can mature into productive individuals within the proper family setting. We need to enact public policy which encourages self-development of families by enabling more families to work and escape the persistent poverty by their own creative work efforts.

□ 1800

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, a week ago today I wrote a note, a get-well message, to President Nixon telling him that one of the greatest honors of my life has been the opportunity to represent a large portion of the congressional district which originally sent him to Washington. Yesterday the

world watched the very moving service that took place in Yorba Linda, CA, at the library and birthplace of President Nixon.

There has been this looming question which many have posed about young people. They have been asking, why is it that there seems to be this great admiration and respect and love for a President who was forced to resign?

I think that there are several very important messages which come to us from Richard Nixon's life, and I think the thing that has struck this chord with young people has been primarily the fact that he was able to successfully overcome adversity on so many different occasions. Frankly when he suffered his stroke a week ago last Monday, I assumed that he would overcome that adversity, too, and we are all extraordinarily saddened that he did not.

Madam Speaker, there are many people who have gotten this message that while we face very serious challenges in life and things are tough, we have got to move ahead. That is the one message that I try to relate to young people about Richard Nixon's life.

We know that from very early on in his life, all the way up to just this past week, that he faced very serious challenges. He was a fighter, and he was a person who did remain in the arena. That should tell young people that when we look at the many challenges that exist in this country and in our world today, do not throw in the towel. Continue to fight. Do everything possible to succeed. That is why I think so many people have been so inspired with this man's life.

Madam Speaker, I will never forget when he stood right here in this well and talked about the need for us to provide assistance to Russia, providing a very eloquent speech to members of the Republican conference. I believe that President Nixon was the world's preeminent foreign policy intellectual.

Madam Speaker, one of the most interesting things I have observed is that throughout the cold war, we had a great degree of stability. But quite frankly, as we have looked at the post-cold-war world, we have had very few people who have been able to provide a great deal of insight. Richard Nixon has provided that for the past several years. Why? He demonstrated he had this amazing ability to deal with rapidly changing situations, and that is why I believe, I know for me personally and for many in this Chamber who had the benefit of hearing from him on many occasions, that he will be sorely missed.

Madam Speaker, there are some who said to me, "Well, he lived a very full life," and as President Clinton said yesterday, he was in his ninth decade. So one might conclude that we were simply looking at a retired octogenarian, but I do not believe that to be the case at all. I have known him for the past 10 years and I would say that up until the past week, he clearly was in the prime of his life. He was in the prime of his life because he was always looking to tomorrow. He was always working diligently to ensure that we could improve the quality of life for people in this country and throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, there are so many people who played a very important part in Richard Nixon's early political life, and I would just like to mention a few of them. One I was just reminded by a man who works in my district office, Mark Harmsen. His grandfather, Fred Harmsen, was a member of the original Committee of 100 who was looking for a candidate to run for Congress back in 1946 and recruited President Nixon. Ray Arbuthnot, Don Peters, Clint Harris, Hubert Perry, and our former colleague, Pat Hillings, these are people who worked for many years to support Richard Nixon. Margaret Brock, who has been on my campaign committee since I first ran, was one of the early and very strong supporters of Richard Nixon.

Madam Speaker, there are so many people who played a role in encouraging him. He provided a great deal of inspiration to all of them, to the United States of America, and to the world, and he will be sorely missed.

Madam Speaker, our sympathies go to all the members of the Nixon family. We know very well that the world is a better place today because of the life of Richard Milhous Nixon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LONG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

UNIVERSAL COVERAGE

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, it is my hope, legislative business permitting, to talk to the American people every week about one issue in health care reform and how it will affect them personally.

I want to talk to the American people tonight about an aspect of health care reform that the President has made the measuring stick of every proposal—universal coverage.

Tonight, we need to talk about why every American, not just the uninsured, needs universal coverage. And we need to talk about what exactly universal coverage means.

Universal coverage means every American always has health insurance, insurance that can never be taken away. No matter how your job changes, or whether you are a homemaker or self-employed or work part-time or lose a spouse or move, your health insurance is constant. It is something you can count on.

It also means that the health insurance you get is substantial enough to give you real security.

If you can still go bankrupt from health care bills, it's not real security—and it's not universal coverage.

Universal coverage is a two-word concept. Not only must it include everyone but the coverage has to be generous enough to really protect people.

Universal coverage means real protection so if you lose your job or get sick or are in an accident or give birth to a handicapped child, you know you can still get the health care you need without going broke—and without worrying about it.

Universal coverage means everyone—everyone—is in the system so there are no more games about who gets care under what circumstances and where.

And no more games where you get coverage if you meet one definition but if you life changes, you don't get that insurance anymore.

If everyone is in the health insurance system—and we all know everyone is in—then we don't have to waste any more time, and money, and paper trying to figure out who gets what—and for how long.

So why do you and your family need universal coverage? Because right now most Americans are just one pink slip away from losing his or her health insurance.

Right now, if you lose your job, you lose your health insurance. So you not only have to worry about getting a new job and having some income, but you have to worry that if your child gets sick you may not be able to get her the care she needs.

If your company cancels or cuts back on the benefits it offers in its health insurance package—you and your family are at risk.

Right now, if you change jobs or go out on your own in business, you may lose your insurance.

Right now, very few people in this country can say with certainty that they absolutely will have health insurance a month from now. We are the only people in the industrialized world who do not have that certainty. Universal coverage is the only way to get that certainty.

But there is another reason to have universal coverage. As a nation, we simply cannot afford to do without it.

The poet John Donne said, "No man is an island unto himself." Nowhere is this more true than in health care.

Because we don't have universal coverage, everyone who has health insurance pays a higher premium.

Because we don't have universal coverage, people get care too late, in emergency rooms, where it costs much

more money than it would if they had had timely primary care.

And hospitals then look for someone else to pick up the tab. Our whole economy is playing a shell game with health care costs, trying to shift them around to different people who pay.

It's called cost-shifting—getting someone else to pay for the people who can't—and it costs the American people a high price.

We will never be able to control health care costs until we have universal coverage. It's that simple. To slow the growth of health care costs, we must have universal coverage.

Every other country in the Western world has lower costs than we do, many have better care, and they all have universal coverage.

Universal coverage is the house of health care reform. We all know that it is better to own your own home than to rent an apartment. But what usually keeps people from buying their own homes? The down payment.

We have to come up with a down payment—the way to get into the house—or, as a nation, we will just have to keep on renting this inadequate and over-priced apartment.

An apartment that is too small, that doesn't suit our needs, that drains our resources and keeps us from ever being able to afford the house.

So how do we get into the house? There is no question that the cheapest, the quickest, the most efficient way to get into the health care house is through single-payer reform.

This is the way every other country in the industrialized world got into the house, and they are living there much more comfortably than we are in our poor apartment.

Single-payer is the way to absolutely guarantee 100 percent universal coverage within 1 year. Even Senator DURENBERGER, who is not a single-payer supporter, acknowledged that only single-payer could achieve full universal coverage with every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed.

Only single-payer guarantees unrestricted free choice of provider and eliminates insurance company interference in the physician/patient relationship. Only single-payer guarantees that you can have a lifetime relationship with your doctor if that is your choice.

Only single-payer provides complete benefits including preventive care, all outpatient and hospital services, prescription drugs, children's dental care, mental health services, and comprehensive long-term care. It takes care of the "coverage" part of universal coverage.

How is single-payer able to do all this? Very simply.

If Americans paid their health insurance premiums to a single national health security fund instead of to all their different insurance companies, and then that single national fund reimbursed health care providers directly for their services the way insurance companies do now, we would save enough money on insurance administration to pay for universal coverage and comprehensive benefits for all Americans.

With single-payer, we get to universal coverage immediately. So don't let anyone tell you we have to phase it in over 5 years, or to the end of the century, or beyond.

We don't need to wait that long. And remember, every year we postpone it, we lose money because we can't control costs. Every year it will cost more to fix the problem. Every year more people will lose their insurance and we will all have more to worry about.

And every year universal coverage is delayed, the chances are greater that something will intervene in Congress to just keep on pushing it back. We will simply lose it.

We can have universal coverage by 1997, and the American people should settle for no less.

When we look around the world and reflect on the events of the last few years, we see historical developments of almost biblical proportions. The Berlin Wall has come down and Russia is a struggling democracy.

Unbelievably, South Africa has ended apartheid and is completing its first nationwide democratic election.

Our fellow industrialized countries are climbing—and scaling—the Mount Everests of political challenge.

Compared to the challenges these nations have embraced, the difficulty of reforming our health care system so that we can finally get everyone into it is so small. It is not Mount Everest. It is not even a hill.

We are the greatest nation in the history of the world. We are the richest and we are the most democratic.

To say that we cannot do something as relatively simple as to get all our citizens into the largest health care system in the world in less time than it took for DeClerk to end apartheid or Gorbachev to bring down the Berlin Wall is unworthy of the American people.

Since when are the American people so weak or so small that we cannot meet our own challenges?

We have witnessed ordinary people around the world in the transformations of recent years and weeks rise to the stature of giants. The American people are every bit their match and we should never concede otherwise.

I urge all of you who want the guarantee of universal coverage for yourselves and for your families to insist on universal coverage by 1997 so that we can finally move into the house that will give us security for the future.

□ 1820

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LONG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 30 minutes as the majority whip.

THE HEALTH CARE DEBATE

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, we are fast approaching a crucial time in the health care debate. In the next 3 to 4 weeks, three major committees are expected to report out bills. After they finish their work, within 2 weeks, another seven committees are expected to send health bills to the full House.

The next 6 weeks will be a period of very intense activity. And from time to time, as often is the case, we can expect passions to rise. Debate will get heated. Words will be exchanged, and some of us may say things that we later will come to regret.

I hope for the most part we can keep the debate focused on the task at hand and not sink into launching personal attacks against any person or any industry. I hope we can continue to work together to pass the best health care reform bill we can.

Having said all that, Madam Speaker, I regret to say that last week I did not even take my own advice. I said some things about insurance companies that were less constructive and more personal than they could have been. I think it was that great statesman, Yogi Berra, who once said that when you come to a fork in the road, you should take it.

Well, I am standing here tonight as a middle-aged Congressman in a white starched shirt saying that I took the wrong road last week. I regret having done that, Madam Speaker, because I think there is a strong enough case to be made for health care reform without launching into personal attacks.

The facts is that today without reform, small businesses are forced to pay between 35 and 40 percent more than larger firms for coverage, or the fact that 85 percent of the people who do not have coverage today are people who are working full time or part time, or the fact that three out of every four Americans, an amazing 133 million people, have health insurance policies with lifetime limits that cut off benefits when you need them most.

Certainly, those facts are bigger grounds for concern in and discussion and should be the focus of our work. Indeed, Madam Speaker, I believe we are making progress in some of the questions that confront us every day.

As I mentioned, three major committees, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, are making progress on health reform

every day. They are working to have bills reported out of committee by Memorial Day.

On the issues that are of great concern to the American people, issues like the impact on small business and the cost to working families, we are making great bipartisan progress that will not only make health care insurance more affordable but will make the system work better. We are starting to achieve some consensus on the best ways to achieve universal coverage, which is a goal I think nearly everyone has concluded must be a part of the final bill. And we are working with many concerned organizations who have stopped fighting us on health reform and begun working with us to strengthen what is right about our health care system, while fixing what is wrong.

And we are doing it the only way we know how, the only way we have made progress in this great democracy for over 200 years, by debating the issues that face us, by working out the differences that divide us and by coming up with a bill that will improve the lives of all Americans for generations to come.

It is not easy and sometimes it is not pretty to watch, but by staying above the fray and focusing on the task at hand, we are making great progress. It has been nearly 50 years since Harry Truman first proposed national health care reform. But the American people have demanded health care reform. They voted for it. And we are responding to that call.

In 1994, that is going to be the year that we provide all Americans with guaranteed private health care insurance that can never be taken away, not if you get sick, not if you lose your job, not if you change your job, not if you have a preexisting condition, it is going to be there for you. It is going to provide you with the peace of mind and security that the American people do not have today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AND THOUGHTS ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity.

I am going to have a two-part special order this evening. One will deal with the Taiwan Relations Act and the 15th anniversary of that act. The other will talk about health care and my observations and what I believe needs to be done.

First, Madam Speaker, this month marks the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, one of the most important and one of the most innovative pieces of legislation ever to become law. We have a lot of new Members in this body in the last 2 years, last 4 years, that do not realize just how important that act was.

The Taiwan Relations Act is important because it sets forth the terms of the relationship between the United States of America and a friendly former allied country.

Indeed, the Republic of China on Taiwan was a treaty ally which suffered the unprecedented experience of having its diplomatic relations with our country severed by a unilateral action by the President of the United States, at that time, Jimmy Carter, without provocation and in a time of peace.

The Taiwan Relations Act is innovative because it represents a constructive response by Congress to the unusual circumstances caused by the diplomatic derecognition of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Madam Speaker, I was a representative-elect 16 years ago, concerned with moving to Washington with my five children, which I never moved them here incidentally and they stayed, thank goodness, in my home town and where I have commuted back and forth all these years.

But I was concerned at that time with moving to Washington and putting an office staff together, when the news came that President Carter had decided unilaterally to abrogate the treaty of alliance with the Republic of China, to sever diplomatic relations with them, and to make a diplomatic about face and to recognize the Communist government of mainland China instead.

That news was shocking but it was not surprising. It was not surprising because the drift of events had been clearly evident for quite some time. There was little doubt that President Carter was preparing to yield to Communist mainland China's political demands. Let me repeat that, yield to Communist mainland China's political demands and meet the conditions that the Communist government established as the price the Chinese Government would have to pay in order for them to accept United States recognition.

□ 1830

What was shocking, however, Madam Speaker, was the timing of President Carter's announcement.

The man who promised never to mislead the American people had given solemn assurances to Congress that any kind of major change in United States policy toward China would not be made at a time when Congress was out of session.

But, in fact, Congress had been out of session for 2 months—the 95th Congress had already adjourned sine die—when President Carter made his announcement.

When I arrived in Washington in January 1979 to be sworn in as a Member of the 96th Congress, one of my chief concerns was the question of how the United States relationship with our longtime ally, the Republic of China, could be set right.

Madam Speaker, only 2 weeks after taking office, I joined a group of Members led by Congressman John Ashbrook of Ohio, and went to Taiwan, in order to assure both the Government and the Chinese people there, that they had not heard the last word from Washington.

In the name of the U.S. Congress, we thanked them for the steadfast support they had given the United States as a treaty ally of ours for over 40 years.

They fought alongside us in World War II, and they stood with us throughout the cold war, as one of our staunchest friends in resisting the spread of communism throughout the world.

As one of the strongest links in a chain of democracies formed to stop the spread of that deadly, atheistic philosophy, the 21 million free people on Taiwan—who live just minutes away from Communist mainland China—stood bravely on the front line, helping the United States deter the scourge of communism, this inhumane form of government that has no respect for human rights—indeed, it has no respect for human life itself.

Madam Speaker, the deplorable treatment of Chinese citizens by the Communist regime continues even today throughout all of mainland China. And America, through the actions of President Carter, literally pulled the rug out from under the valiant, brave, loyal free Chinese allies of ours.

That is why we went to Taiwan, and assured them that Congress would act—and act decisively—if the Carter administration's proposed legislation on the future of United States-Taiwan relations proved to be inadequate.

Indeed, the administration's original draft did prove to be grossly inadequate—almost laughable on its face had the issue not been so important—and Congress was compelled to act.

Madam Speaker, in working with other Members of Congress to draft a bill that would pay proper respect to the historic relationship our country maintained with the Republic of China on Taiwan, we focused on the implications that derecognition had for the future security of Taiwan.

This was a totally bipartisan effort, including all Republicans and a great many conservative Democrats. And there were quite a lot of conservative Democrats back then when their party had a more conservative face.

Among the conservative Democrats who helped so much in developing the

Taiwan Relations Act was Clem Zablocki, a great man and the respected chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and to name just a few of many others, there were Sam Stratton of New York, Bill Nichols of Alabama, RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama, Charles Bennett of Florida, Andy Ireland of Florida, Larry McDonald of Georgia, SONNY MONTGOMERY of Mississippi, Richard Ichord of Missouri, Sam Hall of Texas, and Dan Daniel of Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I am particularly proud of having had a role in writing section 3(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act, which reads:

> The United States will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

And of course, this has always meant that the United States is committed to giving Taiwan the quantitative and qualitative means to defend itself against Communist China.

We were also successful in adding a section to the Taiwan Relations Act that clearly established the policy of the United States Government to "resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan."

Indeed, the act went on to say that the "Preservation and enhancement of the human rights of all the people on Taiwan are hereby reaffirmed as objectives of the United States."

Madam Speaker, all of these declarations, as part of the Taiwan Relations Act, are today the law of the United States. And that law states without question that our country must help defend the people of Taiwan against any attack from mainland Communist China.

Madam Speaker, the Taiwan Relations Act has worked for the mutual benefit of both Taiwan and the United States exactly as those of us who drafted it 15 years ago hoped and believed it would.

In all spheres—politically, economically, and socially—the Republic of China on Taiwan has moved into the highest rank of the newly developed, industrialized nations.

Madam Speaker, Taiwan still faces many challenges. But if the experience of the past 15 years is any guide the future is bright.

The political, economic, and social progress made on Taiwan is a shining example of what freedom-loving people can accomplish when they are not shackled by the chains of communism and socialism.

On this 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, which without firing a shot or losing a life literally saved that threatened democracy, let us all salute the wonderful people of Taiwan.

And let us reaffirm our pledge to work together to achieve freedom and human rights for all people throughout the world, especially those who still suffer under communism.

Madam Speaker, that concludes my special order on the 15th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act.

I would like to take a minute, because my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [DAVID BONIOR], and others had recently spoken of a single-payer plan that they are pushing to reform health care in America. I would like to talk briefly about a town meeting that I had in Saratoga Springs the other night.

The town meeting was sponsored by United We Stand, and they are a group of people, as we all know, that is somewhat connected with Ross Perot, but they are made up of Republicans and Democrats and Independents, conservatives and liberals, and this is what I told them the other night. I attempted to bring them up to date on the health care issue as it stands here in Washington, because it is so confusing today.

□ 1840

I told them that would not be easy because there are no less than 18 plans, including the President's and they all change almost hourly, as you and I know because we see it every day.

Nevertheless, I showed them the latest chart comparing what is considered to be the most serious plans, although Democrat Senate Majority Leader GEORGE MITCHELL just unveiled I think that same day I was making my speech three more plans, the details of which were not available then, and I do not think they are available even yet. The eight plans on the chart that I showed them consisted of three Democrat bills including the President's. There were four Republican plans including the official Republican conference plan, and there was one bipartisan plan called the Bilirakis-Rowland plan, named after a Republican Congressman from Florida and a Democrat Congressman from Georgia.

These eight plans, plus the other half dozen or so, ranged from the most liberal socialized medicine concepts to the most conservative free enterprise plans that limit Government bureaucratic interference.

They all attempt to fix a system, and I think this is important to note, a system that we all know has abuses, has ripoffs, has bureaucratic delays, and certainly excessive costs, in my opinion.

But the fact remains that the medical care delivery system in America provides by far the best quality of medicine in the entire world. Every other country in the world depends on our United States medical system for research and development, for advanced technology. And people from all over the world come to America to take advantage of our quality of medicine when illness threatens their lives or the lives of their family.

Therefore, the most important question in this entire health care debate is, in my opinion, do we want to replace the entire system with a government-run bureaucracy that will make your health care decisions for you, and that is what I believe my good friends, the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], who is the main sponsor of this single payer plan, what that would do, it would be a Government-run bureaucracy that would make your health care decisions for you, just to repeat, and that is not just me saying it. That is what they say about their system.

I think when we look at that we ought to ask ourselves the other side of that question: Should we attempt to preserve what is good about the system that gives us the best quality medicine in the world and then to fix those areas that will allow anyone who is ill access to the system at an affordable cost? I think that is the other question we have to ask.

More specifically, we need to keep asking ourselves this question: Do each of us want to control our own health care decisions? Do each of us want to control our own health care decisions or should we trust the Federal and State governments to do that for us?

In that respect, I believe we should take a close look at the experience of people, particularly senior citizens in Canada, in Great Britain and Germany and consider what kind of health care we here in America could expect under a similar government-run system here in our country. To help evaluate those systems, I refer Members to a recent article in the March issue of "Reader Digest," which is the world's most widely read magazine, for its unbiased analysis of the issue.

The title of the article is "Your Risk Under the Clinton Plan," and that article is subtitled, "It Promises Health Care for Everyone, But What Kind of Health Care and at What Price?" And those, Madam Speaker, are profound questions that I think we all have to ask ourselves.

The article dwells at length on the serious flaws in the government-run Canadian health care plan, and it illustrates how health rationing global budgets and bureaucratic decision making forces many Canadians to come to America for treatment. As a matter of fact, flying here on the plane coming back to work day before yesterday, I was reading the prestigious "New England Journal of Medicine" which just completed a study pointing out that one-third of all Canadian doctors sent patients outside the country for treatment during the past 5 years, one-third of all doctors in Canada had to send their patients outside the country to get timely treatment.

This raises the most serious question of all. Where will Americans go if

health rationing prevents them from receiving timely medical treatment and surgery for illnesses such as cancer, heart ailments, cataracts, hip replacements, and it goes on and on? I for one am not willing to gamble on a government-run bureaucracy that in my opinion limits choice and guarantees that those who are covered now will have to pay more for less, including seniors on Medicare who are cut substantially under the Clinton plan. That to me is not acceptable.

I do not however believe that there is much that can be done to improve universal access to medical care at more affordable cost, and certainly those of us who are opposed to the Clinton plan or the single payer plan ought to have our alternatives.

This is mine: To require insurance companies to make group insurance policies available to everyone at substantial savings. And believe me, if you are talking about paying a premium now of $4,000, if you had group insurance policies available to every small business in America we could reduce the individual cost of that policy by as much as 20 percent. That is almost $1,000 off the cost of that policy.

No. 2, require portability because employees who are laid off or are changing jobs can carry medical coverage with them. That is doable.

Require insurance policies to cover people with preexisting conditions. That is doable.

Here is one of the most important things of all, to allow 100 percent tax deductions for insurance premiums and out-of-pocket uncovered medical expenses. This will dramatically reduce the out-of-pocket cost of insurance for every working American.

Right now, we all know when we sit down and keep track of all of our medical bills and insurance premiums and drug bills and go to accumulate all of those, and figure our taxes, when we get all done we do not save a dime under the existing system. And individuals cannot write off hardly anything. If we allow 100 percent tax deduction for insurance premiums and out-of-pocket uncovered medical expenses, that for all individuals and small business self-employed people, but their employees as well, we are going to reduce that premium out of pocket by almost another $800. If you are in a 33-percent tax bracket, and if you are paying a premium out of your pocket of $4,500, you are going to save $1,500. The Federal Government is going to give you back $1,500. That comes off the cost of your insurance premiums.

No. 5, require meaningful tort reform that would limit attorney fees and limit exorbitant court awards for such things as pain and suffering that the rest of us have to pay for through increased insurance premiums. This will also drive the cost of insurance premiums down.

Let me just tell you something. You know, if you are an American and you are working hard, and you have a potential lifetime earning total of $1 million, let us say, then why should you be able to get a settlement of $30 million? Anything above that $1 million is going to be paid for by you and me and the other insurance premium payers throughout America. So we ought to limit those recoveries for pain and suffering and those punitive damages to $500,000 or $750,000. This would reduce premiums another 15 percent or more. And by the time we end up with it, we have saved about 40 percent off the total cost of that insurance premium with just those three recommendations that I just made, considering reducing insurance costs.

Next, retain absolute choice of doctors and medical facilities, and that should be every American's prerogative.

Guarantee the preservation of Medicare for the elderly with no expansion to cover younger people in that Medicare plan. Right now there are plans to include welfare recipients and kids working part time in the Medicare Program.

□ 1850

And that is just the beginning of what will happen. That is what happened to Social Security, Madam Speaker.

No employer mandate that would result in lost jobs: I have here in my briefcase a Baruch College study predicting a loss of 2 million jobs if the health care plan of President Clinton or the single payer goes through, 2 million jobs. You know, if you lose 1 million jobs, that drives up the unemployment rate by 1 percent, and it increases Government deficit spending for all social programs caused by the 1 million by $40 billion.

Well, 2 million unemployed means an $80 billion expenditure. Where are you going to get the money to pay for that?

No. 9. To provide long-term care for the elderly both at home and institutionally, and I think that is affordable and can be done.

No. 10. To provide prescription drug coverage for the elderly who live on fixed incomes, and that means means-testing it, because I do not think people with $200,000 incomes, even though they are on Medicare and they are entitled to it because they paid for it all those years, I do not think they ought to be entitled to have their prescription bills paid for. But I think people on fixed incomes should.

And, No. 11, and perhaps most importantly, to provide catastrophic-illness coverage for all so that families of surviving spouses are not wiped out after a prolonged catastrophic illness.

There is nothing so sad to see as a man who loses his wife after a prolonged 20-year illness, having driven up medical bills of gosh knows how much, $75,000, $100,000, and then he, the surviving spouse, is left penniless and a ward of the State. That is wrong. We can afford to take care of that.

Our Republican conference plan does.

Those, ladies and gentlemen, are my recommendations. There are 11 of them, and I think that those are critical changes. I believe they are necessary to correct what is wrong with the system while still retaining the good in the system that earns us the respect of having the best-quality medicine in the world.

Along with the extensive comparison chart that I showed to them and are available in my office, you should also have in front of you a one-page chart listing my 11 priorities and how each is covered under those eight programs, under the three Democrat, the four Republican, the one bipartisan.

As the health care debate heats up in the months ahead, I hope we can ultimately pass something along these lines, a bill that brings about real meaningful reform but does not threaten the quality of care or the level of consumer choice that has traditionally made our medical standards the envy of the rest of the world, and incidentally demanded by the American people.

Madam Speaker, those are my thoughts on the health care issue, and at some time I would be glad to engage those that might support other plans in a debate on this issue.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family illness.

Ms. DELAURO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOAGLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(Mr. DORNAN, and to include therein extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,087.)

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

Mr. ORTON.
Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. ROEMER.

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

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.
Mr. MFUME.
Mr. MANN in two instances.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. SANGMEISTER in three instances.
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
Mr. RANGEL in two instances.
Mr. PARKER.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. STARK.
Ms. SHEPHERD in two instances.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.
Mr. HINCHEY.
Mr. REED.
Mr. SARPALIUS.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. KOPETSKI.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. STUDDS.
Ms. LAMBERT.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. BECERRA.
Mr. GEJDENSON.
Mr. COPPERSMITH.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
Mrs. THURMAN.

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

Mr. ROGERS in two instances.
Mr. EHLERS.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. BILIRAKIS in two instances.
Mrs. MORELLA in three instances.
Mr. HOUGHTON.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. FAWELL in two instances.
Mr. CASTLE.
Mr. KING.
Mr. SOLOMON in four instances.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.
Mr. CLINGER in two instances.
Mr. DREIER.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. EVERETT.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Mr. KIM.
Mr. SHAYS.
Mr. WELDON.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mrs. BENTLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1636. An act to authorize appropriations for the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and to improve the program to reduce the incidental taking of marine mammals during the course of commercial fishing operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1930. An act to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the administration of claims and obligations of the Farmers Home Administration, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Frank Anderson Shrontz as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Manuel Luis Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1994, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3070. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and urban Development, transmitting the Department's report on the Federal Home Loan Bank System, pursuant to Public Law 102-550, section 1393(b) (106 Stat. 4011); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3071. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of the anti-terrorism training courses to be offered to the civilian security forces of the Government of Namibia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-3(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3072. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State; transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-15-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3073. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs; transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Joseph R. Paolino, of Rhode Island, Ambassador designate to the Republic of Malta, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3074. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "U.S.-Mexico Border Water Pollution Control Act," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3075. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "U.S. Colonias Water Pollution Control Act," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3076. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health and Human Resources, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Pesticide Reform Act of 1994"; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

3077. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administrator, transmitting the Administration's 1993 annual report on the Natural Resource Development Program; a tree planting program utilizing small businesses; jointly, to the Committees on Small Business and Appropriations.

3078. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Amendments of 1994"; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-485). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 1015. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to assure the completeness and accuracy of consumer information maintained by credit reporting agencies, to better inform consumers of their rights under the act, and to improve enforcement, and for other purposes; with an amendment; (Rept. 103-486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2473. A bill to designate certain National Forest lands in the State of Montana as wilderness, to release other National Forest lands in the State of Montana for multiple use management, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-487, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reform the public housing program; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BORSKI:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to establishment of the National Transportation System; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KLEIN (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. DEAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 4306. A bill to establish a comprehensive risk assessment program within the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 4307. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to applications for process patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WELDON, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 4308. A bill to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to authorize appropriations for allocations under that act for wetlands conservation projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMBURG (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FARR, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4309. A bill to require a local hiring preference for certain defense contracts and subcontracts performed in or near labor surplus areas and closing military bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (by request):

H.R. 4310. A bill to reduce homelessness, reform public housing, expand and preserve affordable housing and homeownership, ensure fair housing for all, empower communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ORTON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HORN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. SWETT):

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to postpone the round of base closures and realignments scheduled for 1995 until 1997; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida (for himself and Mr. GOSS):

H.R. 4312. A bill imposing certain restrictions and requirements on the leasing under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of lands offshore Florida, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 4313. A bill to prohibit the admission to the United States as refugees, individuals who served in the armed forces of Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict, and to deport any such individuals who have been so admitted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LAMBERT (for herself, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 4314. A bill to reauthorize the Safe Drinking Water Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4315. A bill to designate a site for the relocation of the public facility of the National Museum of Health and Medicine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4316. A bill to improve the quality of public elementary and secondary school libraries, media centers, and facilities in order to help meet the National Education Goals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 4317. A bill to designate temporary protected status under the Immigration and Nationality Act for Rwandan students in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. REGULA):

H.R. 4318. A bill to reduce reliance on public assistance by improving education and job training programs, strengthening support services and case management, eliminating penalties against two-parent families, allowing welfare recipients to keep more of their earnings and benefits as they move into the work force, and increasing child support enforcement; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

H.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to designate March 20 through 26, 1995, as "National Long-Term Care Administrators Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. GOSS introduced a bill (H.R. 4319) to authorize issuance of a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel *Reel Toy;* 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. 40: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 65: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 67: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 302: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 303: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 340: Mr. KLUG, Mr. KIM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. LAMBERT.
H.R. 393: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
H.R. 417: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SLATTERY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 493: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 518: Mr. WYDEN and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 647: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. FINGERHUT.
H.R. 799: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 846: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 885: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. RAVENEL, and Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 911: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 979: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 1088: Mr. MCHALE.
H.R. 1110: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 1146: Mr. WYDEN.
H.R. 1289: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 1295: Mr. SWIFT.
H.R. 1309: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. CALLAHAN.
H.R. 1349: Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 1501: Mr. EDWARDS of California.
H.R. 1604: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1606: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1607: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. WYDEN.
H.R. 1712: Mr. CLINGER.
H.R. 1988: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2031: Mr. HAMBURG.
H.R. 2147: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2175: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2218: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2420: Ms. WATERS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2460: Mr. BEVILL.
H.R. 2663: Mr. JACOBS.
H.R. 2708: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2741: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MANTON.
H.R. 2759: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DORNAN Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. ZIMMER.
H.R. 2872: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2882: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2929: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 3017: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 3031: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 3179: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 3246: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 3251: Mr. CLINGER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3266: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 3270: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONDIT.
H.R. 3293: Mr. WELDON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.
H.R. 3324; Mr. FOGLIETTA and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 3333: Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 3347: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 3367: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 3442: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3449: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KYL, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3491: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 3546: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3692: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3716: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3717: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 3739: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3774: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 3775: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3777: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3778: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3780: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3781: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 3790: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 3796: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 3811: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SCHENK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3820: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. REED, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. WELDON, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, MR. ARCHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KING, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 3831: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3835: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. Upton, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 3873: Mr. EDWARDS of California and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3900: Mr. APPLEGATE and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3926: Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. WELDON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. GRAMS.

H.R. 3935: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 3941: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. EWING, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 3967: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 3973: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3986: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 4040: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 4050: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 4064: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4065: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4078: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4095: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KYL, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 4109: Ms. SHEPHERD and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 4116: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 4130: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 4133: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 4138: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4148: Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4155: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4188: Mr. PARKER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 4213: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4215: Mr. LINDER and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 4259: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 4296: Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. FILNER.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. GILMAN.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. LEACH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 112: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HOKE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KASICH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.J. Res. 129: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. PETRI and Mr. HOKE.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 276: Mr. WISE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LEACH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HAYES, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TORRES.

H.J. Res. 304: Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.J. Res. 305: Mr. TUCKER and Mr. POSHARD.

H.J. Res. 311: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Ms. WATERS.

H.J. Res. 315: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.J. Res. 322: Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.J. Res. 327: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. WILSON.

H.J. Res. 333: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, MR. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HOYER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HORN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.J. Res. 342: Mr. REED.

H.J. Res. 344: Mr. FISH, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. KREIDLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COX, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.J. Res. 350: Mr. FROST and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.J. Res. 355: Mr. KASICH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WILSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. PENNY and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 90: Mr. KLUG.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3860: Mr. ARMEY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. SOLOMON on the bill H.R. 493: Y. Tim Hutchinson, Jim Lightfoot, James A. Leach, Lamar S. Smith, Bob Inglis, and John M. McHugh.

Petition 1 by Mr. SOLOMON on H.R. 439: Joe Barton.

Petition 5 by Mr. STEARNS on House Resolution 156: Joe Barton.

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Richard K. Armey and Joe Barton.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Solomon P. Ortiz, John L. Mica, Dana Rohrabacher, Sam Johnson, Newt Gingrich, Duncan Hunter, Cliff Stearns, Jim Saxton, Martin R. Hoke, Harold Rogers, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, William F. Goodling, James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, Curt Weldon, Deborah Pryce, James A. Barcia, John A. Boehner, William F. Clinger, Jr., Michael Bilirakis, Howard Coble, Tom DeLay, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Ron Packard, Jennifer Dunn, Robert S. Walker, Wally Herger, William H. Zeliff, Jr., Henry J. Hyde, Don Sundquist, Michael A. "Mac" Collins, Jim Light-

foot, Sherwood L. Boehlert, Eric Fingerhut, Robert K. Dornan, Susan Molinari, Walter R. Tucker, Ralph M. Hall, Pat Roberts, James A. Hayes, Jack Quinn, Michael Huffington, Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., Terry Everett, Jack Fields, C.W. Bill Young, Bob Livingston, Peter A. DeFazio, Dick Swett, Gerald B.H. Solomon, Jack Kingston, David A. Levy, Richard H. Baker, Ken Calvert, Cass Ballenger, Peter G. Torkildsen, Dan Miller, and Floyd H. Flake.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: John L. Mica, Jim Bunning, Barbara F. Vucanovich, Stephen Horn, and Nick J. Rahall II.

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 6) 48

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MY COMMITMENT TO AMERICA

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Joanna Byrd of Smyrna, DE, on winning the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest in my home State of Delaware. The contest theme this year was "My Commitment to America," and more than 138,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the 39 national scholarships.

Joanna wrote an excellent statement on what it means to be an American and the responsibilities that come with citizenship in our Nation. She discussed what the word commitment means to her and how she would carry out commitments she has made to herself, her family, community, and country. Joanna has decided to become a teacher and she talks about the personal commitment and determination required to achieve her goal.

We can all learn from Joanna's fine enunciation of the qualities of personal responsibility and initiative; qualities which have helped Americans serve their country throughout its history.

Joanna is the daughter of Thomas and Carole Byrd and she was sponsored by VFW Post 8801 and its Ladies Auxiliary in Clayton, DE. Joanna's family and friends in Smyrna should be very proud of her and I also want to congratulate the members of Post 8801 for helping to instill the qualities of good citizenship in the young people of the community in Clayton and Smyrna.

As a state winner and the 31st place national winner, Joanna will receive a $1,000 scholarship from the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joanna Byrd and I am honored to enter her winning script into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY COMMITMENT TO AMERICA

[1993/94 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program, Delaware Winner, Joanna Byrd, Post 8801, Clayton, DE]

"I'm proud to be an American where at least I know I'm free, and, I won't forget the men who died and gave that right to me." These words by Lee Greenwood have always struck a nerve within my heart since the first time I heard them. I *am* proud to be an American. Being born a citizen of the United States has awarded me with several opportunities. Some of these include: religious freedom, the ability to speak my mind without persecution, the right to vote, and the right to equality. Some people in other countries dream of receiving the kind of freedom that Americans have. However, most of the rights given to United States citizens are quite often taken for granted, and that makes me angry. Not taking advantage of freedom is like being given a million dollars and just throwing it away. America was built on the foundation of courage, determination, and, above all, a commitment to the ideals of liberty. In order to prove my loyalty to America, I have sketched a plan for my future. That plan will one day evolve into my commitment to the United States.

Every time I hear the word commitment, my mind automatically breaks it down into two separate parts. These are: (1) deciding how I can dedicate myself to something, and (2) choosing to follow through with that decision. Once these two large steps have been taken, the journey toward commitment is more than half way over.

The easiest part of commitment is deciding how I can show my loyalty to another person, place, thing, or idea. To display my own personal commitment to America, I have decided to become a teacher. What better way is there to prove my dedication to my country than to help shape the young minds of future generations? Behind every excellent student is an exceptional teacher. Without educators, the United States would never have become as successful as they are today. However, simply deciding to become a teacher is not nearly enough. As a matter of fact, it is only the beginning.

The second step of commitment, as well as the most difficult, is to follow through with my plans. After choosing that becoming a teacher will display my loyalty to my nation, I must carry out that decision. I can do that in a couple of ways. The first and most important way is to get the best education I can. The second way is to remain dedicated to my purpose. Above all else, I must never give up. America was not built by quitters. I will do my country justice by rolling up my sleeves and by proving that I am determined to keep going, even when the going gets tough.

America has so much to offer. Anyone would be a fool to refuse to accept the opportunities which the United States give so freely. America is good to me. In turn, I plan to be good to America. By getting involved in community activities, exercising my free rights, and by helping the generations to come, I can prove that I am, and always will remain, committed to my country—the United States of America.

JONESVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT, TWO VETERAN FIREFIGHTERS ARE HONORED

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, those of you who have been in my office have noticed the many fire hats lining the wall of the reception area. That's a token of the high respect I have for volunteer firefighters in our rural areas. I'd especially like to tell you about two of them today.

Their names are Kenneth Noyes and Lou Pasquarell. They have been firefighters for 64 and 58 years, respectively.

On May 28, their unit, the Jonesville Fire Department in Clifton Park, NY, will be celebrating 75 years of providing fire protection to the community. Such volunteer companies save countless lives and billions of dollars worth of property in New York State alone every year. Imagine how many people and how much property Ken Noyes and Lou Pasquarell have saved since they joined. Imagine how many times they have literally dropped whatever they were doing to respond to a neighbor in danger, or a building enveloped in flames.

These volunteer firefighters come in all shapes, sizes, races, creeds, occupations, and income levels. What they have in common is a selfless desire to help their neighbors, which they often do at a moment's notice and under a variety of hardships and dangers. This is the American spirit at its best.

As a volunteer firefighter myself for a quarter of a century, I am positively awed at the long service of Ken Noyes and Lou Pasquarell. They're both real heroes, in my book, and I am extraordinarily proud of them.

In fact, every member of the Jonesville Fire Department is a hero, and so are their supportive families.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the Jonesville Fire Department for 75 years of outstanding service. And let us further salute Ken Noyes and Lou Pasquarell, two men who represent the spirit of voluntarism that has made America great.

BRADFORD REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER AUXILIARY: 1994 GOLDEN DEEDS AWARD WINNER, BRADFORD, PA

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bradford Regional Medical Center Auxiliary, recipient of the Bradford, PA, Exchange Club's 1994 Golden Deeds Award. It is a pleasure to recognize the achievements of this auxiliary, now in its 59th year.

The Bradford Regional Medical Center Auxiliary, numbering 300 members who have volunteered 20,000 hours per year, supports numerous departments in the hospital including x-ray, emergency, and outpatient services. The auxiliary has also been successful in rein-

stating the teen volunteer program, in addition to supporting a dozen other volunteer initiatives associated with the medical center.

One example, in particular, is the auxiliary's fundraising efforts on behalf of the annual gift to the Bradford Regional Medical Center. Over the past 10 years, the auxiliary has produced an annual donation of $50,000. The money raised by the auxiliary has supplemented many projects, including the purchases of a CT scanner in diagnostic imaging and lifeline units. Hospital renovations have also been made possible through their fundraising endeavors.

Helping students meet their educational goals is yet another function of the auxiliary's volunteerism. The auxiliary awards four annual scholarships: two $1,500 scholarships granted to second-year nursing students and two $250 scholarships granted to second-year Bradford Regional Medical Center radiography students.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the Bradford Regional Medical Center Auxiliary as the recipient of the 1994 Golden Deeds Award. I offer my sincere congratulations for the diligence with which they contribute to the health and well-being of Bradford, PA.

RICHARD NIXON

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I arrived in Congress in 1973 and I was one of the first Members of this House to support the impeachment of Richard Nixon. With due respect to his family and friends, because we are all entitled to a private life, Mr. Nixon's public life is not one in which I find much doubt about how it should be remembered.

The country has never fully recovered from the damage Richard Nixon caused this country and the American presidency. Earlier today, Mark Plotkin gave a commentary on Richard Nixon which I believe is right on target. I commend it to by colleagues as we reflect on Mr. Nixon's legacy.

NIXON

When I think of Richard Nixon—I think of the year 1968.

It was a terrible year for the country. A war 10,000 miles away was raging, hundreds of Americans were dying each week, and there didn't seem to be any end in sight.

In April, Martin Luther King was assassinated and in June we lost Robert Kennedy. Two men full of idealism who sought to change the world.

After all the pain, tears, hurt, and tragedy, who came out on top, but Nixon.

It seemed to me then, so unfair and so wrong. How could the country grant the highest office in the land to this man?

Now with all the eulogies pouring in and the revisionist history being played out, I believe some things should be remembered.

Remember in 1968, Nixon said he had a "Plan to End the War." But he wouldn't tell us what it was. That was pure Nixon.

It symbolized who he was. We were to trust him and vote for him and then after he got elected he would let us in on the plan.

The inference was that the plan would end the war and the killing would stop and the boys would come home.

But from 1969 to 1973, over 29,000 Americans died in Vietnam. More than in the previous four years.

In fact Nixon sought not to end the war but to expand it. In May of 1970, he went into Cambodia and would have stayed had Congress not stopped him.

From the start of his political career to its disgraceful end—Nixon was the ultimate practitioner of the theory "anything goes" as long as I win.

Whether it be calling people Communists—when they were not—or collecting names for an enemy, his brand of politics was to deceive and divide.

Richard Nixon cheapened the profession of politics and by his actions brought shame and dishonor to the Office of President and to our nation.

The flag of our country should not have been lowered.

A CHAMPION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES LAYS DOWN HIS LANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend and colleague Representative DON EDWARDS. During his 32 years on Capitol Hill, Congressman EDWARDS has fought relentlessly for civil and constitutional rights for all Americans. His tireless struggle to rid our country of legalized racial discrimination is clear from his voting record in Congress.

He voted for the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. His moral commitment never weakened. During the Reagan-Bush years Representative EDWARDS assembled bipartisan majorities to pass the Fair Housing Amendment in 1988 and the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

I served on the Judiciary Committee with Congressman EDWARDS during the Watergate investigations. He proved himself as a great defender of the constitutional rights that many people take for granted. His accomplishments and dedication will long be remembered.

I was surprised to hear of Representative EDWARDS' decision to leave Congress at the end of this term. I will sorely miss my colleague from California, but I am grateful for the privilege and will always take pride in having served with him.

For the benefit of my colleagues I wish to enter the following article which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, April 3, 1994.

[From the New York Times, April 3, 1994]

CONVERSATIONS

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON—"The next civil right really should be some kind of civil right for livelihood," said Representative Don Edwards, Democrat of California, the pre-eminent defender of constitutional rights on Capitol Hill. Sitting in his office last week, he observed that civil rights debates have become more complex as the focus shifts from political to economic rights.

"It's all very well for a black kid in Washington to have free speech and not to be discriminated against in getting an auto license," he said. "But unless he has a livelihood, unless he is qualified for a job and has grown up with strict adult supervision, he is going to have a hard time making it in this country."

For Mr. Edwards, 79, moving the concept of civil rights forward into another arena in almost a habit. But while he continues this intellectual and moral exercise, he will be championing his concepts in less visible arenas, as he retires in January after 32 years in Congress.

In those years, a time span that stretches from John F. Kennedy to Bill Clinton, he prodded his colleagues into decisions that did at least as much as any Attorney General to protect people against discrimination.

"It was almost magical in those days," he said of the Johnson years. "We could pass anything if we labeled it civil rights. But now there's almost an avalanche of anti-civil rights things going on."

Mr. Edwards voted for the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, which banned discrimination in employment and public accommodations, and for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. "Kennedy's assassination made a big difference," he said. "Lyndon Johnson emotionally asked us to do it for Jack Kennedy. Johnson was just great on these issues."

Mr. Edwards has been chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights for more than two decades. He passed up opportunities to lead other committees so he could keep his position as monitor of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and as field marshal in the battles over civil rights.

Mr. Edwards also turned down a seat on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. "I thought I would be trapped by secrecy oaths, and it would interfere with my free speech," he said.

'A PALEOLIBERAL'

Representative Henry J. Hyde of Illinois, the ranking Republican on Mr. Edwards' subcommittee, describes his colleague as "a paleoliberal," untouched by revisionism or self-doubt. Yet he said he greatly respects Mr. Edwards as "someone whose principles are not malleable."

"Don Edwards is one of the most thoroughgoing gentlemen that I've encountered in Congress," said Mr. Hyde. "He's soft-spoken. He is passionately committed to the cause of civil liberties. He is relentlessly liberal, but that's not a vice. The battle for the fullest expression of civil liberties is losing a general, not a foot soldier."

Mr. Edwards' independence can be judged from his vote in February on a House resolution condemning a speech by Khalid Abdul Muhammad of the Nation of Islam, who had delivered a vitriolic attack on Jews, Catholics and others. By a vote of 361 to 34, the House denounced the speech as "outrageous hatemongering of the most vicious and vile kind."

Mr. Edwards agreed that the remarks were disgusting and racist, but opposed the resolution. Lawmakers should counter Mr. Muhammad with speeches and press conferences, he argued, but Congress as an institution should not take official action to condemn a particular speech. "That's a chilling precedent," he said. "Will we condemn books and magazines next? Offensive movies?"

Mr. Edwards also disapproves of the campus speech codes through which colleges have tried to restrict speech expressing bias toward women, blacks and members of other minority groups. "I am not in favor of these arbitrary codes," he said. "They have civil

liberties problems." Offensive speech requires other remedies, he said, suggesting that counseling and communication were better responses than punishment.

Mr. Edwards, who had not held political office before he was elected to Congress in 1962, grew up in a conservative Republican family. After law school, he served two years as an F.B.I. agent and four years as a Navy officer. He was president of a land title company before coming to Washington.

His son, Leonard P. Edwards, a judge of the Juvenile Court in Santa Clara County, Calif., said his father always had a commitment to civil rights. "He was born with it," said Judge Edwards. "I don't think this is something that he had to reflect upon. It goes to his very essence as a human being. He's very proud of this country and believes that diversity is one of its strengths."

The Congressman's district, at the southern end of San Francisco Bay, includes the heart of San Jose, as well as vineyards of the Santa Clara Valley. Thirty-seven percent of the residents are Hispanic, but many are not registered to vote. Twenty percent of the residents are Asian-Americans, who vote regularly.

'OUR APARTHEID'

In the Reagan and Bush years, Mr. Edwards and his allies assembled large bipartisan majorities to pass civil rights legislation including the Voting Rights Act extension of 1982, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Fair Housing Amendments of 1988 and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which overturned eight Supreme Court decisions.

Today, Mr. Edwards said, it is much more difficult to build such bipartisan bridges. In the struggles of the 1960's, he said, "we had the advantage of a Republican Party that was pro-civil rights." Eighty percent of House Republicans and 61 percent of House Democrats voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964, "a really revolutionary bill that eliminated most aspects of our apartheid," he said.

Recently, Mr. Edwards said, "there definitely has been a diminishing interest in resolving the separation and the alienation and the discrimination against black Americans." He agreed with civil rights lobbyists who assert that the Supreme Court poses a grave threat to civil rights and civil liberties. "This Supreme Court has been hostile to civil rights and to civil liberties," Mr. Edwards said.

In the criminal justice system, particularly in death penalty cases, he said, blacks are still struggling to gain constitutional protections that whites enjoy. "Forty percent of the 3,000 people on death row are black, even though blacks are only 13 percent of the population," Mr. Edwards said. "We have some remnants left over from the slavery days," when the punishment for a slave killing his master was much harsher than the penalty for a master killing a slave.

"Most Americans don't understand how important it is to our domestic tranquility to encourage and advocate a more caring society, which is generous in its laws, its social programs and general attitudes," Mr. Edwards said. "Too many Americans have learned in the last 10 or 15 years that if you just go to church and pray, you are virtuous regardless of how you treat your brothers and sisters, especially the black and Hispanic ones."

TRIBUTE TO IDAMAE GARROTT

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, Maryland State Senator Idamae Garrott has recently announced she will not seek re-election when her term expires this year. I would like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations and best wishes to Senator Garrott, for her more than 25 years of public service to the people of Montgomery County and the State of Maryland.

Senator Garrott was elected to the House of Delegates in 1978, and served in the House until being elected to the State Senate in 1986, where she is currently serving her second term. I had the great honor of serving with her during our 8 years in the House of Delegates. She was a conscientious, caring legislator with a vast knowledge of Montgomery County and Maryland. As a State senator, Senator Garrott has been the vice chair of the Montgomery County Senate Delegation, and senate chair of both the Joint Committee on Federal Relations and of the Advisory Committee on Federal-State-Local Relations. Prior to serving in Annapolis, she served on the Montgomery County Council from 1966–74, including a stint in 1971 as president.

She has also served as the first chairman of the Solid Waste Management Agency of Metropolitan Washington, the president of the Council of Governments, a member of the METRO Board, chairman of the Washington Suburban Transit Commission, and president of the Montgomery County League of Women Voters.

In 1967, she led the battle to establish fair housing in Montgomery County. While a member of the general assembly, Senator Garrott sponsored many important bills such as the child safety seat legislation and banning of corporal punishment in Maryland public schools, the promotion of animal welfare, prohibition of discrimination against the elderly in housing, and various environmental measures.

On May 1, a luncheon is planned to honor the senator for her distinguished achievements for the people of Maryland. Please join me today in thanking Senator Garrott for her commitment to the State of Maryland and in wishing her continued success in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BETTY PLACE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mrs. Elizabeth Place of Webster, MA. Mrs. Place was recently named Woman of the Year, by the Patriot Newspaper of Webster, in recognition of her many years of devotion to that community.

A resident of central Massachusetts for over 40 years, Elizabeth Place has spent much of that time serving as a volunteer in her community. An original member of the fundraising committee for the New Hubbard Regional Hospital in Webster, Mrs. Place is currently a member of the board of directors at the hospital. In addition, she serves as an area director for the United Way. Also, Mrs. Place is a member of the Hubbard Regional Hospital Women's Guild, an organization which she previously represented as president.

A member of the United Church of Christ, Mrs. Place served on a number of different church committees, and is also a former member of the Webster Women's Club and the Webster Garden Club. A devoted mother, Mrs. Place raised her five children in Webster, serving as both a Girl Scout and Cub Scout leader, the latter for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize, along with the people of Webster, MA, the many accomplishments of Elizabeth Place. I wish her well in any future endeavor.

SALUTE TO JOSEPH CERTAINE

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to salute Joseph Certaine, who this week was appointed managing director of the city of Philadelphia by Mayor Ed Rendell. Joe has long served the citizens of Philadelphia, and prides himself on his relationship with the community. Joe learned the importance of constituent services on the front line, serving as a block captain in west Philadelphia during the 1970's, and has carried that understanding with him throughout his career, serving in various posts under Mayors William Green and W. Wilson Goode. In his new position, he will be in charge of the departments of human services, police, fire, streets, recreation, water, and licenses and inspections.

Joe Certaine is one of the best hands on managers in the city of Philadelphia, and the thought of having him in charge of city services will allow each and every Philadelphian to sleep a little bit more soundly at night.

HEALTH CARE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as we finalize the health care debate in the House of Representatives and come closer to agreement, there is an issue that has not received the attention that it clearly merits. The matter of quality medical care and cost effectiveness with respect to new medical technologies and procedures deserves close scrutiny as we move forward on healthcare reform. At the heart of this issue is the need for a reliable national emphasis on medical technology research and development as well as the necessity for quickly bringing lifesaving innovations into the medical mainstream.

Pursuant to these matters, I would like to draw the attention of the Congress to the statement of Dr. Ken Fox presented to the House Science Committee on March 17. Dr. Fox is one of the inventors of laser angioplasty medical technology. Given that heart and circulatory disease is America's greatest killer, it is interesting to read about the debate between balloon angioplasty, laser angioplasty, and open heart surgery. This is an important debate, and I am pleased to be able to bring Dr. Fox's remarks to the attention of the House of Representatives today.

STATEMENT OF DR. KEN FOX PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY, ENVIRONMENT AND AVIATION ON MATTERS RELATED TO HEALTH CARE REFORM, THE ROLE OF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES, AND THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH SECURITY ACT, H.R. 3600

Thank you Chairman Valentine for allowing me to present some remarks to the Subcommittee on matters related to the President's health care initiative and how it may affect leading edge medical technologies such as laser angioplasty. I commend the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment, and Aviation for holding these hearings and providing a forum for these important technological concerns.

PILLCO, of which I am CEO, holds the key patents in the United States and in some foreign countries related to the current treatment method which utilizes a pulsed ultraviolent excimer laser. The procedure is FDA-approved and uses these lasers to vaporize atherosclerotic plaque and restore normal blood flow to arteries of the heart. The fact that ours is a pulsed laser—which utilizes carefully selected energy parameters—permits the physician to vaporize plaque without thermal harm to surrounding arterial tissue. Needless to say, this innovative method is a revolutionary approach to cardiac disease mitigation.

The FDA approved these technologies for commercial use in 1992 after many years of evaluation. Presently, two companies are licensed to manufacture these lasers in the United States: Advanced Interventional Systems and Spectranetics. Dr. A. Arthur Coster and I began working on these advances in the late seventies, and I can tell you without bias today that the list of difficulties in bringing this technology to fruition in American hospitals for human benefit would easily, as a popular song once noted, fill the entire Royal Albert Hall. Any changes to our health care system should address the dual matter of bringing life saving and quality-enhancing technologies safely and efficiently to the marketplace in its opening legislative clauses.

Technology drives our health care system as well as our entire economy. The advent in the later 1970's of "balloon angioplasty" gave interventional cardiologists a tremendous advantage. However, balloon angioplasty is primarily effective in a smaller number of cardiac patients. The balloon can be effectively used when the lesions (plaque blockages) are simple, and changes in personal diet may provide additional success. When the disease gets more complex and includes long lesions, diffused lesions, heavily calcified lesions, and other difficult blockages the pulsed laser is undeniably the best angioplasty method. Obviously the best method of eradication of the most difficult plaque lesions will also be the best method for attacking the smaller and simpler lesions. The net benefit of this thesis statement becomes more apparent when surgery rates for failed balloon angioplasty are taken into consideration. The resultant expense of open heart and bypass surgery is well documented. Announcements in the news recently that the national cost figure for coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) is approximately $9 billion a year was astounding! Both the Bureau of National Affairs and the Health Care Data Information Center have jointly claimed in a study that CABG has inflated our national health costs without a correlating enhancement in our national health status. Their study also suggested that we should quantify our projected financial savings in relation to real changes in our medical practice patterns. I believe this would be helpful, too.

Another interesting facet in this debate is that the pulsed laser advance in angioplasty technology can be less expensive than other angioplasty remediations including balloon. For ease of reference, attached to my statement is a comparative hospital reimbursement and length of stay survey we developed via interviews with hospital administrators for the three major cardiovascular procedures. While the initial hospital investment in the excimer laser technology may appear substantial, the vaporization of the plaque via these lasers provides dramatic cost efficiencies and time savings when the survey results are compared. Although many reasons exist for this, the major ones are:

1. People are out of the hospital sooner than after surgery or balloon,
2. Patients are back to work faster,
3. Laser angioplasty offers lower mortality rates than bypass,
4. Plaque is vaporized via laser versus being compressed against the arterial wall by balloon angioplasty, and
5. Surgery is risky, expensive, and the recurrence of plaque is a familiar result.

The "Wall Street Journal" on February 4, 1994, reported on a U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study in an article entitled "Coronary Disease Poses Risk to 82% of Americans, Despite Lifestyle Changes." The study points out that we should not ignore the risk factors: obesity, lack of exercise, high blood pressure and cholesterol, diabetes, and cigarette smoking (which was defined as having smoked at least 100 cigarettes in one's lifetime!). The CDC's Cardiovascular Health Studies Branch notes that physical activity and diet changes do help reduce one's risk but do not erase the disease altogether. Contrary to popular understanding, coronary heart disease is America's greatest health threat today. In response, "Medical Laser Marketplace '93" quotes 1992 Arthur D. Little Co. statistics which project a 25% penetration of lasers in cardiovascular surgery by 1995. The trend is established, and it is based on medical success and the positive cost-benefit ratio of lasers in cardiovascular treatment.

President Clinton's concern for access to good medical care for all Americans is an honorable goal for our nation. I want to amend that goal with the thought that access to medical care must include access to effective medical care for all Americans. Biotechnology has been an engine of growth for our economy and must remain a locomotive of growth for the continued enhancement of our national health. Everyone should have access to the best medical procedures when warranted. We cannot ignore costs in this equation, and, at the same time, we cannot ignore medical success either. Coronary artery disease cuts across both socioeconomic and geographic boundaries in our country. Our hospitals must be adequately reimbursed for advanced, efficient, and effective procedures like laser angioplasty. If they are not, the companies that develop and supply these and related technologies cannot survive. In a directly related manner our national health status will falter. The resultant macro-economics and macro-politics of this potential turn of events should be evident.

In addition, we are very much in favor of a continued increase in support for research and development in biotechnology. The debate over how much R&D should remain public versus private creates a problem. Lip service has been given to increasing support for R&D by various Federal agencies including NIH. Unless private enterprise is supportive of this increase, the results will not be totally successful. The fact remains that the majority of current R&D is through private innovation, and I believe this is the way it should be in a free market economy.

This view of *total cost* is really the key with regards to *cost outcomes analysis*. In other words, if something like laser angioplasty ultimately gets people out of the hospital sooner, back to work quicker, and permits them to remain in an improved health status for a longer period of time, then many of the more myopic traditional views of health care costs are antiquated. Traditional economics notes that unit costs decrease when efficient production patterns are successfully established. If economic benefits of a healthier society are included in this economic equation as it relates to medical innovation and macroeconomic health care costs, a $200,000 laser angioplasty unit with $1,000 per use catheter costs may be less expensive in total cost to society than a $100 balloon procedure. Is not this a major them of the present health care debate? Are we not in a debate regarding what is best for the American people, both in regard to health care results and as they relate to total expenditure of GNP?

It is penny wise and pound foolish to reject new biotechnology merely because there is a higher initial price tag on the equipment. It follows then that if we are going to pursue 'cheaper' treatments (including diagnostics) without regards to *total cost*, we will have a much less healthy society with fewer medical options. We also may well end up exporting our biotechnology leadership if we take this approach. With regards to *cost outcomes analysis*, total cost is the key. High technology will win out in the end. Higher technology will improve health and eventually reduce the total costs of disease for the nation. This is not only true with instrumentation and drugs but also with delivery of medical services and tasks. For instance, the development of an efficient outpatient surgery center will initially have a high price tag. However, over time an efficient outpatient center will incrementally begin to save society money in variable costs as well as promote earlier rehabilitation.

The concept of price caps disguised as premium limitations is an absolute anathema to biotech's success as well as health care's continuing ability to prosper. When we cut costs for health care without a just review of the resultant *total cost* to society, we can effectively reduce the health of the entire nation. In addition, the thought of extra bureaucracy created under the new terminology of "alliances" and "regional boards" ordinarily runs contrary to the needs of technological innovation. History has shown that government bureaucracies cannot adequately evaluate new technology.

The freedom to choose specialty health care—including those that involve new and high technologies in the biotech field—is essential to preserve. Our concerns are that if someone is locked into a "network" or "alliance" which limits choice, the availability of innovation in severely restricted and the free market is negated. This is counterproductive for the nation. On the companion matter of liability reform, PILLCO favors an immediate review of this matter by the Congress. It cannot be separated out of the *cost outcomes analysis* for patient care. In addition, *cost outcomes analysis* must include an analysis of the *total cost* to society as well as the total effects of procedures and technologies rather than limiting these evaluations to technology's initial costs and the like.

Chairman Valentine, thank you for allowing me to provide the Science Committee some details related to a very complex medical arena—that of laster angioplasty. In closing, I wish to point out that we at PILLCO are not opposed to managed care in the health industry. What kind of managed care is the important issue. We must provide for the American people a health care system which takes advantage of advances in technology and requires the advances to pay back solid dividends in terms of a longer and better quality of life for all Americans.

COLEMAN: MODEL OF LEADERSHIP RETIRES

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true leader in eastern Kentucky banking, as he approaches retirement this year. Burlin Coleman, of Pikeville, KY, built his small bank into a regional power in Kentucky.

Forty-five years ago, Burlin Coleman started as a clerk in Pikeville. Through his hard work and a tremendous commitment to excellence, he continued to receive promotion after promotion until becoming chief executive in 1979.

Under Coleman's leadership, the Pikeville National Corp. went from assets of $218 million to over $1.37 billion. It also acquired seven other financial institutions along the way.

Today, the Pikeville holding company employs over 600 employees in the Pikeville National Bank and 12 other branches in West Liberty, Williamsburg, Ashland, Whitesburg, Mount Sterling, Flemingsburg, Campbellsville, and Lexington.

According to analysts, Pikesville National has been one of the more profitable and well-run banks in America.

Currently No. 2 among Kentucky-based banking companies in terms of assets, it is due to become No. 1 later this year.

Many people have new opportunities today because of Burlin Coleman and his banks. Whether it is a young family getting their first mortgage or a little boy or girl opening their first savings account, the Pikesville National Bank has always been ready to handle eastern Kentucky's needs.

Remaining humble about his banking achievements, his success is a tribute to his hard work, his intelligent mind and his way with people. Always quick to give credit to a team effort by the bank's managers, Coleman is a leader for all of Kentucky.

We are fortunate to have had Burlin Coleman help many of us. I hope he enjoys his retirement; fishing, hunting, and relaxing for many years to come. It is very well deserved.

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER REFORM ACT OF 1994

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues, Representative BLANCHE LAMBERT and Representative GERRY STUDDS, in introducing the Safe Drinking Water Reform Act of 1994. Currently State and local governments are facing enormous difficulties in complying with the new and more stringent requirements of the 1986 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act. This problem is especially acute in small communities which lack sufficient funds and technical expertise necessary to comply with many of the act's requirements.

My Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources recently held a hearing on the difficulties facing small water systems, like those in my rural northeast Oklahoma district, and on ways to address drinking water problems sensibly and cost-effectively while maintaining public health protection. Witnesses at the hearing testified that five major problems underlie small drinking water system compliance problems: Lack of adequate funding; lack of alternative technologies appropriate for small systems; the need for reform of monitoring requirements so that systems test only for those contaminants they reasonably expect to pose health threats; inadequate technical and financial assistance to meet water system needs; and lack of financial, managerial or technical capacity necessary for many small systems to maintain compliance with the act. Mr. Speaker, our bill is designed to address each one of these issues without jeopardizing public health in any way.

First, our bill creates a drinking water State revolving fund [SRF] to provide loans and grants to local water systems to help them comply with statutory requirements. As you know, Congress has appropriated $599 million for a drinking water SRF, but has not yet passed authorizing legislation for the SRF.

The Safe Drinking Water Reform Act of 1994 also directs EPA to establish cost-effective best available technology [BAT] for small systems that are unable to meet maximum contaminant level requirements in the same manner as larger systems.

Perhaps most importantly for small systems struggling to pay for sometimes excessive or unnecessary contaminant monitoring, our legislation would expand existing waiver authorities by also allowing the States to provide monitoring relief to local water systems once they have established local drinking water pollution prevention programs. Drinking water systems in Massachusetts have been able to avoid spending millions of dollars on unnecessary contaminant monitoring costs by investing only a fraction of that amount in prevention programs and receiving monitoring waivers in return. This pollution prevention approach will go a long way toward ensuring safe drinking water for all Americans in the future, and will allow water systems to focus their scarce resources on needed improvements.

Importantly, this legislation improves the process for selecting new contaminants for regulation by eliminating the law's current requirement to regulate 25 contaminants every 3 years. Instead, our bill requires EPA to regulate those contaminants that present the greatest threat to the public, taking risk reduction benefits and costs into account.

Our legislation offers technical assistance and will ensure enhanced health protection for drinking water consumers. For example, the bill requires EPA to distinguish between small, medium, and large systems and to set appropriate technologies which meet Federal maximum contaminant level requirements for each. In addition, the bill requires that operators of water systems be trained and certified and that systems conduct internal inspections of drinking water operations.

Finally, our bill creates and funds State programs to ensure that small water systems are financially and technically capable of providing safe drinking water to their customers over the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we have worked hard to avoid creating any unfunded mandates and to incorporate risk reduction benefits and cost considerations wherever possible without sacrificing public health protection. We intend for this bill to make commonsense changes to a statute that has become overly burdensome and prescriptive, and to provide States and small drinking water systems the flexibility they desperately need. We look forward to working with Health and Environment Subcommittee Chairman WAXMAN, Representative JIM SLATTERY, the minority and other members of the committee to craft and enact a meaningful reform of the Safe Drinking Water Act this year.

SAFE DRINKING WATER REFORM ACT OF 1994

HON. BLANCHE M. LAMBERT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, today two distinguished colleagues and I are introducing legislation, the Safe Drinking Water Reform Act of 1994, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act [SDWA]. We have heard the cries of the small systems who are unable to comply with the stringent requirements of the SDWA. They are forced to monitor for contaminants that do not exist in their water systems and install expensive technology that is not needed. We need to protect the quality of our drinking water sources without needlessly placing financial and technical burdens on our small water systems. We must focus on prioritizing the true health risks that present themselves in the water.

The quality of our drinking water came into the forefront when Milwaukee found

cryptosporidium in its drinking water. This crisis left 40 people dead and hundreds of thousands of Milwaukeeans ill from drinking the water. This is a warning that we cannot ignore. We can no longer take the quality of our water for granted.

This country is one of the few nations where citizens can drink their water out of the tap with few reservations. However, with the past drinking water scares in Washington, DC, New York City, and Milwaukee, citizens are beginning to wonder if they can drink the water. We want to allay these fears and ensure that the quality of our drinking water continues.

Our bill sets forth parameters that will encourage compliance with the SDWA through both financial and technical assistance. We have incorporated a State revolving fund provisions to provide funds that will enable States to upgrade their infrastructure and to establish pollution prevention programs. The language we have used came from H.R. 1701 which the Energy and Commerce Committee passed last session. We also provide for $100 million a year for grants over a 5-year period for States to administer their State drinking water programs and $20 million a year to finance State and local assessment and pollution prevention programs. Through these financing measures we believe that we are not placing another unfunded Federal mandate on the States.

Our purpose in introducing this bill is to alleviate the burdens on small systems while pursuing the goal of pollution prevention. By encouraging pollution prevention through the State and local establishment of pollution prevention programs, we can stop problems before they start. We hope to eliminate the sources of potential contamination to our drinking water while allowing small and large systems the option of obtaining monitoring relief. States will have the authority to grant monitoring relief to public water systems within local pollution prevention programs where the contaminant is not present in the drinking water. The whole basis behind this bill is to find out what contaminants are out there, where they are, and monitor and treat where they exist. We don't need to invest valuable financial and human resources where we don't have a problem.

We are proposing additional measures to ease the burden on small systems. This bill directs EPA to develop less expensive alternative best available technology [BAT] for systems that can't come into compliance with the act through restructuring or obtaining alternative water sources. Compliance with this alternative small system BAT constitutes compliance with the act. In addition, both small and large systems will have an extended time period to come into compliance with new health standards for contaminants. Large systems have up to 48 months and small systems have up to 60 months to come into compliance.

Many water systems have complained about the current SDWA requirement mandating EPA to regulate 25 contaminants every 3 years. This provision has proven to be unworkable and unnecessary—we should not regulate for regulation sake. Our bill eliminates this provision and directs the EPA to use the newly created occurrence data base and other health based information, incorporating risk reduction benefits and costs, when selecting new contaminants to regulate. Again, this approach should focus EPA's priorities on trouble spots and address contaminants that pose the greatest health risk to persons served by public water systems.

My colleagues and I have worked very hard to compose legislation that will help small systems without rolling back health standards, and I urge other Members to cosponsor this responsible and effective bill.

REFORMING THE SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues Representatives MIKE SYNAR and BLANCHE LAMBERT in introducing the Safe Drinking Water Reform Act of 1994. This bill is a recognition that there are problems with the Safe Drinking Water Act that need to be addressed, but which can be done in a way that does not compromise the fundamental public health protections in the law.

First, unlike the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act [SDWA] provides no Federal funds to help local water systems finance increasingly expensive programs. Our bill deals with this problem by establishing a State revolving fund [SRF] program, which would provide grants to States to make loans—and grants in hardship situations—to local public water systems for SDWA compliance purposes. The measure authorizes $599 million for fiscal year 1994, allowing that same amount, which has already been appropriated, to be released. The program is authorized for $1 billion annually for fiscal years 1995–97.

Second, this measure recognizes that the best long-term step a water system can take to protect public health is to adopt an effective source water protection program to prevent contaminants from ever entering the water supply. My State of Massachusetts has learned the hard way that it can be very expensive to clean up a contaminated water supply.

Building on this experience, Massachusetts environmental officials have created a model program that grants SDWA monitoring relief to water systems that have worked with local governments to develop and implement source water pollution prevention programs. This effort has saved Massachusetts ratepayers $12 million. Our bill creates a similar national program, allowing States to use up to 10 percent of SRF funds to assist local or regional management entities to develop local drinking water assessment and protection measures.

Third, our bill addresses the problem faced by small water systems which often cannot pay for the contaminant treatment technologies designated by the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] in its drinking water regulations. The Safe Drinking Water Reform Act of 1994 requires the agency to designate cheaper "best available technology" for small systems and allows States to grant variances from the existing maximum contaminant level and treatment technique requirements.

Fourth, this measure changes the way new contaminants are selected for regulation. Under current law, EPA must issue regulations for 25 new contaminants every 3 years. This has proven unnecessary and unworkable. Our bill directs the agency to use an occurrence data base and other information to designate 15 contaminants that occur in water supplies, present the greatest public health concern and may require regulation. EPA must then individually determine whether or not to regulate these 15, taking into account costs and risk reduction benefits. Every 4 years, EPA would designate 12 new contaminants to study for possible regulation.

Fifth, our bill allows water systems up to 36 months to comply with EPA regulations, increasing this to 48 months if additional time is necessary for capital improvements and 60 months for small systems. The current deadline for compliance is 18 months, which has proven to be an unrealistic timeframe for many systems.

Sixth, this measure addresses several problems that have been identified by GAO and EPA as those that most frequently result in SDWA noncompliance. It does so by creating and funding State programs to ensure that small water systems are financially and technically capable of providing safe drinking water and to require that operators of water systems be trained and certified. The measure strengthens State inspection requirements and directs EPA to issue a drinking water regulation for cryptosporidium, the micro-organism that caused illness in over 400,000 Milwaukee residents and threatened the Washington area's water supply late last year.

Finally, our bill authorizes $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 through fiscal year 2000 for grants to States to carry out their drinking water programs, and an additional $20,000,000 annually for grants to States to use for State source water assessment, pollution prevention and system viability programs.

HARAMBEE COMMUNITY SCHOOL IS A NATIONAL MODEL

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring an educational success story in Milwaukee's central city. For the past 25 years, Harambee Community School has provided thousands of central city youngsters with an academic foundation that has allowed them to reach their potential.

Harambee Community School is a private, nonprofit, parent controlled and operated school that first opened its doors in the fall of 1969 to offer an environment of respect, responsibility, and discipline. Harambee draws its name from a Swahili word that means "pull together".

For two and a half decades, the Harambee community has pulled together for the children of Milwaukee's central city. The school currently serves 395 children from 4-year-old kindergarten through eighth grade.

The Harambee story began in 1968 with the dream of an African-American-owned school emphasizing the basics through creative instructional programs, coupled with a strong cultural foundation. The school has survived because of the incredible commitment on the part of the school's parents, administrators, and teachers.

Harambee continuously strives for quality education through a flexible, structurally based curriculum where parent input and involvement are of the utmost importance. This involvement enhances the academic and social excellence of the students by promoting positive self-images, goal-setting and high ambitions.

Harambee students consistently score high above the national average in reading and math, and more than 90 percent of its graduates complete high school and go on to higher education. Most Harambee graduates return to the community to carry on the tradition of the school.

In the early years, Harambee managed to meet its financial obligations in a variety of creative ways. There were car washes, coordinated raffle and Bingo games, and a newspaper, the Harambee Shopper, whose profits went to pay the teachers.

For the past 10 years, Harambee has been on more solid financial ground because its corporate board has successfully steered its course. The school is now a trusted institution that serves as a beacon of hope for Milwaukee's central city youths.

On its 25th anniversary, Harambee is a national model for educational quality, innovation, and commitment in the face of adversity. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this fine institution.

TRIBUTE TO ROCKVLLE MUSICAL THEATRE

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the Rockville Musical Theatre on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. The theatre was founded in June 1974, as a nonprofit residence theatre, and has brought quality musical productions to the Greater Washington Metropolitan area since its founding.

Rockville Musical Theatre held its first show in the gymnasium of Broome Junior High School, with the production of "Bells Are Ringing." Since that time, Rockville Musical Theatre has found a home in the F. Scott Fitzgerald Theatre at the Rockville Civic Center, producing two Broadway musicals a year.

The members of the theatre have been recognized a number of times by the British Embassy Players, with the prestigious "Ruby Griffith Award," for excellence in community theatre.

The theatre has come a long way since 1974, building an outstanding reputation and laying the groundwork for generations to come. It has provided the community with an opportunity to not only enjoy the theatre, but to be involved in the actual production of the numerous shows.

The theatre's concern for the community is obvious with its annual contributions to the Montgomery College Foundation, providing for an annual scholarship to a worthy student majoring in performing arts.

I would like to personally thank and congratulate the theatre for the wonderful productions over the years and wish it continued success in its future endeavors.

RONALD C. GILLESPIE OF GALWAY, NY—A "SUPERINTENDENT'S SUPERINTENDENT"

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1994, Ronald C. Gillespie will be retiring as superintendent of schools for the Galway Central School District, a position he has filled for 15 of the 36 years he has spent educating our children.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I intend to see Mr. Gillespie get some long-overdue recognition.

Mr. Speaker, we are often so busy reciting what's wrong with American education today, we sometimes forget to notice what's right with American education.

Ronald C. Gillespie is what's right with American education. His peers and staff consider him a "superintendent's superintendent," a reputation he earned with a consistent record of effective leadership and management skills. His dedication to the education of our young people has inspired those around him. The entire community is indebted to him and proud of him. And so am I.

There will be a retirement dinner in Mr. Gillespie's honor on June 10. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and other Members to join me in wishing him all the best in his retirement years after such a long and distinguished career.

TRIBUTE TO GAUDENZIA DRUG TREATMENT AND PREVENTION CENTERS

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the silver anniversary of Gaudenzia, an important provider of drug and alcohol treatment and prevention services in Pennsylvania. Having grown from a single modest residential therapy center, Gaudenzia is now the largest, freestanding, nonprofit treatment and prevention provider in the State.

After 25 years, Gaudenzia operates a diversified network of 36 residential, outpatient, and prevention programs in 20 facilities throughout the eastern and central regions of Pennsylvania. Their services include programs for residential and outpatient treatment of chemical dependency in men and women, prevention programs for children, and services for mentally ill, mentally ill homeless and dually diagnosed clients. The agency also acts as a referral source for hospitals, mental health units, and county drug and alcohol offices throughout Pennsylvania.

Gaudenzia has proven time and again its value to the community through its unique achievements. These include initiating one of the first residential programs in the United States for addicted pregnant women and mothers with young children, and creating a drug prevention program serving youngsters 5 to 12 years old in high-risk areas of Philadelphia. Gaudenzia further distinguishes itself as an important community leader in serving the homeless in residential programs.

Mr. Speaker, Gaudenzia has provided 25 years of nobel service to the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania. I join with the Philadelphia community and the State of Pennsylvania in congratulating Gaudenzia on 25 years of service.

GLENN BRIERE: 25 YEARS OF QUALITY REPORTING

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a reporter from my home city of Springfield, MA. Glenn Briere has been covering politics at the local and State level for the past 25 years and is about to leave for a new career. Briere will soon become the head of public communications for Massachusetts auditor Joe DeNucci. Auditor DeNucci is sure to benefit from the years of fine work Glenn has put in as a general assignment reporter in Springfield and as the statehouse reporter for the Springfield Union-News.

It is a drive of a couple of hours from western Massachusetts to the statehouse in Boston, but politically it often seems like a world away. Those of us who closely follow the Governor and our local Representatives and Senators come to rely on solid stories from our western Massachusetts reporters. In that sense, Glenn Briere has provided a valuable service for the past 11 years as he reported on events under the Golden Dome on Beacon Hill. With hundreds of important matters before our Massachusetts House and Senate each week, Glenn has always known how to pick out the issues of true importance to people in Springfield, Chicopee, and the towns of the Pioneer Valley. He has also given us an inside view of how decisions are made in Boston and alerted us to upcoming measures that may affect our lives. His weekend wrap-up of the past week's events on Beacon Hill has long been a must read for me.

In addition to his newspaper work, Glenn has also been a fixture on our local political television show, "The State We're In," on our PBS outlet, WGBY. Glenn Briere is also a past president of the Statehouse Press Association. He will be greatly missed in our daily paper and each week on television, but I hope to be able to work with Glenn in his new role in State government. He may find that it is easier to observe the workings of government than to try and make government work, but if

his past work is any indication, Glenn will excel in auditor DeNucci's office.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Glenn Briere the best of luck in the years ahead and join with many people in western Massachusetts in thanking him for his fine work as a political reporter.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. STANLEY ROUSONELOS

HON. GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly unique individual, a good friend of mine and a great American—Dr. Stanley Rousonelos of Joliet.

Dr. Rousonelos, who will be honored as the 1994 Citizen of the Year by the Joliet chapter of UNICO on May 14, has a record of professional and public service to his community that is truly unmatched.

Dr. Stan, as everyone calls him, was born and raised in Joliet. For 37 years he was the family doctor in town, providing care to thousands and thousands of residents—including the more than 3,000 he helped bring into the world.

Not only did Dr. Stan's patients appreciate his plain spoken manner and keen sense of humor, but so did his peers. He was elected chief of staff of St. Joseph Medical Center in Joliet and president of the Will County Medical Society.

Now retired from practice, Dr. Stan has undertaken even bigger challenges in serving his community. He was a driving force in establishing the Will-Grundy Medical Clinic in 1987 to help the 14,000 residents of Will and Grundy Counties that are medically underserved. At the time of its incorporation, the free clinic was only one of three such facilities in the United States. It has since served as a model for similar programs across the country.

In addition to serving on the board of directors of the clinic and recruiting his peers to volunteer their time there, Dr. Stan regularly staffs the facility, providing sorely needed health services to those who can least afford them.

He also was instrumental in the passage of State legislation that made it easier for physicians to volunteer at facilities like the Will-Grundy Medical Clinic, paving the way for creation of smaller facilities across the State.

Although his work on the clinic may be Dr. Stan's greatest contribution to his community, there are few worthy causes in Joliet in which he is not somehow involved.

He is: a member of the board and immediate past president of the Joliet Area Community Hospice; president of the advisory board of the Catholic Charities' Senior Companion program; a board member of Daybreak, a local homeless-assistance organization; vice president of the Joliet Junior College Foundation; on the governing board of St. Joseph Medical Center; a member of my Health Care Advisory Committee; and a widely sought after lecturer on such public health issues as AIDS. Why does a man who has certainly earned the relaxation of retirement insist on a schedule of helping others that would tire a man half his age?

Because, as a former patient put it so well, "He cares."

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend Dr. Stan on this well-deserved honor, and I wish him many more productive and enjoyable years, both public and private.

REMEMBERING A HERO—BOB LETTON

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Kentucky and the Nation lost a war hero and humble servant when Bob Letton passed away on Friday, March 11.

Bob Letton was truly a war hero. Flying over 100 missions in Vietnam, Letton rescued many downed Air Force and Navy pilots behind enemy lines. He also served a 1-year tour as the commander of a Sikorsky helicopter unit.

Letton attained the rank of captain and was awarded a Presidential Citation, two Distinguished Flying Crosses and a host of other military decorations for his bravery and valor.

After returning to civilian life in 1967, Bob went to work for the farmers of Kentucky, starting work as a Farmers Home Administration [FmHA] assistant county supervisor in London. Later, he became the Montgomery County supervisor before moving to the State FmHA office in 1975.

As the State's FmHA director of community and business programs, Bob's work was vital to agribusinesses and other small businesses in Kentucky.

In 1992, when the Rural Development Association separated from FmHA, Bob became the State's first RDA coordinator, where he served our communities, State, and country until his death.

Bob Letton was responsible for millions of dollars of projects to help Kentucky. Whether it was hospitals, water projects, or helping farmers, Bob Letton always listened and worked as hard as he could for the people of Kentucky.

Just like those downed pilots he flew missions to rescue, he rescued thousands of farmers, businesses, and families from disasters.

That was Bob Letton. Giving himself and always willing to risk himself for others.

Bob Letton was intelligent, fair, honest and cheerful. He was always positive and knew if he worked hard enough, he could make things happen.

That is the definition of a great leader.

All of his efforts focused on improving the quality of life for the people of Kentucky. Because of this commitment, he will be sorely missed.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD W. BARNICKLE

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, second only to the family in its crucial influence in shaping the lives of the Nation's children, are our schools, and particularly, the individual teachers and principals in whose care they are entrusted during a large part of the day. For this reason, I take special pride and satisfaction in asking my colleagues to join the people of Naperville, IL, as they honor Elmwood Elementary School Principal, Donald W. Barnickle, who will retire this June after more than 44 years of service in education.

From the start, Don Barnickle has been committed to the shaping of young children's minds in their most formative years. He began his career in Naperville in 1950 as a teacher of fourth through sixth grades at the old Washington Junior High School. Five years later, Don accepted a job as the first principal of Elementary District 78's third school, Beebe. In 1960, Don left Beebe to open district's 78's fifth elementary school, Elmwood. In 1965, under Don's able direction, district 78 built a 12-classroom addition to the Elmwood School. Serving as district 78's overflow facility, Elmwood served 926 students in its peak attendance year.

During his second year at Elmwood, Don implemented a new, nongraded primary program and cooperative teaching methods for students who learn at an accelerated pace. This program resulted in the selection of Elmwood as a demonstration center for the State of Illinois program for gifted students during the 1970's. Elmwood was also one of the school districts sites for the piloting of an early form of computer assisted instruction. The Program for Learning in Accordance with Needs [PLAN] emphasized individualized instruction and recording-keeping assistance through the use of a computer service.

Don also served as the first chairman of the School District's Joint Curriculum Advisory Council, a long-standing committee comprised of representatives of the school district and the community. He also has conducted workshops in other districts on the subject of individualized instruction, and has served as a consultant for the State of Illinois Gifted Program.

The inscription on the dedication plaque in the lobby of the Elmwood School best sums up Don Barnickle's career:

> A dedicated leader in education who has given a lifetime of service to the children of Naperville, * * * A man who has influenced the lives of many.

Mr. Speaker, this says a great deal about Don Barnickle, perhaps it says it all. Professional education credentials are important, but they lose their vitality if they are not combined with a genuine affection for the children under the school's care. Don Barnickle, for more than four decades, has recognized the importance of providing children not only the beginnings of formal instruction, but also the meaningful experiences which will ultimately

produce independent, responsible, and productive adults.

I commend Don Barnickle for his countless years of dedicated service, and wish him the best in his retirement.

MONROVIA ANTICRIME RESOLUTION

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this week I met with Chiefs of Police Brad Hoover, Robert Moody, and Joe Santoro from Whittier, Claremont, and Monrovia, CA, to discuss the increasing fear of violent crime in our communities. The tragic fact is that the United States today is facing the worst rate of violent crime of any developed country.

Congress has now taken the first step in combating violent crime. Both the House and Senate have passed their respective crime initiatives, and a conference will be called to hammer out the differences. I would like to bring to light six critical points that should be considered by the conference committee, as resolved by the city council of the city of Monrovia.

First, anticrime funds given to cities and towns should be in the form of block grants with a minimum number of Federal restrictions and mandates. Local communities are in the best position to determine how to allocate additional funding. Second, many of the cities in the greatest need of additional anticrime funding are unable to meet stringent matching requirements, and should not be pressured by the Federal Government to overextend their scarce resources. Third, eligibility for Federal grants should be granted to small cities and towns as well as large metropolitan areas. Most American towns have fewer than 40,000 inhabitants, with severely limited local resources to combat their growing violent crime problems.

Fourth, the Federal Government must recognize the cost to the States of incarcerating undocumented aliens, and reimburse the States for these amounts. Cities in border States have been particularly hard hit in recent years by a poorly implemented Federal immigration policy. Local communities should not have to pick up the tab for the Federal Government's failure to enforce our immigration laws.

Fifth, while I am opposed to any new taxes on law abiding citizens, I believe that revenues from licensing fees on firearms, ammunition, or firearms dealers should be dedicated solely to anticrime programs and not used to fund new bureaucratic federalized social programs.

Sixth, an effective anticrime strategy must include measures to prevent crime as well as strengthen our law enforcement capabilities. Congress must balance increased criminal deterrence enforcement with the creation of more economic opportunities and a strengthening of our communities.

I am submitting for the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Monrovia City Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 94-19—RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONROVIA TO STOP CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN OUR CITY

Whereas, America's communities and families are scarred by increasing numbers of violent crimes; and

Whereas, the level of violence associated with criminal acts is increasing; and

Whereas, no community or family is untouched by incidents of crime or the fear of being victimized by crime; and

Whereas, reductions in crime and in the fear of crime will require enactment of meaningful national anti-crime legislation as well as work by local communities and state governments to develop and implement long-term solutions that deal with both the causes and effects of crime; and

Whereas, implementing short and long-term solutions to stop crime and violence in our cities and towns is the National League of Cities' top priority in 1994; and

Whereas, the critical nature of the problem demands an end to Congressional gridlock; and

Whereas, achieving an early partnership to reduce crime will require immediate action by the Congress.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City of Monrovia urgently calls upon the Congress to enact anti-crime legislation immediately so that the resources and programs which such legislation will provide can be utilized on a timely basis to deal with this critical problem now.

Be it further resolved that such anti-crime legislation should include:

A balanced approach that includes both enforcement and prevention programs.

Direct block grant anti-crime funds to cities and towns with maximum flexibility allowed in the use of those funds. Let local communities decide the best way to increase officer hours on the street through the use of overtime and other options, not necessary to hire new officers; because each new officer means new equipment costs and at least a six month delay to hire and train.

Eliminate any condition that cities be required to match grant dollars they receive.

Make sure that solutions—and the flow of dollars—go to help all cities, not just the largest cities in this country. Most of the towns in America are small; less than 40,000 population. This legislation should help the smallest communities, who tend to have the least resources, as well as large metropolitan areas, address the problems of crime.

Creation of a federal anti-crime trust fund financed by dedicated revenues derived from licensing fees levied on weapons, ammunition and weapons dealers.

Require the federal government to reimburse states for the cost of incarcerating criminals who are undocumented aliens and encourage the federal government to pursue reimbursement from the criminal's country of origin.

Be it further resolved that the City of Monrovia rededicates itself to crime prevention and suppression and calls upon its citizens to assist in these efforts.

THE EXERCISE TIGER CEREMONY PHILADELPHIA NAVAL BASE

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking all of those attending this momentous ceremony for their interest and dedication in recognizing the 50th anniversary of "Exercise Tiger." I am certain we all agree on the important role that Tiger, and the men who fought there, play in our Nation's history.

Over the last several months I have received thousands of letters from students all over New Jersey that ask for my assistance with gaining official recognition for Exercise Tiger on a Federal level. I think that the magnitude of this ceremony today indicates that, through the sincere efforts of several people, Tiger is finally getting the attention it deserves.

The students' letters have been of particular interest to me because they indicate the importance of this ceremony and the battle that it commemorates. That students taking a vested interest in this event should indicate to us all the importance that history plays in the curriculum of our schools. I am very proud of these students and their schools for their part in making Exercise Tiger a part of history.

As a direct result of the efforts of these students and their schools, and with the help of Walter Domanski and the Exercise Tiger Association of New Jersey, we have been able to go a long way in honoring those who served in Exercise Tiger. My office is currently working with the Department of Defense in an attempt to obtain official commendations for Walter Domanksi, Sr., and other survivors of the battle. We are also having flags flown over the dome of the U.S. Capitol today that will be given to several Tiger veterans and their families.

In addition to the efforts aimed at commemorating the individuals involved in Exercise Tiger, we are also attempting to place Tiger in the Congress official record books. I, along with over 90 other Members of Congress, have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 305 which seeks to officially name April 28 as "Exercise Tiger Day." I will also ask that this statement be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of remarks.

In closing, I would again like to thank all of you for attending today and for your continued efforts in developing Exercise Tiger's place in history.

RISK ASSESSMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of the Risk Assessment Improvement Act of 1994, which Mr. KLEIN is introducing today. The bill establishes a risk assessment peer review program at the Environmental Protection Agency, and it requires the program director to develop and keep current risk assessment guidelines based on up-to-date science. The bill would also establish a pilot program using comparative risk analysis to rank environmental risks.

The introduction of this bill is the result of testimony received by the TEA Subcommittee of Science, Space, and Technology from many Federal agencies, among them, EPA and OMB. At a time of scarce Federal dollars,

it makes sense to identify areas of greatest risk and to direct our resources to those areas. Sometimes the public perception of risk is different from the evaluations of scientists whose lives are spent studying and reducing risks. This risk assessment bill effectively contributes to the current debate. It deserves our support.

ST. PETER'S, MOTHER CHURCH OF HUDSON VALLEY, MARKS 150 YEARS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 18, 1994, St. Peter's School in Poughkeepsie, NY, will celebrate its 150th anniversary.

St. Peter's School is the oldest known continuously operating Catholic school in upstate New York.

Mr. Speaker, even non-Catholics acknowledge and applaud the outstanding job parochial schools have done in educating millions of Americans. The work of dedicated teachers, religious and lay, the superior discipline, and the character and spiritual formation provided in these schools has produced a large and continuous supply of outstanding citizens, high achievers in every sphere of activity, and heroes in every American war. The academic excellence alone of these schools has provided a standard against which the public school systems can measure themselves.

As is the case with so many of our churches, the history of St. Peter's is intimately woven into the history of the region. As one of the oldest churches in North America, St. Peter's was a jumping-off spot for countless missionaries to Canada and to the then-untamed American West.

The Catholic Association was formed in 1832. St. Peter's Parish was formed in 1837, and the school in 1844. St. Peter's is the "Mother Church" of numerous other churches. Every Catholic church in Dutchess and Ulster Counties, and most of them in Putnam and Orange Counties, stem from St. Peter's, the result of the waves of European immigration in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

St. Peter's Cemetery is the site of the largest freestanding Celtic cross in America, dedicated as a World War I monument in 1917 by former Congressman Ham Fish, Sr.

Priests from St. Peter's were instrumental in getting a bridge built across the Hudson River so that Catholics from Ulster County could cross the river for Mass instead of relying on rowboats. Legend has it that St. Peter's priests gave Lafayette the Sacrament of Penance toward the end of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and the entire House to join me in tribute to Sr. Cecilia Dolores, principal, and to everyone associated with St. Peter's School in Poughkeepsie as this historic and outstanding institution celebrates 150 years of educating area Catholics.

A TRIBUTE TO THE JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a group of truly remarkable young men and their equally remarkable leader—the Joliet Junior College Men's Basketball Team, the National Junior College Athletic Association's 1994 Division II National Champions, and their coach, Mr. Pat Klingler.

The Joliet Junior College Wolves won the title March 19 with a thrilling 85–80 victory over the previous champion, Owens Technical College of Ohio.

Athletic championships are always an impressive achievement, but the Wolves triumph is exceptional in that Joliet Junior College had not been a consistent national power until very recently, unlike so many junior college programs that serve as virtual farm teams for NCAA division I schools.

Much of the credit for this sudden prominence goes to coach Klingler, who arrived at the school in 1991. Through coach Klingler's inspiring leadership and tireless work, the Wolves completed an incredible 3-year turnaround that was capped with the NJCAA Division II Championship last month. Appropriately, Mr. Klingler was named National Junior College Coach of the Year by College Sports magazine, among his many honors.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Joliet Junior College Men's Basketball Team on this great triumph, and wish the squad continued success in the future.

WHITEWATER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 27, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHITEWATER

Despite the extensive media coverage, it is often difficult to understand the allegations, to say nothing of the facts, surrounding Whitewater. Many people believe the President and the First Lady have done nothing wrong and are angry about what they see as a political distraction. Another view is that the allegations are credible and the White House may be holding back information. Other are simply confused. At this point, I know of no evidence the President or the First Lady has done anything illegal. However, when the agenda of a President is clouded by allegations such as those concerning Whitewater, I think it is important to get all the facts out as quickly as possible so that the country can move on.

BACKGROUND

The Whitewater affair involves several things, most directly the financial relationship between Bill Clinton and two businesses: the Whitewater Development Corporation and Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan.

In 1978, while he was Attorney General of Arkansas, Bill Clinton, along with Hillary Clinton and James and Susan McDougal, entered into a real estate venture, which they later named the Whitewater Development Corporation. Whitewater consisted of over 200 acres of land in northern Arkansas that the investors hoped to develop and sell as individual properties. Clinton was Governor of Arkansas from 1979 to 1981 and 1983 to 1992. The Clintons sold their share of the Whitewater corporation in 1992. In 1982 James McDougal bought a savings and loan, which he renamed Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. Madison, like many S&Ls, got into financial trouble in the mid-1980s. Madison was taken over by federal regulators in 1989 at an estimated $60 million cost to the taxpayer.

The Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC), the federal agency charged with disposing of failed S&Ls, began an investigation of Madison that in 1992 resulted in a referral to the Justice Department for a criminal investigation of Madison, including possible links to the Whitewater Corporation and the 1984 Clinton gubernatorial campaign. The Clintons were named in the referral as possible beneficiaries of allegedly illegal Madison transactions. In January, Attorney General Reno appointed Robert Fiske, a former U.S. attorneys, as special counsel for the investigation.

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONS

The RTC investigation apparently uncovered evidence of questionable financial practices by Madison in relation to Whitewater and the Clinton gubernatorial campaign. The central question is whether funds from Madison were diverted illegally to Clinton's gubernatorial campaign fund. Madison money also might have been used improperly to sustain the unprofitable Whitewater venture. There is no evidence that the Clintons were aware of the alleged funding of Whitewater or any illegal donations to the governor's campaign.

A second question is whether Clinton might have repaid Madison with political favors, including lenient treatment by regulators, or whether there was special treatment because the Rose law firm, including Hillary Clinton, represented Madison before state regulators. The evidence seems to show otherwise—Arkansas regulators were at least as aggressive as federal officials in dealing with the Madison case.

The third question relates to charges made by David Hale, then the owner of Capital Management Services, a corporation licensed by the Small Business Administration to make guaranteed loans to underprivileged individuals seeking to start their own businesses. Hale, who was convicted in mid-March on two counts of fraud related to Capital Management Services, has charged that in 1986 Clinton pressured him to make loans that benefitted both Madison and Whitewater. President Clinton denies ever pressuring Hale, and the Clintons say they were unaware of any use of loans to benefit Whitewater.

Finally, there are the separate questions raised about the Clinton administration's handling of Whitewater. First, have they covered up the facts? Second, did the Washington RTC office interfere with the regional office's investigation? Third, did any of the various contacts between the White House and RTC officials constitute attempts to impede the investigation? Thus far, there is little to suggest interference at either level.

INVESTIGATIONS

Unanswered questions remain about dealings in Arkansas, so I think the appointment of the special counsel was in order. The special counsel is currently investigating these questions and has convened a grand jury to hear testimony and evidence.

My concern is that his investigation could take months. The facts need to get out as quickly and fairly as possible. So far as I am aware, the White House is cooperating with the special counsel and it has made public a significant amount of information, including the Clintons' tax records. These efforts have helped to defuse the situation. Some in Congress argue that the work of the special counsel and the President's disclosures make congressional hearings unnecessary. My present view is that we should proceed with hearings. Hearings not only help Congress fulfill its responsibility to explore possible abuses of power in the executive branch, they also give the public the facts it needs to judge the performance of the President and his administration. The job of the Congress is to conduct a legitimate inquiry without impeding a thorough and fair criminal investigation. Clearly the Congress has to work out an accommodation with the special counsel. We should not put the criminal investigation at risk for the sake of some publicity.

The news media is part of this process as well. The media has a responsibility to pursue the story, but also to pursue it responsibly. Several stories have been published about events and actions for which there is no nameable offense let alone any evidence of impropriety.

CONCLUSION

My view is that most Americans give a President the benefit of the doubt and will continue to do so until they are confronted with strong proof of wrongdoing. They are far more interested in hearth care, welfare, jobs, and other issues, but they are also quite curious and even a little confused about Whitewater, and they want to know more. Like them, I simply do not feel I know the full facts. The investigations should proceed, but the White House and Congress need to make sure their primary focus remains on finding solutions to the most pressing national problems.

EIGHT DECADES AS KIDS' PAL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear friend, the long-time district attorney of Manhattan, Robert Morgenthau. Over the course of 31 years, Bob Morgenthau has shown true dedication and commitment to the State of New York and to our troubled youth. New York City's youth have found a safe haven in Mr. Morgenthau's organization. In a city plagued by the ravages of drugs and crime, the Police Athletic League [PAL] has been a fountain of positive reinforcement, learning, and growth.

Mr. Morgenthau has spent countless hours as the president of PAL, an organization whose mission is to offer kids a sense of identity and belonging. PAL allows young people to envision possibilities that they might never have considered before.

Under Mr. Morgenthau's three decades of leadership, PAL's ability to reach out to New York City's boys and girls has expanded. Through its 71 recreation centers. PAL provides neighborhood kids with a safe place to go after school. PAL now serves 60,000 kids throughout the city.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the Daily News on March 13, 1994.

[From the Daily News, Mar. 13, 1994]

EIGHT DECADES AS KIDS' PAL

(By Suzanne Rostler)

Former New York City Police Commissioner Benjamin Ward was a 17-year-old kid from Brownsville when in 1944 he first sat behind the desk that once belonged to Teddy Roosevelt.

He didn't dare imagine that one day he would sit behind that same desk as the head of the force.

"There was nothing in my memory to make me think I could be anything as glorious as a policeman," said Ward. "It was kind of a bewildering experience, coming out of a cold-water flat at the edge of Brownsville. It was like going into a strange new world."

What brought Ward to this new world was the Police Athletic League's essay contest, "Police Commissioner for a Day," in which Ward offered winning suggestions for running the department.

Besides providing him with an afternoon with then-Commissioner Lewis Valentine, the contest allowed Ward to envision possibilities he had never before considered.

The essay contest is just one way the Police Athletic League, celebrating its 80th anniversary this year, has opened doors to generations of city kids whose after-school itinerary is not likely to include piano lessons and private tutors.

"The streets are awfully rough," said PAL President and Manhattan District Attorney Robert Morgenthau. "(PAL) offers kids a sense of identity and belonging to something constructive. We're sending a message that someone cares about them."

Created in 1914 by Capt. John Sweeney of the New York Police Department to offer athletic activities to city kids, PAL's scope has expanded under Morgenthau's 31-year leadership.

Today, PAL serves 60,000 kids throughout the city. In addition, to providing boys' and girls' basketball and softball leagues, boxing, track and field, and weight training, the organization offers job and family counseling, study centers and computer training programs.

The "Police Commissioner for a Day" essay contest alone draws about 3,000 entries from kids in grades nine to 12.

Another program brings cops and communities together each summer to reclaim the streets for the children. As police patrol the periphery, kids jump rope, play baseball and read in bookmobiles.

On a daily basis, PAL provides neighborhood kids with a safe afterschool haven, through its 71 recreation centers.

Providing such basic services as a place to study, however, is not cheap. With an annual budget of $12 million, PAL spends about $200 a year on each child. The budget is not nearly enough to meet the demand for services.

The organization is building four new centers at a cost of $8.1 million apiece. Funding will come from the city and private corporations and foundations.

Said Morgenthau: "It's the only organization I'm committed to about which I can honestly say if we had twice or three times the amount of money, we could spend it wisely. The demand is so tremendous."

The pay-off, however, is immeasurable, he said. Over the years, PAL has played a significant role in the lives of kids who have gone on to become models in their fields.

"Through the program, kids find themselves as individuals and develop their self-esteem through competition and teamwork," said former New York Knicks forward Bernard King. "I had a chance to meet people from other parts of the city and, from a competitive standpoint, learn other styles of basketball."

AMERICA'S ENERGY OPTION

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Earth Day, I think it is important to remind my colleagues of the contribution nuclear energy makes to clean air. Nuclear energy is the second largest source of electricity in the United States, providing 19 percent of the Nation's electricity. It supplies the needs of 65 million households with virtually no air polluting emissions.

Congress wisely recognized nuclear energy as an important energy resource with enactment of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. President Clinton also acknowledges nuclear energy's important role in the Climate Challenge Program.

In fact, nuclear energy is responsible for reducing an astounding 92 percent of all U.S. electric utility CO_2 emissions since 1973. These reductions will be increasingly important as we consider building new electric generating capacity to fuel a growing economy.

I can tell you firsthand about the environmental advantages of nuclear energy. My district gets about 70 percent of its electricity from nuclear powerplants. This means that when my constituents celebrated Earth Day this year, they breathed cleaner air thanks to nuclear power.

But you need not take just my word for the environmental benefits of nuclear energy. The World Energy Council reports "If global policymakers are serious about reducing greenhouse gases in the long-term, nuclear power must make a comeback * * *. There is no chance of stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels until the nuclear energy question is resolved."

Moreover, the Office of Technology Assessment says that nuclear energy is the only nonfossil energy option that offers the greatest potential for "achieving deep cuts in carbon dioxide emissions." The National Academy of Sciences agreed that nuclear energy is "the most technically feasible alternative" to replace fossil fuels as the primary source of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, in observance of Earth Day, I ask my colleagues to carefully consider the important role that nuclear energy plays for a cleaner environment. I encourage my colleagues to support policies that enhance America's nuclear energy option.

A TRIBUTE TO MARY CASSELL

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the substantial contribution that Mary Cassell has made to the work of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education over the last 8 months.

Mary is a Women's Research in Education Institute [WREI] fellow pursuing graduate studies at Johns Hopkins University. From her first day with the subcommittee, she tackled all tasks with enthusiasm and quickly became a fully contributing member of my subcommittee staff as we worked on H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act and H.R. 6, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.

The end of April brings the end of Mary's fellowship. I am sorry to see her go and am grateful for what she helped us accomplish this year: the President's Goals 2000 bill has been enacted into law—Public Law 103–227—and H.R. 6, which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, has passed the House.

Mary Cassell exemplifies the excellence that we all hope for in the variety of academic and policy fellows that come through our offices. During the last 8 months, she has represented well both the Women's Research in Education Institute and the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

Mr. Speaker, I have often said that we need people in public service with good heads and hearts—and Mary is certainly one of these individuals. I want to thank her for all of her hard work and wish Mary well as she develops her career in public policy.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS' LOCAL 479 CENTENNIAL IN TERRE HAUTE

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Local 479 in Terre Haute, IN.

The centennial marks a milestone in the history of these dedicated workers. For one century, Local 479 has strived to improve the lives of letter carriers, and its commitment, discipline, and excellence are clear in the pride with which Indiana letter carriers perform their daily duties.

Local 479 was chartered by the national association on March 19, 1894, and currently has 153 active and retired letter carriers from Terre Haute and Clinton, IN. Under the leadership if its new president, William E. Weese, Local 479 continues to expand its membership and influence throughout Indiana.

Local 479 will host the 94th Indiana State Convention for Letter Carriers on April 28–30 in Terre Haute. More than 300 letter carriers and auxiliary members from branches statewide will attend the convention. I am proud to join these workers to help celebrate their century-long record of accomplishment.

IN HONOR OF LARRY DANNER: A TRUSTED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Capt. Larry Danner, who is retiring from the Police Department of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, or BART. Captain Danner, who lives in Fremont, CA, has been a police officer for 30 years. I just want to take a moment to share with my colleagues some of his many accomplishments and contributions to the citizens of the East Bay.

Larry joined the Fremont Police Department in 1964 after being discharged from the Army. As a patrol officer, he spent a great deal of time in the Niles district of Fremont, earning the respect of the community, but making no friends among the city's criminal element. Officer Danner would walk the neighborhoods, stop and talk to shop owners and citizens, and offer assistance where he could. Without knowing it, he was practicing community policing, only then it wasn't a buzzword, it was a job description.

After 8 years in Fremont, Larry was hired by the BART Police in 1972 and was quickly promoted to sergeant. As a sergeant, he set up the traffic section of the department and helped change the rules to give BART officers more police authority, making the transit system safer.

In 1976, Sergeant Danner became Lieutenant Danner and was assigned to the administrative bureau. Many of the basic operating rules in use in the department are Larry's handiwork. He started several safety and education programs, including Ride With Pride—transit etiquette and safety education aimed at grade school children, and Commute With Confidence, which promoted safety for adult riders. Larry was promoted to captain in 1981 and was placed in charge of department administrative functions, where he served 5 years before being assigned to the patrol bureau.

As patrol bureau commander, Captain Danner made changes to cut down on travel time for officers as they reported for their shifts, improved the beat system, and established the honor guard, tactical team, and joint task forces with the Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco Police Departments. Larry never stops working to make BART a better and safer system, whether it's tackling long-range planning problems, improving parking lot and station security, or making it easier for his fellow officers to do their jobs efficiently and effectively.

Larry Danner has a full plate, but after work his roots in Fremont bring out the best in him at home. He is an active veteran and is committed to community service. He has volunteered at a teen crisis center, with youth baseball leagues, and in local classrooms bringing teens responsible sex education. Larry and his wife Marie work with Shelter Against Violent Environments [SAVE] to provide secure shelter for battered women. He's an active Democrat and has been on the State Central Committee for 8 years, and was a guest here last year for inauguration.

Capt. Larry Danner has a lot to be proud of: A loving family, a successful career in law enforcement, and a community he and his family have helped to build and enrich over the years. His colleagues, family, and friends are gathering for a special dinner on Friday, April 29, to recognize his service to BART and the people of the bay area. I want to join them in offering my congratulations and best wishes for a well-deserved retirement. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that Fremont, which is a better place because of Larry Danner, hasn't seen the last of him.

BOB BUSH: CHAMPION OF AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Bob Bush, an accomplished businessman, a selfless community leader, and a dedicated family man from Green Bay, WI.

In recognition of Bob's exceptional career at Schreiber Foods, the Green Bay Rotary Club International will award him their 1994 Free Enterprise Award on May 2. Bob will become the 12th recipient of the award, which recognizes people and organizations in Brown County that exemplify American free enterprise.

As the chairman of one of America's most successful food producing companies, Bob is indeed a champion of free enterprise. Beginning his career as a Schreiber mechanic, Bob rose the ladder to become chairman and chief executive officer. Along the way, Schreiber sales expanded from $12 million a year to more than $1 billion in sales last year. Thanks to Bob's leadership, Schreiber grew to be the world's second-largest cheese company and one of the largest employers in Brown County.

Throughout his career, Bob was a visionary and an innovator. As a young engineer, he revolutionized his industry by inventing a machine to slice cheese into individual slices. From the factory floor to the CEO's office, Bob has always tested novel ideas. Thanks to Bob's ability to develop new technologies to satisfy his customers' needs, Schreiber has always run a step ahead of its competition.

Aside from running Schreiber, Bob lends his business experience to a number of corporate boards and industry groups, including the Green Bay Packers.

Bob devotes his talent and energy to his community as well. His list of volunteer activities reads likes a Who's Who of Wisconsin philanthropies, educational, and service organizations.

A firm believer in public education, Bob serves on the chancellor's council and the in-

dustry advisory committee of the Center for Dairy Research at his alma mater, the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Previously, Bob served on the Board of Visitors of the College of Agriculture and Life Science at UW-Madison. Closer to home, Bob has served on the Allouez school board.

In addition, Bob served as a YMCA director and as a United Way chairman. As chairman of the New Community Clinic Building Fund Campaign, Bob helped to raise $1 million to establish a free medical clinic in Green Bay.

Bob married Carol, his college sweetheart, in 1950. They raised two daughters, Tracy Arndt and Toni McBride, and two sons, Terry and Tom. Following in their father's footsteps, all four children graduated from UW-Madison and went to work in the food producing industry. Bob and Carol are active members of the Union Congregation Church, which recently celebrated its 150th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 8th Congressional District, I congratulate Bob Bush for winning the Free Enterprise Award. A man loyal to his company, his community, and his family, Bob's life and deeds embody the best virtues of American free enterprise.

SALUTE TO THE PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a school district that has been educating elementary school children in Camarillo, CA for 125 years, the Pleasant Valley School District.

Established on November 10, 1868, Pleasant Valley is the oldest existing school district in Ventura County and the source of inspiration and knowledge for many generations of young people well-served by their time there.

Three years after the end of the Civil war, John and Rebecca Mahan and their three children settled in the picturesque area known as Pleasant Valley. At the time, the nearest school the children could have attended was located miles away in San Buenaventura, now known as the city of Ventura. But the journey to the school was long and—particularly in rainy weather—often treacherous.

Concerned about his children's education, Mr. Mahan made the one-day trip to the Santa Barbara County seat to secure the permit establishing the school district thenceforth known as the Pleasant Valley School District.

Located about 10 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and covering an area of about 65 miles, the district began with six pupils and a teacher holding classes in an abandoned granary. Funds became available in 1871 that allowed the district to build its first wood-frame schoolhouse with seats, handmade desks, and a blackboard.

Over the years, population in the area increased and so did the number of children sent to Pleasant Valley schools. In 1922, there were 152 students. This number climbed to 270 by 1940, 592 in 1952 and 860 in 1958. Today, there are roughly 7,000 students in 13 schools served by 356 certificated and 190 classified employees.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the Pleasant Valley School District in its celebration of 125 years of fine education. Many in the Camarillo community have devoted their time and talents to ensure the success of the district and of its students. Generations of young people have been made aware of the past, given a vision of the future and well-equipped to face the challenges of today through their association with the district.

I have no doubt that the teachers, administrators and supporters of the Pleasant Valley School District will continue to make an important contribution to children's lives for many years to come.

IN HONOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize all of the dedicated public servants of Ohio's First Congressional District.

As a public servant for most of my career, I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 253, the legislation that marks the week of May 2–8, 1994 as "Public Service Recognition Week."

Without my staff and the Federal, State, and local government agencies that we work with on a daily basis, I would not be able to do my job as a Representative in the U.S. Congress. Many of the cases that my staff works on deal with Social Security, Medicare/Medicaid, Federal workers compensation, and veteran affairs. It is always a collaborative effort to make sure that my constituents and the public are served. On other occasions we make referrals to various agencies. They always do a tremendous job and I am never disappointed.

Often we fail to give recognition to those who serve our communities through city, county, State, and Federal public service. Truly, these employees are the backbone of this great Nation. Many thanks to you all.

LEGISLATION TO GRANT TPS TO RWANDAN STUDENTS IN UNITED STATES

HON. MICHAEL J. KOPETSKI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1994, an airplane was shot out of the sky as it approached a landing at Kigali, the capital of Rwanda, killing President Juvenal Habyarimana of Rwanda and President Cyprien Ntaryamira of Burundi. The two Presidents of these neighboring, central African nations were returning from a conference in Tanzania on ways to end the ethnic killings in Burundi, where 100,000 people were killed last October.

Since the assassinations, Mr. Speaker, the simmering ethnic tensions between the Hutu and the Tutsi tribes in Rwanda have escalated, and we have seen the worst that human beings can do to each other. More than 20,000 people have been slaughtered in 2 weeks, and possibly 10 times as many are refugees, forced from their homes, on the run for their lives.

It is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to introduce legislation, on behalf of myself and Mr. JEFFERSON, to designate 12 months of temporary protected status [TPS] for Rwandan students and their dependents currently residing in the United States.

Provisions exist in the Immigration and Nationality Act to offer temporary relief from deportation under certain circumstances. The Administration currently provides some type of blanket relief from deportation or forced departure to several hundred thousand nationals from Afghanistan, China, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Liberia, Somalia, and most recently Bosnia. TPS, although not currently in effect, was extended to Kuwaiti citizens during the Persian Gulf War. It is entirely appropriate at this time to extend TPS to Rwandan students in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a matter of little controversy. Let's not force Rwandans to return to the senseless slaughter that has overrun their homeland.

A TRIBUTE TO LEA B. KERR ON 50 YEARS IN JOURNALISM

HON. GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman who embodies all that is good about the profession of journalism—Ms. Lea B. Kerr, the Grande Dame of the Joliet Herald-News.

Before her retirement this month, Lea wrote and reported for the Herald-News, a newspaper in my district, during a career that spans back to World War II. After being denied induction into the U.S. Marine Women's Corps because she was too young, Lea applied for an opening at the Herald-News in 1944. She impressed the editors with her rewrite of a sports item during her tryout and got the job. In the 50 years after, she covered everything from city hall to police to courts, and, yes, she wrote the occasional sports feature.

Lea's tenacity and ingenuity are legend in both media and government circles in Joliet. Back in the days before open meeting statutes, the Joliet City Council was meeting secretly in a local hotel to discuss the budget. Lea got wind of the location of these closed-door confabs and swung into action. Taking an elevator only part of the way up to the meeting room, she climbed the final two flights up a fire escape in her high heels to prevent being detected by the participants. Planting herself outside of the room, she recorded the proceedings in her notebook. The councilmen were quite surprised to read a blow-by-blow account of their secret meeting in the paper the next day.

Lea has won numerous honors during her distinguished career, including the Copley Ring of Truth Award for her moving and provocative commentary on a 1977 court decision to let local Nazis march in Skokie, IL a Chicago suburb with many Jewish residents. Instead of fighting hatred with hatred, Lea, in the best tradition of journalism, fought hatred with the truth. Besides writing the stirring commentary, Lea coordinated a $55,000 fund raiser to erect a Holocaust Memorial in Joliet to make sure local residents never forget what nazism really means.

Trophies and plaques are not what have driven Lea Kerr throughout her distinguished career, however. Her professional philosophy is best summed up in her own words:

A reporter's life is a kaleidoscope of a community's problems, solutions and history. People from all walks of life deserve to have their stories told. It's a challenge, but it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Lea B. Kerr on 50 years of service to her community and profession, and wish her a long and enjoyable retirement.

DONALD GIBSON RETIRES AFTER OUTSTANDING CAREER AS CAIRO-DURHAM SUPERINTENDENT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, I'm going to have the honor of attending a retirement dinner for Mr. Donald Gibson, who is stepping down after 14 years as superintendent of the Cairo-Durham School District.

Let me tell you a few things about Mr. Gibson, who, I'm glad to say, will be getting some overdue recognition.

He received a B.S. in education and an M.S. in social studies from SUNY-Oneonta before beginning his career as fifth grade teacher in Edmeston Central School. From 1963 to 1965 he was vice principal and 12th grade social studies teacher at Leonardsville Central School. From 1965 to 1971 he was assistant principal and 11th–12th grade teacher at Lafayette Central School.

Following 2 years as principal of the Indian Reservation in Lafayette, he took the position of principal at Seneca Falls Central School in 1973. He moved on to become chief school officer at Richmondville Central School until reaching his current position in 1980.

Throughout this record of increasingly greater responsibilities, Mr. Gibson managed to complete 57 hours of post-graduate study at Colgate University and SUNY-Oswego.

At Cairo-Durham, Mr. Gibson played a vital role in reorganizing the Booster Club in 1988. He can usually be seen at Cairo-Durham sporting events, and rarely misses a concert, play, open house, or other school function. He was a founder of the Cairo-Durham chapter of Dollars for Scholars, which raised thousands of dollars and matching funds for college-bound seniors.

In 1989, when there was no one else to chaperone the senior class on its senior trip, he volunteered and accompanied them to Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this outstanding record alone would be enough to merit our tribute, but there has been much more. Mr. Gibson has found time to be quite active in the Cairo-Durham community. He is a trustee of the United Methodist Church and an active participant in their many activities.

And as is so often the case with someone who gives so much to his profession and to his community, Mr. Gibson is a outstanding family man.

His wife, Betty, and children, Donald and Donna, are proud of him. So is the entire community, and so am I.

Mr. Speaker, let us pay our own tribute today to an outstanding educational administrator, Donald Gibson, and let us also wish him many happy retirement years.

HONORING THE OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, members of the legal profession from throughout eastern Connecticut will join their colleagues in national observance of Law Day. Law Day is a special day for Americans to celebrate our liberties and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of equality and justice under law. This year's Law Day theme is "Just Solutions," which emphasizes the law's fundamental role as a facilitator for the fair and reasonable resolution of conflicts. The need for improvement in the American justice system is an equally important consideration for contemplating Just Solutions.

Among the Law Day observances in eastern Connecticut on Monday, May 2, is the award ceremony for winners of the Law Day grade school poster contest and the Law Day high school essay contest. I congratulate all the young people who took part in these creative competitions, and I commend the legal community for its efforts to reach out to youth in thoughtful and positive ways that promote respect for law and democracy.

CABINET ELEVATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we all take note of the Earth Day festivities, one can not help but reflect that another Earth Day has come and gone and still the Environmental Protection Agency has not been elevated to a Cabinet-level department. Frankly, this was one of President Clinton's first environmental priorities. Elevation of the EPA is more than symbolic because of the EPA's role in international negotiations. Every industrialized country, with the exception of one other, has a cabinet level environmental department. But one more time the legislation has gotten bogged down, and the blame lies squarely on the shoulders of the administration.

Unfortunately, as I and many of my colleagues have indicated from the beginning this course of events was entirely predictable. There were only two paths to travel. We could elevate the agency by providing a clean straight up elevation without any bells or whistles and do so easily and cheaply. Or alternatively, we could consider a bill that contains numerous extraneous provisions to inflate an already bloated EPA bureaucracy. This latter path was chosen. In doing so, it became clear that there were several other issues, such as risk assessment of environmental regulations, which Congress signalled were on the table. Once the door was opened, all relevant issues needed to the debated and considered by Congress but this was not allowed to occur.

If we had traveled down the path with a clean elevation, which I have consistently advocated, we could have had a Department of Environmental Protection just in time for Earth Day 1994. At this point, however, EPA Cabinet legislation may never see the light of day and we will probably see many more Earth Day celebrations come and go without a Cabinet-level environmental agency.

1994 TRI-COUNTY AMERICANISM AWARD HONOREES

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, It is a privilege to be able to bring to your attention the New York State Anti-Defamation League's 1994 Tri-County Americanism Award honorees: Bernard Handel, Jerome Affron, and my personal friend, Dr. Laura Fliegner. All three of these distinguished individuals are deserving of our recognition and commendation, and I am honored to be able to speak on their behalf.

Dedicated to securing justice and the fair treatment of all citizens, the Anti-Defamation League plays a vital role in furthering harmonious co-existence in our communities. Each of the three 1994 Tri-County Americanism Award honorees are distinguished members of our community and through their service have enriched many lives.

Laura Fliegner's extensive community service is well know to those of us who have had the privilege of working by her side over the years, and her professional reputation is one that receives statewide recognition. Bernard Handel has devoted his life to preserving the rights of his fellow citizens. And Jerome Affron has managed to combine business acumen with a full schedule of community service. All three embody the principles most espoused by the Anti-Defamation League, and it is a unique privilege to be able to call your attention to the success of their labor.

It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to be able to join in celebrating their achievement on Sunday, May 1st.

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, WEBER STATE, AND BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

HON. KAREN SHEPHERD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the University of Utah, Weber State, and Brigham Young University for being chosen to participate in the American College Theater Festival, hosted by the Kennedy Center, April 18 through April 30, 1994. To have even one of our fine colleges participate in ACTF is an honor, but to have three colleges chosen to participate in this prestigious event is simply amazing and points to the hard work and find acting of each of the schools' drama departments. Their performances are as follows: The University of Utah, "Kiss of the Spider Women;" Weber State, "The Pirated Penzance;" Brigham Young University, "Prisoner."

But it is not just the colleges that I wish to honor. James A. Bell, who directed "Prisoner," received the National Student Playwriting Award. In addition, Keven P. Rahm, who played the lead in the production, received the Irene Ryan Acting Competition Award, which awards two college students a $2,500 scholarship to be used at the institution of their choice. Rahm also won the National Stage Combat Workshop Fellowship and will spend 3 weeks this summer learning how to use the tools of stage combat. In 1991, another Utahn, Scott Claflin, was a recipient of the Irene Ryan Acting Competition Award. In 1986, the University of Utah performed "Idioglossia," as part of the festival.

The American College Theater festival was started in 1969 by the Kennedy Center's founding chairman Roger L. Stevens. The ACTF is a national, year-round theater program involving 18,000 students from colleges and universities nationwide. Since its inception, ACTF has given more than 132,000 college theater students the opportunity to have their work critiqued, improve their dramatic skills and receive national recognition for excellence. More than 15 million theatergoers have attended approximately 8,000 festival productions nationwide.

We salute the drama departments of the University of Utah, Weber State, and Brigham Young University for their award-winning performances.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

HON. DAVID MANN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, please join me in congratulating the Alumni Association of the College of Nursing and Health, University of Cincinnati, as it celebrates its 100th anniversary in 1994.

The University of Cincinnati's College of Nursing and Health has the distinction of being the first institution to grant baccalaureate degrees in nursing. The alumni of the College of Nursing and Health have served the community, the Nation, and the world as caregivers, educators, scholars, researchers, administrators, professional leaders, and members of the U.S. Armed Forces in time of peace and war.

Association members work to advance professional standards in nursing, promote nursing research, and encourage excellence in scholarship and professional practice through the granting of annual awards.

To commemorate its 100th anniversary, members of the alumni association have established the Laura E. Rosnagle Endowed Scholarship Fund, in memory of Laura E. Rosnagle, dean of the College of Nursing and Health from 1945 to 1967. Dean Rosnagle led the transformation of the college from an adjunct of the College of Medicine to its current status as an independent college within the university.

Please join me in applauding the Alumni Association of the College of Nursing and Health on its 100 years of service, not only to Cincinnati, but to the world. May they continue granting us their much needed talents for many years to come.

IN HONOR OF JAMES O'TOOLE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant, Jim O'Toole, for his outstanding contributions in the field of alcohol and drug recovery in northern California.

For over 40 years, Jim O'Toole has been assisting men and women of all ages, backgrounds, and ethnicities in their struggles against alcoholism and drug addiction. Jim began his career in the field of recovery with the city of San Francisco in 1952. He has served as the national coordinator of the Seventh Step Foundation, worked as a rehabilitation officer for the San Francisco city jails, and founded the San Mateo Athletic Association, which offers men in recovery a clean and sober way to play golf.

In 1972, Jim O'Toole became involved in Project Ninety, an innovative and comprehensive alcohol and drug program in San Mateo County. Jim provided Project Ninety with invaluable leadership and direction and helped to establish it as a model agency in our community and our country.

Jim's devotion to the recovery community is unsurpassed. He continues to be a leading advocate for services for recovering alcoholics and addicts and is currently serving on the Project Ninety Foundation board of directors and the golf committee.

Mr. Speaker, Jim O'Toole is an outstanding public servant who has made a difference in so many people's lives. He has gained the utmost respect and regard of those who have worked with him and of those whom he has served. I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Jim O'Toole for his countless contributions and commitment to his community. He is, indeed, a national treasure.

PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON: AN ADDRESS ON FOREIGN POLICY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Richard M. Nixon has been an occasion of reminiscences by those who knew him personally. And among those memories, no attribute of his has been mentioned and honored more than his unique ability to analyze foreign affairs.

Last year, House Republicans were privileged to be present as he made a tour of the horizon, as diplomats say, a wide-ranging analysis of the many problems now confronting Russia. Without referring to a single note, without a moment of hesitation or confusion, he talked about the complexities of Russia today and then answered questions. His talk was a spellbinding and unforgettable display of uncanny memory, shrewd insight, dispassionate analysis, and passionate love of freedom. It is with a great deal of pleasure, therefore, that I insert into the RECORD at this time, the remarks made by President Richard M. Nixon before the House Republican Conference, March 10, 1993:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON BEFORE THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, U.S. CONGRESS, MARCH 10, 1993

Thank you very much. Thank you.

Well, I want to express my appreciation to the Congressional Institute for inviting me back again to address this distinguished group. I was going to say "my colleagues"; I'm a little old for that, but at least I'm glad to be here with * * * 175 [Republicans] and, we hope, 218 next time around.

Bob Michel was most generous in his introduction. But I want to set the record clear on one point: That ad [looking for a congressional challenger] was not in The Washington Post.

I also want to tell you that Bob gave me a choice this morning. He said, "If you like you can speak where you did when you were President—up there—or you can speak down in the well." And I said, "I'm going to speak down in the well. I want to be where the others have spoken."

And I want to be here because it allows me to put present events in historical perspective: It was just 43 years ago that I stood in this well, in this place, and I addressed the Conference that was then in the Whole House. I had a one-hour special order. (I got it myself. Newt Gingrich wasn't around here then to get it for me.)

But I remember that occasion so well: It was the only time I had a special order in the four years I served in the House. I reported to the House on the Alger Hiss case, the case [of his] releasing secret documents to agents of the Soviet Communist government. That [Floor] speech of January 26, 1950, had a great impact on my career. I have been known ever since as a very strong, even fierce, anti-Communist.

And I am sure that today many people would say: "Richard Nixon, down here talking about aid to Russia? What happened?"

The world has changed a great deal since then. I want to address that subject but, in

doing so, I'd like first to put it in a political perspective. Many have said, "Why talk about foreign policy at all? Nobody cares." If you read the polls and look at the last election, you would reach that conclusion.

In the last Gallup poll, only 4% of the American people indicated that foreign policy was of major concern. When President Clinton had his town meeting in Michigan, he took questions for an hour from all over the country. One question on foreign policy—it was about Bosnia. Today, the newspapers [devote] almost exclusive attention to domestic problems, hardly any to foreign policy.

And, for example, we all remember that, during the campaign, there was a famous sign in Clinton headquarters: "The economy, stupid." So under the circumstances, then, why address foreign policy?

Let me tell you why foreign policy is important. It's important because foreign policy and domestic policy are like Siamese twins: One cannot survive without the other. If the democratic government of [Boris] Yeltsin collapses and is replaced by a nationalist, aggressive Soviet or Communist government—not a Communist government, that isn't going to happen, but even a nationalist government—this would mark possibly the beginning of "Cold War Two."

It would have an enormous impact as far as our economy is concerned. Peace would be down the tubes. We would have to increase the defense budget by billions rather than decrease it; any plans to reduce the deficit would be off the table. So that's why the two are so closely related.

I come now to the very critical issue that you have been reading—the democratic government of Russia, whether it can survive; and what our policy towards that government should be. And in order to address that question, it is first necessary to disabuse ourselves of two myths.

First, you've often heard it said—and I've said it myself—the Cold War is over and the West won. But that's only half true. The Communists have lost the Cold War. But the West has not yet won it.

Look at what has happened in Russia. Why did they turn against Communism? Because it failed to produce, for the masses, the better life that it promised. But now Freedom is on trial. If Freedom fails to produce a better life, they will not return to Communism—but they could return to some kind of authoritarian, nationalist government.

And such a government, shorn of the baggage of the failed faith of Communism, armed with nuclear weapons, could be a greater threat to the forces of peace and freedom in the world than was the former totalitarian Soviet government. So that is what is at stake.

The second myth to disabuse ourselves of is this: Many people blithely say, "The Russians lost the Cold War." That's not true. The Communists lost the Cold War. The American people, the American Congress, you and the others that preceded you, deserve great credit, along with our allies, for holding the line against Communism and turning it back for 45 years.

But the knockout blow to Communism, in its mother country Russia, was rendered by democratic Russians. They overthrew the Communist government. And this means that, at the present time, rather than treating Russia as a defeated enemy, we should treat them as an ally, and as a friend.

And so if we can start with those two propositions we are then able to address the question of what is going to happen in Russia, what should happen, and what we can do about it.

Let me give an analysis of the situation as I saw it recently and compare it with what I saw just nine months ago. The situation has sharply deteriorated. The economy is in deplorable condition. We've got to see Russia for the magnitude of the problem that it faces—as compared with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and others where freedom is working extremely well. That's the good news as far as that part of the world is concerned.

But Russia is such a different country. It's a huge country, as you know. There are 11 time zones. In addition, there are 31 republics and provinces in Russia and all have declared themselves to be basically independent within the Russian government. In addition, there are 132 nationalities. The hardline Vice President said: "Look, what works in Poland is not going to work in Russia." That's an idea of the magnitude of the [social and cultural] problem.

Now consider the economic problem. We went through a Great Depression. (I say "we" did, you didn't—a few of us here may be that old, but I can remember it well.) It was deep and shook this country to its foundations; we recovered from it only after World War Two began.

But what is happening in Russia today is much worse than the Great Depression. For example, inflation in 1992 was 25% a month; it's even higher today. The average Russian's living standard has gone down by 50%. Some of this started before Yeltsin, under Gorbachev. Russia might face hyperinflation, they might face [even higher] unemployment, when the troops come home from abroad. It is a very, very serious problem.

Also remember that Russia, as compared with China and as compared with the countries of Eastern Europe, had 75 years of Communist brainwashing compared with 45 years in those [other] countries. And that means the development in Russia, among many of the people, of the idea that they may prefer what they already had. They like the security which a "command government" economy provides. And they face an unprecedented rise in corruption, and an unprecedented rise in crime.

That's Russia today. And when you see all that, it is so mind-boggling, you wonder how any leaders in Russia could still be for reform. But they are. It's hard to know why. All the leaders I spoke to—to ones on both sides, from the National Salvation Front (which as you know is pro-Communist) to the other end of the spectrum—and nobody wants to return to Communism. There will be no return to Communism. I believe that the reforms are irreversible.

However, there is no road map: Nobody's ever gone from a command economy to a free-market economy in the space of a year-and-a-half. There will be detours, there will be setbacks, but in the end it will prevail. That is certainly the conviction that I have, after having met with those leaders there.

Now, having pointed out why this has happened, let me just suggest we should look historically into why the Russians—who have shown a great capacity for suffering and sacrifice—why they are willing to go through this again, despite enormous economic cost.

Seven centuries ago, St. Thomas Aquinas said: "If the primary aim of the captain was to preserve his ship, he would keep it in port forever." The Russians are a great and proud people. And as they saw America and the West moving ahead from them (and, incidentally, that was the great message for them from SDI and other programs of that sort) they knew they were falling hopelessly behind.

And as a proud and great people, they were ready to leave their safe, stagnant port of Communism and to go out on this stormy sea toward freedom—political and economic freedom. They're still willing, but time is growing short.

And that brings us to what the positive news may be; it's been obscured by all the bad news. You are probably not aware of the fact that over 20% of the Russian economy is now privatized. You see it all over Moscow with the small shops. It is primarily a small-business operation, somewhat like what happened in the U.S. during the 1980s. Thirty percent of the Russian workforce today—30%—now works in private enterprise. That is unprecedented.

Another factor to keep in mind is that democracy, in its broadest sense, is alive and well in Russia. I have been to Russia nine times. And the [first] seven times I was in Moscow, and in Russia generally, dating back to 1959, in those seven times, I never met anyone who opposed the government. If I asked somebody who I thought might be critical, he'd just sort of close his eyes and point up to the chandelier. (That's how I learned about taping.) [laughter]

Today it is hard not to find someone who will speak—in the government, outside the government—and that is a hopeful sign.

Here's another very hopeful sign. In St. Petersburg, I met with a private entrepreneur running a very, very successful enterprise there. He has a mix of workers—some of them were German, some of them were Russian. And he said the Russian workers were more productive even than the German workers. This gives the lie to the idea that the Russians, unlike the Chinese, simply will not respond to private incentives. They will.

Remember something else about them. The Russian workforce is one of the best educated in the world. Over 90% of all Russian workers have graduated from high school. That's higher even than the percentage in the United States. So those are the possibilities as far as Russia is concerned. It is there, it can be saved—but the political problems are enormous.

Now we come to a critical situation: Can Boris Yeltsin survive? Some of the world leaders I've spoken to don't think so. I can assure you, also, that some of the people in his own country don't think so. And certainly it did not help when the one in charge of aid to Russia for the past year publicly predicted that Yeltsin probably wouldn't survive.

So I want you to take, with me, a good look at this man. I know how he mesmerized this House, which shows he knows how to communicate even with a western audience; he showed the same when he was in Canada. We know his charisma. We know that he is a man who successfully led a revolution.

We also know that, historically, those who lead good revolutions are seldom good nation-builders. Nehru in India is an exception. In our case we have George Washington, another exception. But Sukarno in Indonesia? Good revolutionary leader, disastrous nation-builder. The same with Nkrumah in Ghana.

Can Yeltsin—a good revolutionary leader who knows how to destroy—can he build? And I answer, first, that he has shown surprisingly good political methods and tactics. He made some mistakes in dealing with the Congress. But if you think George Bush had

a problem with the Democratic Congress, just think what problems he would have with this [Russian] Congress. Yeltsin inherited it from the previous regime—from Brezhnev and Gorbachev. The fact that he did not become authoritarian, and is trying to compromise [with the legislature], is something in his favor. So much for the political games.

What is most important for us to remember is what the man stands for. He stands for what we believe. Unlike Gorbachev, he believes in democratic elections. He is the first elected Russian leader in a thousand years. He is one who has repudiated, unlike Gorbachev, both Socialism and Communism. He is flatly for private ownership, something Gorbachev would never be.

Most important, from our standpoint, he is the most pro-Western, and I would say pro-Amercian, Russian leader in foreign policy we have ever had. And when we consider those facts, it brings home this conclusion: When we look at the Russian scene today, the choice really is not between Yeltsin and somebody better, the choice is between Yeltsin and somebody worse.

I have met all the other potential candidates. [Although] Yeltsin's popularity is not nearly as high as it was, it's higher than any of the others. It's a risk for President Clinton to begin to take the leadership (as he has in meeting with President Mitterrand yesterday) in trying to get some assistance from the Group of Seven.

But, on the other hand, even with aid, the Yeltsin democratic government may not survive. Without the assistance of the West, in particular the U.S., it will not survive. So we have to take the risk—because nothing great has ever been achieved without great risks. And in this case we should support President Clinton when he comes forward, as I'm sure he will, with a program of assistance going beyond what has so far been done.

Now let us turn to what the U.S. and others can do. All the Russian leaders want to know what is going to happen. I said, "Look, politically, as far as an increase in so-called foreign aid, direct foreign aid, it doesn't have much of a chance these days. We have economic problems, we have tremendous demands on our budget and so forth. And, while the Congress will support some increase, it cannot be a massive increase."

Having said that, I also make this point. The story in this morning's paper indicates that President Clinton, after meeting with President Mitterrand, has agreed to ask for an emergency meeting of the G7. That is a very hopeful sign; I'll tell you why. Because action can and should be taken on three fronts. And it should be done not just by the United States—but President Clinton and the U.S. need to [provide] cover [for] the other big G7 nations.

First, Russian debt. There is $85 billion of it, mostly inherited from the Gorbachev regime. That debt should be rescheduled for 15 years, as President Yeltsin has requested. And believe me, the bankers—and they're primarily not ours; they're German, Japanese and the rest—they would be stupid not to reschedule that debt. Because if Yeltsin's government falls, they'll get nothing. Better to reschedule the debt. Get it paid sometime in the future, and take the burden off the economy now. That's something that I trust the G7 comes through with.

And then there is another factor to be considered. As you are all aware, after World War Two, the U.S. was very generous in assisting our former enemies, the Germans and the Japanese, to recover. Now it is time for them to assume part of the burden, a major part of the burden, of assisting the Russians and the other former Soviet states, including those of Eastern Europe, to recover from the Cold War.

The Germans are doing their share to a certain extent because of the great burden of East Germany. Japan's conduct, however, is unacceptable. Here's a nation that is economically very rich but they are going through a recession too (2% employment, they call that a recession in Japan!). On the other hand, when we look at the Japanese, they are holding back on providing aid to Russia on the grounds that they won't give aid unless they get back four tiny islands the Russians hold as a result of World War Two. Now that just doesn't make sense.

The Japanese are a very intelligent people. But this again is something that is really stupid—stupid because if the Yeltsin government falls, they'll never get the islands back. If the Yelstin government survives, they might. But to insist they get the islands back before they provide aid—that might bring him down because it would look like the was selling the islands to Japan. So this is something I am sure will come up at the G7 meeting; I hope it does, and it should be effectively handled when it does.

We come now to the critical question—a question for Members of this House, Republicans as well as Democrats: With all our other responsibilities, why be concerned about this issue of foreign policy, and particularly aid to Russia? I've already covered that in broad strokes; let me now put in a more definitive way.

The survival of political freedom and economic freedom in Russia serves the interests of peace. Russia is no longer Communist, but it is still Russia. It is the only nation in the world with the power to destroy the U.S.A. There is nothing more important to our vital interest than a non-aggressive government like [that of] Boris Yelstin. And so that should be a major goal of U.S. foreign policy.

Second, Russia still has a veto in the U.N.; It also plays a critical role in Iraq and the Mideast, and of course in Yugoslavia. It's a very difficult role at times for them, particularly with regard to the Serbs, but we need their support in these areas. An anti-U.S. Russian government certainly would make it much more difficult for us to handle those regions.

And then there is another reason. Many people said, quite correctly, that the Soviet Communists were evil. But nobody claimed they were crazy. We have to bear in mind that those who are trying to get into the nuclear club, many of them, are crazy. We can't be sure in any event. Therefore, it is vitally important that the U.S. and Russia, the two superpowers, join together to prevent nuclear proliferation. So that's another good reason for us to remember that any aid to Russia that enables a democratic government to survive is first an investment in peace.

Second, it's an investment in prosperity. Consider these numbers. China is a third-world country. Russia's GDP is seven times as great. China's trade with the US is eight times as great as that of Russia's Why? Because China has an economy that's over half privatized. Russia's is only one-fifth privatized. As Russia becomes a free-market economy, as it begins to grow, as it will grow, it means billions in trade and hundreds of thousands of jobs for Americans.

And then there is another point; it's a little more esoteric, but I think all of you will appreciate it: The survival of a government in Russia which is dedicated to, and supports, political and economic freedom is in the interests of freedom in the broadest sense.

For 75 years Russia, they key state of the former Soviet Union, has been trying to export Communism to the rest of world. Now democratic Russia can be exporting freedom to the rest of the world—if it works. I freedom works there—works economically, works politically—that will be an example to the other dictators of the world to go our way, because this is the way.

But if it doesn't work, if [Yeltsin and the pro-Western Russians] go down, look at the message that sends to the hardliners in China. In China they have economic freedom, but they have no political freedom. They'll say, "It didn't work there, we're doing the right thing here." So those interested in freedom, those interested in democracy, have got to remember what happens in Russia is going to make a big difference.

A hundred years ago Marx's colleague Engels said, "We must change the world." Those five words inspired millions of supporters of a false state for over 100 years. Now that's all shattered. Today, democratic Russia, with our support, can change the world.

Let me now address a few words, if some of the older Members will permit me, to the new Members of this House. Naturally, I will have to reminisce—that's something that happens. (Strom Thurmond did it last night, I can do it today.)

Forty-six years ago, right at this very time, Jack Kennedy and I were discussing the request of President Truman to provide military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey, which were threatened by Communist aggression.

Our offices were on the fifth floor of the old house office building. He was about two places away from me. Boy, that was the dregs in those days—they had inside plumbing, but that's about all that I can remember. In any event, we got together. We disagreed on most domestic issues (like the Taft-Hartley bill) but we happened to agree on foreign policy.

It was a tough vote for him because the liberal Democrats in his Massachusetts district didn't want any military foreign aid. I remember they sent postcards, and I got some myself: "Send food, not arms." The conservative Republicans in my California district didn't want any foreign aid—they were against all foreign aid.

But we both voted for it, and that led us to the Marshall plan and then to NATO. I remember the high excitement of that time. I remember Kennedy and myself, I remember John Lodge, Thurston Morton and others in the Republican 80th Congress. We thought we were doing something very great. We were inspired because we thought that we were contributing to the defeat of an evil system—Communism—and we were right.

This morning, I'll tell you new Members something that you will find [to be] true. There are going to be times after the euphoria of coming here for the first time wears off; there will be times when you're fed up to here about this job: Too little pay, the little time for your families, too much abuse. You may wake up in the middle of the night and say, "Who has to do this?" You may want to throw it all in. And you will read in the papers that America no longer has a great cause: With Communism defeated, there's nothing to inspire us.

But when you see that, and when you think that way, don't you believe it. Let me tell you something: There could never be a better time to be alive. There could never be

a better place in which to live than America. And there could never be a better place in which to serve than the Congress of the United States.

Just think what we have witnessed in the last four years. Eastern Europe liberated. Communism collapsing in the Soviet Union. Socialism being rejected all the way from Sweden to India. We ought to be celebrating victory. Yet we act as if we had suffered defeat.

Way back in 1946, that class in the 80th Congress, we had a challenge, and the challenge was to meet the danger, or to deal with the threat, of war. Your challenge is something different. It is to deal with, to meet the promise of, peace. War brings out the worst and the best of men. Peace can and should bring out only the best. And you have that opportunity to work toward that end.

In describing that, however, I want to make it very clear that this is not just a case of your supporting a strong foreign policy, a strong defense policy—it goes beyond that. Because in order to meet that challenge it is necessary for us to recognize what America means to the world—and why we must see that the American example is worthy of what it does mean to the world.

I was in Warsaw a few days ago. As I traveled through the streets of that new city—it is new, now that it's free—I thought back to a time 34 years ago, to a time which for me and for my wife Pat was the most, not the biggest, but the most emotional welcome we ever received, as Vice-President or as President.

I'd just had the "kitchen debate" with Krushchev and on the way home we stopped in Warsaw on a Sunday afternoon. The Communist government refused to publicize the fact that we were coming. There was nothing in the papers about the parade route. But it got through the Polish underground and 250,000 Poles turned out to welcome us; they threw hundreds of bouquets and flowers into our cars. After having rocks [thrown at us] in Venezuela [the prior year], believe me this was something very different.

And at times, at the intersections, they would flood the motorcade and we'd have to stop. I looked into their faces, I can see them even now: Some of them were singing, others were crying—grown men and women with tears running down their cheeks—and they were all shouting Niech zyje Ameryka, Niech zyje Amerykan: "Long live America, long live the American!"

Thirty years passed before Warsaw and Poland became free. Today, it's a different city, full of the color of the life and music of freedom. That would not have happened had it not been for America. That would not have happened had it not been for our example. And we must not fail to meet our opportunity to continue to be an example to others that may be seeking that path.

What can you do about it? Help America be seen for what it really is—a great and a good country. Whatever you can do to see that the American economy continues to be and becomes even more productive, whatever you can do to see that all Americans have an opportunity for better housing, for better health care, for all of the things that make life more livable, whatever you can do to clean up our cities and our countryside from drugs and crime.

[In short,] whatever you can do to make America a better place in which to live, that serves the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

And so I wish you well as you meet these challenges. You are fortunate to be here—and I speak now not just to the freshmen but to all of you—and to have this kind of a challenge.

I can sum up best what America's role in the world should be by going back 185 years to a British Prime Minister's statement. After Nelson's great victory at Trafalgar, William Pitt was toasted as the savior of Europe. One hundred years later, Lord Curzon would describe Pitt's response as being one of the three great masterpieces of English eloquence. Listen to his words:

"I return you many thanks for the honor you have done me. But Europe will not be saved by any single man. England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, I trust, save Europe by her example."

Today the world is not going to be saved by any single nation. But America can save herself by her exertions and can, by our example, save the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

TRIBUTE TO JULIA EVANS

HON. MIKE PARKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today, in the people's Chamber, in honor of an outstanding citizen and true philanthropist, Ms. Julia Evans of Laurel, MS. Ms. Evans will be awarded the Peter Meek Award for Home Care Aide of the Year by the National HomeCaring Council here in Washington, DC, on April 26, 1994, at a luncheon held in her honor during the National Home Care Aide Service Conference.

Home care aides have been called the unsung heroes of the health care system. Ms. Evans is a 21-year employee of South Mississippi Home Health in Laurel and was selected from among the thousands of home care aides who have been certified through the Foundation of Hospice and Home Care's National Certification Program. She was chosen to receive this prestigious award because of her selflessness, kindness, dedication, and leadership. The people who know her best, her colleagues at South Mississippi Home Health, say Ms. Evans honors her agency through her high performance standards and her genuine devotion and care for her patients.

Ms. Evans is the fourth person to receive this honor, named in memory of Peter Meek, a National HomeCaring Council board member. In the spirit of the late Mr. Meek, Ms. Evans is an honor to her profession, willing to go far beyond the call of duty, always kind and caring, an inspiration and a friend to her patients.

I am extremely proud to represent in Congress this fine leader and friend to the needy. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this hero, Ms. Julia Evans, for her many outstanding achievements and dedication to excellence.

IMPROVING PUBLIC HOUSING ACT OF 1994

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will make reforms that are desperately needed in public housing. These reforms will help stop the waste and mismanagement of public housing funds and improve the living conditions for residents living in public housing.

The bill, H.R. 4304 would do three things: abolish the one-for-one replacement rule; allow public housing authorities to use their development funds for new construction if it costs the same or less to renovate; and require HUD to turn a troubled housing authority over to private management if it does not improve within 5 years.

The one-for-one replacement rule requires that for every public housing unit that is demolished, a replacement unit must be built or a housing certificate must be issued. The intent of the law—to preserve the stock of low-income housing—is important. But the law causes problems.

It's a catch 22. Housing authorities can't demolish buildings unless they can replace every unit, but there isn't enough development money to replace the units. As a result, many buildings remain vacant or mostly vacant for years. They become a hazard to the neighborhood, increasing urban blight, drugs and crime in and around public housing.

Millions of Federal dollars are wasted on these vacant units. The HUD inspector general has reported that since 1987, the Cuyahoga, OH public housing authority [PHA] has received over $47 million in HUD operating subsidies for vacant units. The Newark, NJ PHA received over $17 million in operating subsidies for several buildings that were sealed from 1985 through 1992.

The bill targets a second Federal policy which wastes Federal dollars. According to the General Accounting Office and the HUD inspector general, funds for new construction are scarce and competitive, and PHAs can only use their modernization funds to renovate, not rebuild, buildings. Many times this forces PHAs to do what many times is the most expensive option—to renovate rather than rebuild. In the Desire project located in New Orleans, LA it would have saved the Government at least $14 million to build from scratch. Due to current Federal law, the city could only use HUD funds for renovations even though two independent contractors had advised against it because the project's original structure is weak and it was built on a former swamp and dump. There are other examples like this one at PHAs around the country.

The third problem the bill addresses is troubled public housing authorities. Troubled housing authorities fail to renovate thousands of vacant units while tens of thousands of people languish on waiting lists. Many of these PHAs are plagued by mismanagement, poor oversight and revolving door leadership. These problems hurt public housing residents who

continue to live in deplorable and unsafe housing.

While troubled PHAs represented only 1 percent of all authorities, they control 20 percent of the Nation's public housing units. They receive over a quarter of the $6 billion dollars in operating subsidies and modernization funds HUD allocates every year. Currently there are 105 PHAs that are on HUD's troubled list—18 in large cities.

In a recent audit, the HUD IG found that HUD's attempts to improve management and stop financial waste at these PHAs were ineffective. The IG called for HUD to "act more decisively and forcefully to remove PHA management when all else fails."

In the 13 years between 1979 and 1992, 10 PHAs in major cities were continuously troubled. In only two of these cases did HUD replace the management of the housing authority. PHAs should be given no more than 5 years to show improvements. If the local management cannot turn the situation around in that amount of time, then HUD should turn the PHA over to private management.

In introducing my bill today my hope is that we can make fundamental changes which both Federal taxpayers and public housing residents deserve.

GIBSON GUITAR—ONE OF THE BEST IN THE BUSINESS

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join musicians around the world and congratulate the Gibson Guitar Co. on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

Although I am not a musician, I know of the fine reputation Gibson Guitars have in the music community. Among the great artists who have owned and played a Gibson guitar are Elvis Presley, the Beatles, Jimi Hendrix, Les Paul, Chet Atkins, Garth Brooks, Aerosmith, Slash of Guns N' Roses, and Bob Dylan.

The future of the company was pretty grim several years ago because of continued financial losses. In fact, the company had cut staff and had closed all of its divisions except one line of electric guitars. But the company was rescued by a team of investors led by Henry Juszkiewicz, who is now chairman and whom I am pleased to call a friend. And the company is back to manufacturing more than 80 models of both acoustic and electric guitars.

Gibson was founded in Kalamazoo, MI, by amateur guitarist and woodworker Orville Gibson. Gibson revolutionized guitarmaking by applying the construction principles of the violin to his guitars. An echo of that innovation is the f-hole sound sound construction pioneered by the company in its hollowed-bodied electric guitars—a technique borrowed from the violin.

In 1924, the Gibson Co. produced the first electric guitar. Later came innovations to prevent warpage and feedback, as well as other innovations that have defined industry standards.

Gibson is now headquartered in Nashville, "Music City, U.S.A." The company sells about 200,000 guitars a year, from a relatively inexpensive line to custom-made models costing more than $100,000. But, to artists everywhere, Gibson is among the best names in the business. That's why it is ever present on the concern stage and in the recording studio.

I extend my heartfelt congratulations to Henry Juskiewicz and his employees on a job well-done and wish them every success for the next 100 years of business.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, next week is the ninth observance of Public Service Recognition week. I am a proud sponsor of House Joint Resolution 253, which designates the first week of May as Public Service Recognition Week.

Today, there is much uncertainty among the public about public service and the people who work in government. Actually, public service is a high calling and one which permits a public official to provide a wide range of needed services to his or her fellows.

All of us, at one time or another, have benefitted from the service of public employees. Public employees defend our Nation, enforce our laws, work to protect our environment, maintain vital transportation systems, and perform many other important functions vital to our Nation's affairs.

We set aside this week to honor public servants who do both the obvious things and the things we may not notice, all of which make our lives safer, healthier, happier and more rewarding.

Public servants deserve to be recognized and appreciated, not only for all their hard work, but for their unique brand of dedication as well. I join my colleagues in saluting public service employees.

IN TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE A. GARBER

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, our communities and our country have always relied on the contributions of individuals who rise above and beyond the call of duty to make a difference in the lives of others. I pause today to join the Congregation of Temple Emanuel of the Pascack Valley in Woodcliff Lake, NJ, as they pay tribute to a true hero in their community, Mr. Lawrence A. Garber.

It has been said that the future of our society lies in the hands of individuals. And radiating out from him or her is the family, the community, the county, the State, and the Nation. But in the end, it all depends on the individual to make a difference. As President of Temple Emanuel, Larry Garber has made that difference in the Pascack Valley.

Under Larry Garber's leadership over the last 2 years, Temple Emanuel has focused more and more of its resources on the plight of the less fortunate members of the community. Social action services provided to the community include feeding and housing the homeless 1 day a week on the temple premises; collecting over $10,000 worth of food and clothing; providing transportation and companionship to seniors living on their own; and, conducting an annual blood drive. Their participation in the Operation Isaiah Program was recognized with a citation from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, compassion for the disadvantaged and underprivileged is a basic tenet of our Judeo-Christian faith. Larry Garber has never forgotten this. Moreover, each day he strives to remind us all of the principles of our own faith and our duty to our community.

Larry Garber's years of tireless effort have made an immeasurable difference in the lives of countless persons throughout northern New Jersey. His dedication and commitment has set an example for all to follow. I ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in saying a heartfelt thank you and congratulations to Lawrence A. Garber as he completes his very successful tenure as president of Temple Emanuel.

INTRODUCTION, BY REQUEST, OF THE HOUSING CHOICE AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT ACT OF 1994

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today, by request of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, the Housing Choice and Community Investment Act of 1994. The primary purpose of this legislation is to reauthorize for 2 years HUD's housing and community development programs. The principal focus of the legislation is on five priority areas, including: First, reducing homelessness; second, turning around public housing; third, expanding affordable housing; fourth, enhancing fair housing; and fifth, empowering communities.

I am entering into the RECORD Secretary Cisneros' transmittal letter accompanying the legislation.

This comprehensive legislation demonstrates HUD's, and this administration's, renewed commitment to addressing this Nation's housing and community development needs. The legislation contains various program modifications, and new programs, that will warrant close review by the House Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development as it moves toward markup of the housing reauthorization bill for this year.

On February 10, 1994, I introduced the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994, H.R. 3838, which also reauthorizes housing and community development programs, and contains many of the proposals made in HUD's bill, including, in particular, re-

form to the public housing and section 8 programs. The subcommittee, since the bill's introduction, has been holding reauthorization hearings, that have included, in addition to representatives of housing organizations and other members of the public, Secretary Cisneros and HUD Assistant Secretaries Joseph Shuldiner, Nicholas Retsinas, Andrew Cuomo, and Roberta Achtenberg. During these hearings, many of the proposals included in the HUD bill that I am introducing today have been outlined by these HUD officials.

I am looking forward to working with HUD, with other members of the subcommittee and committee, other House Members, and our counterparts in the Senate, as we move toward completion of the reauthorization process, and this critically important legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1994.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to transmit to you the "Housing Choice and Community Investment Act of 1994." For the past several months, the department has been working with the Office of Management and Budget, key Congressional Committees and various housing and community development groups on the preparation of this authorization bill.

This legislation would authorize $60 billion over the next two fiscal years for HUD's housing and community development programs. The legislation is focused on the five central priorities governing HUD's community investment agenda: reducing homelessness, turning around public housing, expanding affordable housing, enhancing fair housing, and empowering communities.

This legislation will transform the delivery of homeless assistance programs by consolidating and reorganizing several disparate programs into a single source of funding to support local "continuum of care" systems to assist homeless persons and prevent future homelessness.

The Act would set the foundation for a total remake of our public housing program, ending public housing as we know it. The bill would remove disincentives for public housing residents to seek employment. It would reward entrepreneurial public housing agencies through deregulation and the granting of added powers to experiment and innovate. Anti-crime efforts would be streamlined and linked to other law enforcement efforts.

This bill also proposes to once again make HUD's Federal Housing Administration (FHA) a positive force for enhancing homeownership opportunities. The Act would raise the maximum mortgage limits and give FHA the authority to innovate with new homeownership products as well as enter into risk-sharing arrangements with qualified governmental entities. Additional subsidy tools and increased funding for counselling will also help to foster homeownership opportunities.

HUD's fair housing efforts would be greatly enhanced under this legislation, by advancing the goals of geographic mobility, neighborhood equity, and residential diversity. The bill would expand existing programs that enable HUD, with the aid of nonprofit groups and state and local governments, to enforce our nation's fair housing laws.

Mr. Speaker, the Act would also consolidate and revamp HUD's Section 8 rental assistance programs, permit public housing authorities including Indian housing authorities to sell public and Indian housing to nonprofit organizations to facilitate homeownership opportunities to public housing residents and create a new Choice in Residency program that would give, for the first time, recipients of federal housing aid the counselling they need to make informed choices about where they should live.

The Housing Choice and Community Investment Act would also support HUD's efforts to once again become a positive force in the revitalization of our nation's communities. The legislation would continue the strong support for the Community Development Block Grant program, create a Neighborhood LIFT program to develop neighborhoods' economic infrastructures, create a Community Viability fund to build the capacity of community-based groups, authorize additional funds for the President's empowerment zone initiative, and facilitate the use of Section 108 loan guarantees.

A section-by-section explanation and justification accompanies this letter and more fully sets forth the contents of the bill. I request that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee and urge its early consideration.

The Housing Choice and Community Investment Act of 1994 would affect direct spending; therefore it is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement of the Omnibus Budget reconciliation Act of 1990. OMB's estimate is that the bill's pay-as-you-go impact will be zero.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that the enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

I am sending a similar letter to the President of the United States Senate, Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.

Sincerely,

HENRY CISNEROS,
Secretary.

REFORM IN RUSSIA: PLUS OR MINUS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a strong and direct interest in the transition to democracy and market economics in Russia and the newly independent states. There has been considerable debate recently as to the extent of reform and whether it is adequate: whether the glass is half-full or half-empty.

In order to provide a factual basis for this discussion, I asked the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to develop a list of the positive and negative developments on reform in Russia.

I am inserting this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to contribute to the congressional and public debate over this critical foreign policy issue.

REFORM IN RUSSIA

CENTRAL CONTROL

Pluses

Sufficient departure from Soviet socialism such that a return to a command economy would be difficult

Elimination of the central element of Soviet socialism—central planning and central distribution of industrial materiel.

Elimination of the preeminent position of defense in resource allocation.

90 percent of prices freed.

State role in food distribution ¼ of its former size; the state will purchase only nine types of agricultural commodities.

Enterprises no longer depend on Moscow for decisions or resources.

Minuses

Energy prices are still set administratively, with crude oil prices at one-third of world prices.

PRIVATIZATION

Pluses

Consumers now make 70 percent of their purchases from privately-owned businesses.

7,500 large enterprises (35 percent of total) sold to the public or employees. In comparison, Poland and Hungary, where overall reform is further advanced, have privatized ⅓ of state enterprises.

87,000 small firms transferred from state control.

8.1 million housing units (30%) turned over to individual owners.

270,000 private farms.

Minuses

Few former or current state enterprises have streamlined and adapted to a market economy.

The number of registered cooperatives and proprietorships (200,000) has stagnated since 1991.

LEGAL SYSTEM

Pluses

Beginning of establishment of a legal system necessary to underpin a fully functioning market economy.

Creation of a legal basis for bankruptcy proceedings.

Patent and copyright laws have been written, and international conventions joined.

Minuses

In spite of passage of antitrust laws and bankruptcy laws, there have only been 10 bankruptcies. The economy remains highly concentrated. The antimonopoly committee has little enforcement authority.

There is little respect for written contracts; property rights are not clearly delineated.

New laws are inconsistent and not widely available.

Organized crime is a rampant legal and social problem in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Yekatarinburg, and throughout Russia, and has become a disincentive to entrepreneurs.

FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Pluses

Introduction of modern financial institutions includes:

Large number of commercial banks;

Ability of enterprises to purchase and sell hard currencies;

Burgeoning agricultural exchanges; and

Development of stock markets.

Minuses

Many commercial banks are owned by large enterprises that use them to gain access to credit.

Stock market is still at an infant stage.

Most exporters are required to sell half of hard currency earnings for rubles at the market rate.

Capital flight is high.

There is little bank regulation; banks can be formed with little seed capital; a clearing system is in its infancy.

Small business has difficulty securing credit.

Banks generally finance only trade and middlemen operations.

MONETARY POLICY

Pluses

Rudimentary development of Western monetary and fiscal policy.

Tough monetary policy and structural changes to the economy (privatization) have caused inflation to decline from 21 percent in January to 10 percent in February and 9 percent in March.

The ruble is stable vis-a-vis Western currencies; internal ruble convertibility means a more efficient allocation of resources.

Minuses

The Government and Central Bank still allocate a large portion of credit, mainly to prop up state enterprises. These credits are contributing to a high rate of monthly inflation.

Pressures from economic interests for subsidies are likely to rekindle inflation.

Credit creation and an inflationary monetary policy will undermine sound fiscal policy.

FISCAL POLICY

Pluses

As pledged, the government submitted in April an austere budget, with the budget deficit held to 7 percent of GDP.

Because the second tranche of IMF lending ($1.5 billion) is tied to the budget, there is some expectation that it will be approved and implemented.

Minuses

The Duma has required revision of the budget, with the deficit raised to 9.5 percent of GDP to provide more funds for agricultural and social spending.

Tax rates are high and unstable.

The overall tax burden, combined with bribes, can take as much as 70–90 percent of small business profits, which leads firms to operate informally and to alter their books.

TRADE/INVESTMENT

Pluses

Foreign trade has been decentralized.

Export quotas and licensing now apply to only a few commodities.

The import tariff regime is largely transparent, nondiscriminatory, and relatively free of non-tariff barriers.

The removal of major obstacles to foreign investment has led to growth in the number of foreign firms.

Minuses

Frequent changes in import duties, and a sharp rise in average tariff rates, are used to protect domestic industry.

Few investors are prepared to make significant investment commitments because of the absence of necessary commercial laws and an inhospitable political and economic climate.

POLITICAL SYSTEM

Pluses

Progress in political reform includes:

A relatively free media;

The development of national political parties;

The adoption of a new constitution, which gives Yeltsin the power to continue reform; and

December 1993 elections that were generally free and fair.

Hardliners elected in December and brought into the government are continuing many of the reforms.

The new parliament is more receptive to a cooperative relationship with Yeltsin than the previous parliament.

Minuses

Political parties are splintered and coalition-building is weak.

There is concern over Yeltsin's authoritarian tendencies and accumulation of power, and concern over how a successor to Yeltsin could abuse the considerable powers of the office of the President.

December 1993 elections increased the voice in parliament of the extreme flank of the opposition—Zhirinovsky and former communists.

Significant fighting between the President and the Parliament continues.

The Russian government often does not speak with one voice, and the President often appears disengaged from involvement in his own government.

RECOGNITION OF REV. JOSEPH COSCHIGNANO

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding Long Island citizen on the occasion of his 25th anniversary to the priesthood. On May 31, Rev. Joseph Coschignano, the pastor of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church in Rocky Point, NY, will reach this milestone.

Father Coschignano was named pastor of St. Anthony's in June 1989. Among his contributions to the community was the completion of the parish building so that more than 1,000 children could receive religious instruction. During this time, adult education programs have flourished. Soccer, basketball, and baseball sports teams for youths have been formed, and a parish outreach ministry has been established to serve those in need. These are but a few of the many programs that owe their success to Father Coschignano's leadership.

In addition, this well-loved pastor meets regularly with other religious leaders in the area to actively address community needs. Father Coschignano worked diligently to ensure that the rerouting of a State road was done in such a way as not to disrupt the children's athletic program nor harm the small business area of Rocky Point.

Mr. Speaker, Father Coschignano serves not only the people of his parish but all those who live in the Rocky Point area. It is with great pleasure that I join with his family, friends, and the parishioners of St. Anthony's to honor him and celebrate his 25th anniversary.

FIGHT FOR THE LIVING: WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe Workers Memorial Day in remembrance of workers who have suffered and died on the job and to renew our commitment to preventing these tragedies in the future. This year marks the AFL–CIO's sixth observance of Workers Memorial Day.

April 28, has been chosen by the unions of the AFL–CIO because it is the anniversary of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. In addition to paying tribute to workers who have been victims of unsafe working conditions, this year unions will have a real opportunity to win changes in the OSHA law that will give workers greater rights and protections.

The United States now has the highest rate of job injuries and illnesses in more than a decade, and while much progress has been made in protecting American workers, still, every year 10,000 American workers die from job-related injuries. In 1992, in my own State of California, there were 551 workplace fatalities, an average of 4.4 fatalities per 100,000 workers.[1] Moreover, workplace injuries are costing American business $83 billion a year, according to a 1989 Rand Corp. study. These statistics show that it is time for Congress to act again.

On Workers Memorial Day, trade unionists can take action to raise public awareness about the epidemic of workplace injuries and illnesses and organize support for passage of comprehensive OSHA reform legislation now pending before Congress. This bill is the first major revision of OSHA since it was established in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in observing Workers Memorial Day and supporting the OSHA reform legislation.

RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our 37th President and one of the greatest Americans of this century—Richard Milhous Nixon.

Richard Nixon was a dedicated patriot and the most outstanding foreign policy President of this century. For more than four decades he demonstrated unsurpassed courage in enduring unrelenting attacks from the liberal media. History will remember Richard Nixon far more for his extraordinary achievements than for his very human failings. Richard Nixon was an American giant on the world stage and his unique knowledge and talents will be sorely missed.

I was fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to meet with President Nixon on several occasions, and had the privilege of working as an intern in his New York law firm in 1966 and 1967.

President Nixon has left behind him a rich historical legacy. In the eloquent words of Senator BOB DOLE, spoken at President Nixon's funeral last night, "Richard Nixon was an American hero."

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries, 1992.

THE EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 1994

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is aware of the need to revitalize America's public school systems. American students are outranked annually in the areas of math and science by their European and Asian counterparts. Across the country, students' educational development is hindered for reasons such as fear of violence or pressure to experiment with drugs. If students to not have a safe learning environment, their development will be limited. Congress already has taken action to ensure that these fears do not continue to prevent any child from learning. By setting national education standards, this body took the lead in improving public school systems and the performance of students. I am proud to say I played an integral part in the passage of both the "Improving America's Schools" and the "Goals 2000" bills which address these problems. While these reform bills take significant steps toward helping local school districts overcome their problems, more still needs to be done.

Students lack adequate, environmentally safe school buildings. In some urban areas, schools are closed due to asbestos and dirty, rust-filled bathrooms that continually leak and are practically unusable. In other schools, water fountains have been removed because the water contained an unhealthy amount of lead. A recent study by the Education Writers Association found that 25 percent of our nation's schools are shoddy places for learning. In addition, the study found that 61 percent of America's schools are inadequate facilities and are in need of major repairs; 42 percent are environmentally hazardous; 25 percent are overcrowded; and 13 percent are structurally unsound. Another study performed by the Council of Great City Schools found that the city I represent, New York, needs $1 billion both to repair old buildings and to construct new ones.

Unfortunately, State and Federal funding for education infrastructure development is harder and harder to secure. In fact, over 20 States provide little or no funding for school facility projects, and only 10 percent of Federal dollars have been contributed to this endeavor (and only in school districts negatively affected by Federal activities).

That is why I am introducing the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994, the companion to S. 2034 introduced by Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN. This bill requires the Secretary of Education to directly allocate $600 million to local school districts for the repair, renovation, alteration and construction of public elementary and secondary school libraries, media centers, and facilities used for academic or vocational instruction.

The Secretary would target these funds to local school districts which serve large numbers or percentages of economically disadvantaged students and which can demonstrate urgent repair, renovation, alteration, and construction needs. Priority would be given to those districts having the oldest facilities, the highest number of facilities with health and safety hazards, and highest rates of unemployment. School districts would use the money to inspect their facilities, repair facilities that pose a health or safety risk to students, upgrade their facilities to accommodate new instructional technology, install school security and communications systems, and to build new schools.

Mr. Speaker, this bill forces the Federal Government to accept its fair share of responsibility to maintain the public school system infrastructure. I hope my colleagues will favorably consider this legislation. We've already invested billions of dollars to ensure that our children receive high quality education in crime-free, drug-free schools, now let's finish the job of protecting our children from unnecessary hazards by investing in the upkeep of our Nation's public education infrastructure.

SALUTE TO AN AMERICAN VETERAN

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, the Guyton-Callahan Post No. 152 American Legion Department of New Jersey will honor World War I veterans at a memorial service in Newark, NJ. At the time the honoree, Mr. James Rounds, the only living World War I veteran and member of Guyton-Callahan Post will be in attendance. Mr. Rounds is 99 years young. He was drafted in September of 1918 at the age of 23. He was trained at Fort Dix and was assigned to guard the seaports of New Jersey. His orders to go overseas were pending when the armistice came. Mr. Rounds remained in the service until 1920.

I am proud to let my colleagues know that many servicemen of distinction were members of the Cuyton-Callahan Post No. 152. The post was named in honor of Emmett Guyton a World War I veteran who was killed in action and Archie Callahan killed in action at Pearl Harbor. Both men were from Newark, NJ, and the Post was named as a living memorial to their ultimate sacrifice.

After being discharged from the service Mr. Rounds returned to Newark and began working for the Pennsylvania Railroad as a mechanic until the stock market crash. Wanting to continue his education, Mr. Rounds worked odd jobs in the day and went to school at night securing this blue shield in charge fireman's license while working at General Electric. Prior to his retirement from General Electric be became engineer in charge.

Mr. Rounds was an active member of the community. He was active with King Hiram Lodge Ancient Free and Accepted Masons No. 4, the Elks Liberty Lodge No. 4, the United Order of Moses, and the 90th Barracks World War I veterans as well as Post 152 where he served as senior vice commander. Mr. Rounds did not limit his involvement in the community to organizations, he became a successful landlord and was an entrepreneur. He was a business partner with Clara Bell Jackson in the Poro Beauty School on West Market Street In Newark.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this great American, this World War I veteran, Mr. James Rounds as he is honored by the members of the Guyton-Callahan Post No. 152. His return salute would be as snappy as any West Point cadet.

THE VOTE IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today marks a new dawn for the people of South Africa and the world. After many, many years of an oppressive political system in which South Africa's black majority were denied any voice in national affairs, an entire country marched to the ballot box in hopes of creating a free and democratic society. Beginning April 26, masses of people converged on more than 9,000 polling stations eager to shed the yoke of disenfranchisement; the elderly and disabled arrived hours before the stations were scheduled to open, and one woman—too feeble to walk—even came in a wheel-barrow. This historic all-race election ends decades of state-sponsored racial oppression, and we can all hope that it puts the final nail in the coffin of apartheid.

The world rejoices in this remarkable achievement, and I am especially proud that the district I represent has played an important role in the electoral process. More than 200 South Africans traveled to the State Fairgounds in Raleigh, NC, to cast their vote along with their compatriots across the Atlantic. Raleigh was 1 of 17 American cities designated as polling sites for South Africans living in the United States. I congratulate Judith Hargrove, who was contracted by the South Africa Consulate to coordinate the effort, on a job well done.

One cannot pause in recognition of this historic moment, however, without recognizing the courage and sacrifices of the many individuals and groups who have labored for South Africa's liberation. This election culminates years of massive civil disobedience, international protests, and 3 years of negotiations. The forces that stood in opposition to the apartheid regime persevered in the face of seemingly unsurmountable obstacles. These obstacles—including recent bombings intended to intimidate voters—could have derailed the electoral process. To the contrary, these acts have only strengthened the South African people's resolve to create and nurture a free and politically tolerant home for themselves and their children. The message is clear; these attempts to frustrate the will of the people are futile. In the words of Nelson Mandela, "the forces are far more powerful."

Let me remind this body and the international community, however, that elections alone will not deliver stability and prosperity for South Africa. Apartheid is dead, but we are only beginning to address the great challenges that establishing a government of national

unity will no doubt present. South Africa is still a fractured society, with unemployment and illiteracy higher than 50 percent among blacks. South Africans and the international community must not flag in our commitment to making this democratic experiment work.

Again, I commend the people of South Africa on their tremendous accomplishment, including those who cast this historic vote in Raleigh. This is indeed a day to celebrate.

TRIBUTE TO GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. PETER W. BARCA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute three outstanding young women who have been honored with the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Gold Award by the Badger Council of Girl Scouts in Beloit, WI. They are Senior Girl Scouts of Girl Scout Troop 456.

They are being honored on May 1, 1994 for earning the highest achievement award in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout awards to Senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a Girl Scout must fulfill five requirements: Earn four interest project patches, earn the Career Exploration pin, earn the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, earn the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, and design and implement a Girl Scout Award project.

As members of Badger Council of Girl Scouts, Rachel Smith, Sonja Stenli, and Sara Wille began working toward the Girl Scout Gold Award in January 1994. The completed project involved community service and positive developmental skills for younger children, as well as satisfaction in the value of their efforts. This valuable learning experience for these three young women will continue to benefit many younger children and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to commend these young women on this significant honor.

TRIBUTE TO MILLSTADT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SCIENCE OLYMPIAD TEAM

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Millstadt Elementary School Science Olympiad Team of Millstadt, IL.

This year represents the fourth year that the Millstadt team has competed on the State level. The competition, held at University High School in Normal, IL, attracted 28 regional teams from throughout the State. The Millstadt team boasts a third-place finish to first-place South Middle School and second-place Grayslake Middle School as well as 17 medals.

The Millstadt Science Olympiad team, coached by sixth-grade science teacher Kathy Alt, includes sixth-graders Matt Nagel, Kelley Woehlke, and alternate Lucas Meyer; seventh-graders Lacey Diesel, Allison Duncan, Dusty Loeffler, Shawn Woy, and Beth Yagge; and eighth-graders Catherine Betz, Kyle Leesman, Kelli Reese, Ryan Tyler, Traci Werner, David Wild, and alternate Amanda Carrico. The team also includes two ninth-graders from Belleville West High School, Brent Gaines and John Randall, both of whom graduated from Millstadt last year.

The Millstadt Science Olympians prepared for competition before and after school, as well as on Saturdays. Through this dedication and sacrifice, the team proved proficient in many Olympiad events which include problem-solving within the framework of earth science, chemistry, technology, and physics. The team also demonstrated hands-on understanding of scientific principles through the construction of bridges from lightweight materials, the design of insulated structures, the interpretation of topographic maps, and the identification and analysis of solid and liquid chemical substances.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Millstadt Science Olympiad team. It is this determination to succeed that is the driving force behind this great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO JOYCE MATSUMOTO AND ANH PHAM

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the excellence and accomplishments of two students from my district in California. Joyce Matsumoto of Yorba Linda, and Anh Pham of Anaheim have worked diligently to earn the honor of being selected by the Department of Education as scholars under the National Science Scholars Program [NSSP] for the 1994–95 academic year.

The program recognizes students who have demonstrated outstanding ability in the physical, life, or computer sciences, mathematics, or engineering by providing scholarships in order for meritorious students, who are graduating from high school or receiving a General Educational Development certificate, to continue their studies at the post-secondary level.

This program is designed to strengthen the leadership of the United States in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering by attracting highly qualified men and women into these fields and by encouraging them to pursue teaching careers in these areas. I am sure that Ms. Matsumoto, and Ms. Pham will work with the same zeal and fortitude that has made us proud for them today.

GRANT'S TOMB NATIONAL MONUMENT

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, April 27, 1994 marked the 127th commemoration of the birth of our 18th President Ulysses S. Grant. I feel a special connection to this great war hero, for during his Presidency, my great-grandfather, Hamilton Fish, served as U.S. Secretary of State.

Grant's Tomb, which is located in New York City overlooking the Hudson River was once one of the most popular attractions in New York. Today Grant's Tomb has become the most desecrated Presidential burial site in the Nation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of Congressman NADLER's legislation, "Grant's Tomb National Monument Bill," which will restore the tomb, and once again make it the great attraction and tribute it was meant to be.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. THORESON

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of Robert Thoreson of Adelanto, CA. Robert, who has demonstrated a remarkable dedication to the needs and safety of southern California residents over the past 23 years, will be honored on May 12, 1994 as he retires from his position of Detective III at the Los Angeles Police Department [LAPD].

As a graduate of the FBI Academy and valedictorian and class president of his LAPD class, Robert was well-prepared for a career in law enforcement. Because of his involvement and active leadership in the community, Robert has been an instrumental force in preserving the law and order in Los Angeles.

Robert was appointed a policeman on August 9, 1971, marking the beginning of a successful career in law enforcement. With only 6½ years on the job, Robert achieved the rank of Detective III—a true rarity in the history of the Los Angeles Police Department. For the past 16 years Robert has diligently served as Detective III at the LAPD where he worked on many different assignments including forgery, gangs, intelligence on terrorism, juvenile, burglary, robbery, and homicide.

Not only has Robert served on the front lines of law enforcement, he has also played a significant role in preparing the next generation of police officers for service to the community. As a detective, Robert's responsibilities included teaching detective supervisory, gang, auto theft, and homicide schools. In addition to teaching interrogation techniques at UCLA, Robert was also the LAPD's expert on search warrants where he taught this ever

changing and challenging subject for 13 years. Robert also served on the Board of Directors for the Los Angeles Police Memorial Foundation for 21 years.

Not only has Robert been a leader in the law enforcement community, he has also made significant contributions to numerous organizations in California. From 1985 to 1991, he served as the Governor's appointee to the California State Advisory Board on Drug and Alcohol Programs as well as vice chairman of the Republican Party in Los Angeles from 1990 to 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Robert's family, and many friends in honoring this unique individual for his extensive and dedicated service. Over the years, Robert has touched the lives of many people in our community and it is only fitting that the House recognize him today.

TO HONOR SERVICE OF LT. COL. MICHAEL C. STEPP

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the retirement of Lt. Col. Michael C. Stepp from the U.S. Air Force after more than 27 years of service. He is currently the Director for Defense Information, Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. A native of Dothan, AL, Lieutenant Colonel Stepp will retire on May 1, 1994.

Colonel Stepp served as chief of public affairs, 1776th Air Base Wing, Andrews Air Force Base, MD, and was then assigned, in 1987, to the Pentagon as a plans officer and later as a spokesman on the Air Force News Deck in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. In 1989, he was asked by Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney's spokesman, Mr. Pete Williams, to become one of his military assistants and served from August 1991 to September 1993 as senior military assistant.

Colonel Stepp's military awards and decorations include the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Joint Meritorious Unit Award, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Air Force Good Conduct Medal with one oak leaf cluster, and National Defense Service Medal with device.

I join Lt. Col. Michael C. Stepp, his wife Mary and daughter, Jenifer in the celebration of his retirement May 1, 1994. I am proud of his years of dedicated service to the U.S. Air Force and wish him well in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO GREGORY WILLIAM LATZ

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Gregory William Latz of troop 2 in Misquamicut, RI, and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. This young man has distinguished himself in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Gregory developed, arranged, and coordinated the food donations, preparation, and catering of a buffet supper in honor of the 75th anniversary of the Westerly Ambulance Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Gregory William Latz. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has, through its 80 years, honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Gregory William Latz will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

TRIBUTE TO 31ST DISTRICT MILITARY ACADEMY APPOINTEES

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, something quite special has occurred in our district. It really exemplifies the kind of people in the Southern Tier and Finger Lakes region of New York State.

Here's the story:

Three young men from our district are top recruits for the three U.S. Military Academies. They will enter with the class of 1998 this July. All three will be playing NCAA division I basketball against each other for the next 4 years. Each was offered early appointment to the Academies last year. They were heavily recruited by the coaches and athletic directors.

Let me tell you a bit about each of them:

Michael Heary is a senior at Fredonia High School. Michael will be a member of the Naval Academy's basketball team. He's been a member of several western New York all-star teams, and has maintained a high academic average. The chairman of our academy selection committee, Jim Mintun, took Michael under his wing after the recent death of his father, Tom Heary, and helped lead him toward the Naval Academy.

Justin Johnson will be playing basketball for West Point this fall. A senior at Jamestown High School, Justin is a top student, excellent athlete, and is involved in many community activities. He's also been a member of several Western New York all-star basketball teams, the National Honor Society, and is very involved in his church.

Entering the Air Force Academy this year after graduation from Trumansburg High School is Michael Reed. He will play ball for the Falcons this year. Like the other two, Mike is a dedicated student, athlete, and community servant. He was captain of his school's varsity basketball, football and track teams, and has received numerous awards and honors. He also has been just as successful with his academics. Mike volunteers for the Special Olympics, and is involved in many extracurricular activities both in school and in his community.

So these three men, along with the other outstanding young men and women we have nominated to the service academies, are really the pride of New York's 31st District. It will be exciting to watch them play basketball against each other later this year, and serve our country as officers in the Navy, Army, and Air Force later in life.

I can not emphasize sufficiently how proud I am of Michael Heary, Justin Johnson, and Michael Reed. I know I join many people in wishing them the best of luck and success.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HERSHEL EUDY

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to meet many wonderful people throughout the 9th District of Florida. However, I rise today to pay tribute to a particularly remarkable individual—a good friend of mine—Hershel Eudy of Dunedin, FL.

Those of us who knew Hershel will always miss him dearly. In remembering him, there are so many positive qualities which he displayed—he was a loving husband, a devoted father, a proud grandfather, and a patriotic American.

Hershel was only 74 years old when he died, but he lived a very full life. He always believed in the power of people to make a difference—in their congregation, their community, and their Nation. Through much of his

adult life. Hershel used his God-given talents to serve his country—as a soldier during World War II, and later, as a data analyst for the Federal Government.

It would be impossible for me to list each of the ways in which Hershel contributed to his community and to the spirit and dignity of his fellow man. He was an enthusiastic member of the First United Methodist Church of Dunedin, the Masonic lodge, and the National Association of Retired Federal Employees.

To many people, Hershel will always be remembered fondly as a man who loved to fish. His dear friend, Dr. E. Duane Hulse, minister of the United Methodist Church of Clearwater, spoke eloquently of Hershel's favorite pastime at his memorial service. Dr. Hulse dedicated a special poem to Hershel, and I believe these words best express the sentiment that we all share in remembering him.

God grant that I might fish,
Until my dying day.
And when I make my one last cast
I then most humbly pray
When in the Lord's safe landing net
I'm peaceably asleep,
That in His mercy, I'll be judged,
As good enough to keep.

DAVID KAPOLKA HONORED FOR SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHING

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to honor an outstanding educator from my home district. David Kapolka of Forest Hills Northern High School has been selected to receive one of the 1993 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching. These national awards help encourage outstanding teachers to remain in the teaching field. As a result of this award, his school will receive a National Science Foundation grant to improve science and mathematics programs. David and the other award recipients will be honored for their excellence during a visit to Washington.

David's qualifications for this award are numerous. He holds degrees from Michigan State University and the University of Detroit. He has also accumulated 45 additional graduate semester hours of mathematics, graphing calculator technology, and computer science from 17 institutions of higher learning. In addition to his mathematics teaching responsibilities, David has been serving as chair of the Forest Hills Northern High School Mathematics Department since 1989. His involvement with education extends beyond the classroom. He has served as a consultant, author, speaker, and is a current member of four professional organizations. In addition to his extensive involvement in education, David has also been active in alumni affairs, athletics, choir, and church outside of the education field.

David's commitment to excellence is one that I truly admire. Being an educator in the sciences myself, I can appreciate all that David has done to promote the importance of understanding science and mathematics. His effort and results are a model for all to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in honoring the achievements of an outstanding educator and role model. It is truly a pleasure to take time to honor David Kapolka for his dedication to these areas. David's technique and teachings will continue to ignite interest in learning more about the fields of mathematics and science, and he serves as an example to all other educators.

IN HONOR OF MANY VOLUNTEERS WHO HAVE MADE HOOPS FOR HOPES AND A BETTER CHANCE PROGRAM A DRIVING FORCE

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and appreciation that I rise to commend the many community volunteers who will gather to support "Hoops for Hopes," sponsored by the "A Better Chance" Program in Simsbury, CT, this weekend. A Better Chance, or ABC, is a national, nonprofit organization founded to give inner city youngsters the opportunity to spend quality time with suburban families and interact with children their own age in more rural, less stressful settings.

The ABC families and volunteers, who will gather for a 3-on-3 youth basketball tournament on Saturday, April 30, are key members of a team providing an important educational and cultural experience for inner-city suburban kids. We all know the benefits of teamwork, of having fun, and working hard for something that is important and I commend the many Simsbury volunteers on helping these youngsters, as well as their own children, aspire to the highest goals. For the students from the city, ABC helps build their confidence and encourages their dreams. For the children from Simsbury, ABC deepens their understanding of our common hopes and responsibility of one another. The people of Simsbury deserve recognition for their hard work and commitment to the values that have made America a remarkable nation. I am pleased to share their good news with the House of Representatives.

WHERE "THREE STRIKES" HAS CHANGED THE ODDS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share an article with my colleagues from the Washington Times. I hope they find Pete Du Pont's article as enlightening as I did.

[From the Washington Times, March 27, 1994]

WHERE 'THREE STRIKES' HAS CHANGED THE ODDS

(By Pete DuPont)

No one would argue that crime is not a threat to Americans' daily lives. Twenty-four million people each year are victims of serious crime. A young black male is more likely to die by violence than any other cause. And millions of our children go to bed each night to the sound of gunfire as vast sectors of our cities are effectively controlled by criminals.

In too many neighborhoods, crime overwhelms all else—school, home and work environments are often helpless in its grip.

And no one would argue that this violence is not imposing a terrible cost upon society, in pain, suffering, trauma and dollars.

But there are those who will argue it is not really the criminal's fault, that they are but victims of various "root causes" of their behavior—urban decay, poverty, parental inattention, etc. In the words of Attorney General Janet Reno: "One of the principal reasons for violence is that we have forgotten and neglected our children."

For 30 years, the liberal response to the rising tide of criminal violence has been therapeutic: Understand, help and rehabilitate the criminal.

But rehabilitation is proving a mirage. We like to think it works, but a 1975 study by City College of New York sociology professor Robert Martinson reviewed the results of 200 separate rehabilitation programs and concluded that the efforts "had no appreciable effect on recidivism."

Punishment, on the other hand, is viewed by some liberals as excessive (we lock up more people than any civilized nation), ineffective (jail just teaches people how to be criminals) or vindictive.

Rep. Kweisi Mfume, Maryland Democrat, chairman of the House of Representative's Black Caucus, dismisses prisons as "an antiquated approach to crime." Strong punishment statutes, in the words of former Deputy Attorney General Philip Heymann, often "look tougher than they are smart."

Even Louis Freeh, director of the FBI, America's foremost crimefighting organization, is an apologist: "The crime and disorder which flow from helpless poverty, unloved children and drug abuse can't be solved merely by bottomless prisons, mandatory sentencing minimums or more police."

But the negative correlation between crime and punishment is striking. Criminals make their own rough comparisons of the expected benefits of crime against the expected costs to decide whether crime pays, just as any rational person weighs decisions in other areas of life. If the anticipated probability of punishment is high, fewer crimes are committed.

Morgan Reynolds, an economics professor at Texas A&M University and a senior fellow of the National Center for Policy Analysis, has developed a measure called "expected punishment" to gauge anticipated punishment probabilities.

Expected punishment is calculated by multiplying the probability of being arrested for a crime after it is committed, of being prosecuted if arrested, of being convicted if prosecuted and of going to prison if convicted.

The result is multiplied by the median time served for an offense—and the resulting figure is the expected punishment.

This measuring stick shows that as the expected punishment for serious crimes was dropping from 22.5 days in 1954 to 5.5 days in 1974, the crime rate was increasing from 1.2 to 4.9 serious crimes per 100 population. The serious crimes rate has since leveled off at 5.9 as the expected punishment index has risen back up to 8.5 days.

If you still doubt the value of punishment, consider the experience of California and

Texas during the 1980s. California, with far more people, began the decade with fewer incarcerated criminals than Texas—and a crime rate that was 28 percent higher. But over the decade California began arresting, convicting and jailing more of its criminals. Its prison population rose 400 percent. In Texas, however, fewer criminals went to jail; its prison population grew by 73 percent.

By 1991, California not only had almost twice as many prisoners as Texas, but also had a crime rate that was 13 percent lower than Texas'.

Raising the cost of crime by making sure people go to prison when they commit crimes will not only get practicing criminals off the street, but also deter crime by making it clear to prospective criminals that if they commit a crime, it is going to cost them.

The state of Washington's "Three Strikes Law" is a good example. Enacted by the voters in November, the law dramatically raises the stakes for people convicted of a third felony—to life imprisonment without parole.

Former Deputy Attorney General Heymann called it "a bad idea being spread as far and as fast as it could be." But in Seattle alone, 17 registered sex offenders have moved out of state because, as the author of the initiative states, "their next offense (in Washington) would be their last."

While there are those who still don't get it, the rest of us do: Punishment and the consistent threat of punishment work. They deter crime.

HONORING TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY GYMNASTICS TEAM

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring the Texas Woman's University Gymnastics Team for their recent success at the National Collegiate Championship.

Texas Woman's University successfully defended its national gymnastics title at the recent National Collegiate Championship. This marks the second consecutive year that the TWU gymnastics team has captured the National Championship title. The dramatic triumph was staged before a hometown crowd of 1,488 at the Coliseum at the University of North Texas. I join these supportive and encouraging fans in offering my sincere congratulations for their success which shows the hard work and dedication of these talented athletes.

Texas Woman' University is a comprehensive public university, primarily for women. The university seeks to provide minority women an academic and social environment for learning, involvement, and leadership development to enable them to complete higher educational programs which afford economic independence. The university, by this achievement, has also proven its commitment toward developing the emotional and physical capabilities of its students as well.

Once again, I would like to extend my congratulations to these outstanding athletes. Texas Woman's University has my deepest admiration for its success in encouraging these talented young women to achieve their highest potential.

OREM HIGH SCHOOL HONORED

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Orem High School has won the honor of representing the State of Utah at the National competition of the "We the People. . . The Citizen and the Constitution" program.

This competition, supported and funded by Congress, is the most extensive educational program in the country, developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 3-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

The distinguished members of the team representing Utah are: Alison Bergeson, Jeremy Bingham, Branden Bunker, Julie Cardon, Rebecca Conrad, James Davis, David Farmer, Kathryn Frame, JoEllen Hansen, Nathan Holdaway, Derek Jensen, J.J. Larsen, Tyler Mitchell, Wayne Mitchell, James Peterson, Michael Phaysey, Chad Snelson, Helen Stoddard, Kell Summers, Eric Taylor, Jaime Tucker, and Travis Wilde.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, William Gillespie, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Shirley Garfield, and the State coordinator, Rulon Garfield, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

TRUMBULL HIGH SCHOOL TO COMPETE IN NATIONAL FINALS FOR "WE THE PEOPLE"

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, from April 30 to May 2, the Center for Civic Education will be holding its national finals for students of its "We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution" curriculum in Washington, DC. Students from one school in each State will showcase their knowledge of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights.

This nationally acclaimed program fosters civic competence and responsibility. The "We the People . . ." curriculum helps students understand the history and principles of our Government.

I am very proud to have a school from Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, Trumbull High School, representing our State. The students of Trumbull High will be among 1,200 students competing for the honor of being our country's national winner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the students and teachers of Trumbull High School on their impressive knowledge and understanding of our great Constitution and wish all the competing students good luck.

HONORING THE SOUTH BEND CLAY HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a group of constituents in my district who have distinguished themselves with excellence and sportsmanship. They have experienced the dream of every Hoosier boy who holds in his heart the love of the game of basketball—winning the Indiana High School Basketball Championship. While the rest of the Nation experiences March Madness with the undertaking of the NCAA Tournament, Indiana is already afflicted with Hoosier Hysteria, a constant condition that engulfs much of its population from late November until it reaches fever pitch in March with the State finals. Each year nearly 400 high schools from all over Indiana, both large and small, enter the State tournament to compete for what has been described as the most coveted prep crown in the world. Unlike many other States, Indiana does not employ a class system for basketball, where teams are tiered by their respective sizes. In Indiana, all schools are on equal footing and without seeding. By the time the 384 team tournament is completed, there is only one champion.

Mr. Speaker, Jacques Barzun once wrote, "Whoever wants to know the heart and mind of America had better learn basketball." I say to understand Indiana one must learn the game of basketball. While basketball was not created in the Hoosierland, it is where the game was instilled with it its heart and soul. For in Indiana, basketball is more than a game, it is the very fabric of its social being. Towns and communities find their identities in their high schools and their teams. It is no accident or mere coincidence that 14 of the 15 largest high school gymnasiums in the Nation are in the State. Indiana holds the record for the largest crowd to ever witness a high school basketball game when over 40,000 people attended a State final game in 1990. It is the home of tiny Milan, the mighty titan who, with an enrollment of only 60 students, won the State Championship against a bigger and stronger city school and who inspired the movie "Hoosiers" which has become a memorable part of American sports legend. It is the home of the famed John Wooden, who was not only a high school star in his own right, but one who went on to become national college player of the year and also the greatest coach ever by guiding his college team to an unprecedented and unequaled record 10 national championships.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not to reiterate Indiana High School's long and rich tradition of basketball, but to salute a team who has demonstrated themselves to be worthy of the title Indiana State Champions. In 1994, the South

Bend Clay Colonials reached the pinnacle of high school sports by claiming what has been described as the most exciting championship game in the storied history of the State Tournament. South Bend Clay entered the finals as the least favorite of the four entries. They had not even won their own conference during the regular season, yielding to a tough and worthy adversary, Elkhart Central. They avenged this loss on their way to the finals, only to find two nationally ranked opponents standing in their way.

After defeating a tough New Albany team, a team who had beaten the defending State champion twice and who held the eighth position in the USA Today national rankings, South Bend Clay went on to face the undefeated Valparaiso Vikings, who were ranked No. 1 in the State and 13th nationally. The Colonials were down eight points with 46 seconds left to play when they staged one of the most improbable and incredible comebacks ever. They cut the lead to just three, and with 7 seconds to play, they brought the ball down the length of the court and sophomore Jaraan Cornell launched the 3-point shot heard throughout the State. The ball went through the net with one-tenth of a second left to tie the game. The result of overtime seemed academic and anti-climactic. The Colonials' momentum carried them to the school's first Basketball State Championship and South Bend's first in 37 years. I would like to take this opportunity to salute coach Tom DeBaets, his staff, Jim Parent, Ken Vargo, Steven Scott, Pat Sousley, Mike Jackson, athletic director Greg Humnicky, principal Joann Ollman, the trainers, Carole Gonglewski, Susan Graves, and Meera Gupta. Most importantly, I recognize the players who displayed sportsmanship and determination in the face of adversity, Joe Hunter, Michael Lee, Kerry Pates, Chad Hudnall, Jaraan Cornell, Charles Bonds, Steve Griffin, Yul Lee, Jeff Proctor, Jon White, LeShawn Nailon, and Lee Nailon. But because a basketball championship is won not only on the court with talent and strategy, but in the school and in the stands with support and assistance, I would like to salute assistant principals Mike Downey, George Jones, ticket manager Vic Papai, scorer Jim Morgan, statistician Howard Wallace, student managers Willie Rogers, Bjorn Bauer, Joey Acklin, Jason Shirrell, Jeff Shirrell, the cheerleaders, Julie Kleiser, Stephanie Viraghazi, Heather Schaack, Natalie Hansen, Meldora Milon, Angela Bole, Andrea Rodriguez, and finally, the parents and student body of Clay High School. Their achievement speaks well not only of Clay High School and the South Bend community, but of young people everywhere. Given goals and the tools to pursue them, they can attain their dreams, even reaching the pinnacle of high school athletics, the Indiana Boys Basketball State Championship.

TRIBUTE TO CLUB ESPAÑA FOR KEEPING SPANISH CULTURE THRIVING THROUGHOUT NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment today to recognize the important cultural contribution made to New Jersey by the Club España of Newark as they celebrate their sixth annual Folkloric Festival. This occasion is noteworthy because it also gives us an opportunity to honor the significant contribution of Spanish immigrants to our great Nation.

Club España is in the forefront of preserving Spanish culture throughout New Jersey for the children of immigrants. While fostering love for the United States, they try to nurture in young students a deep affection for El Cid, Goya, and Cervantes.

One of their most important activities is their sponsorship of the Folkloric Groups of Club España. The groups consist of three different ensembles: Grupo de Danzas-Alborada, Grupo de Gaitas-Andurina, and the Grupo de Flamenco-El Rocio. They are dedicated to maintaining their Spanish cultural heritage, while at the same time bringing the special charm of Spanish dance and song to the community at large.

Roughly, 85 percent of the participants in the Folkloric Groups are students—ranging from kindergarten to college age—born in the United States of Spanish immigrants. Each time the groups perform, they reveal a spectacular display of the music dances and a wide variety of costumes representing the different regions of Spain. At various times, members of the groups have performed in New York City, Washington, DC, and in April 1992 the Grupo de Danzas-Alborada and Grupo de Gaites-Andurina performed in Zaragoza, Spain.

All the members deserve praise for their efforts, but let me take a moment now to single out the accomplishments of several individuals who have been crucial in the development of the Folkloric Groups. Andres M. Camano works tirelessly as the instructor of the Grupo de Danzas-Alborada. Nabor Lopez sets an example of hard work and creativity as director of the Grupo de Gaitas-Andurina. And, I would be remiss, if I did not take note of Carmen Acevedo, the instructor of the Grupo Flamenco-El Rocio.

May the melodious sounds of the Spanish bagpipe, known as a gaita, and the graceful dance steps of the Muineira, long remain a large part of this country's cultural heritage.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH ELLISON

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the writer of one of the greatest and influential American novels. Ralph Ellison, author of "Invisible Man," died at his home, at the age of 80, on April 16.

Mr. Ellison was born on March 1, 1914, in Oklahoma City. His father, a construction foreman, died when Ralph was 3. His mother was a domestic worker. Ralph Ellison had intended to be a composer, yet the lack of money necessary for proper training led him to discover and pursue his love and talent for writing instead.

Mr. Ellison evolved as a writer studying the works of such greats as T.S. Eliot, Langston Hughes, Ernest Hemingway, Richard Wright, Gertrude Stein, and Dostoyevski. The wealth of his experience as transmitted through his novel has been a major influence on later generations of writers. He has made it clear that "[y]ou don't write out of your skin * * *, [y]ou write out of your imagination," and "[t]he imagination is integrative."

Published in 1952, "Invisible Man" transcends generational and racial barriers. The African-American narrator does not merely represent blacks, but any social group whose humanity has become invisible to those around it. Unlike most protagonists of African-American fiction up to that time, he has intellectual depth and ambition. "Invisible Man" transforms the powerless victim into a participant, the vagrant into an explorer, and the mindless drifter into a philosopher.

"Invisible Man" advocates for the American culture. As the narrator says, "America is woven of many strands; I would recognize them and let it remain so." Mr. Ellison was an integrationist, but not a conformist. He believed in the preservation of identity through the acceptance of the cultures of which we have evolved, but never a denial of the culture from which we have come.

Mr. Ellison never published another novel, though he could never stop writing. He published two nonfiction collections, "Shadow and Act" in 1964 and "Going to the Territory" in 1986. His second novel was destroyed after a fire in 1967. He never abandoned that novel and proceeded to reconstruct it by talking to those friends who had read excerpts and from sections that had been published in literary journals. The manuscript, over 1,000 pages long, was almost complete at the time of his death. We can only hope that this novel, too, be published, so we may be blessed further by Ralph Ellison's literary genius.

SALUTE TO JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

HON. SAM COPPERSMITH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Junior Achievement of Central Arizona and Junior Achievement of America. This year marks the 75th anniversary of Junior Achievement making a difference in America, and the 30th anniversary of the beginning of its work in my State of Arizona.

Over the past 30 years Junior Achievement has reached nearly 200,000 young men and women. This year alone, more than 24,000 will learn about business and economics from Junior Achievement volunteers.

These volunteers work with children from kindergarten through high school. The volunteers, members of the local community, help students learn about the real economic world—one not necessarily found in textbooks. The students learn how to balance a checkbook, the importance of financial planning, and the importance of community. In high school, they learn about finding and getting a job, the economics of education, and how to start up and run a business.

I take especially great pride that staff members in my congressional office actively support Junior Achievement of Central Arizona by serving as volunteers. I encourage my colleagues to support Junior Achievement in their communities. By volunteering, we can help our young people to a better understanding of our Government and our economy—and their vital role in our Nation's furture.

The 340 young men and women who made up the first Junior Achievement of Central Arizona graduating class in 1964 now form part of my State's vital and growing economy. I know that 30 years from now, the Junior Achievement students of today will be the business leaders of tomorrow, in Arizona and throughout the Nation. I know of no better "anniversary present" for Junior Achievement.

LENSCRAFTERS SELECTED TO RECEIVE 1994 PRESIDENT'S VOLUNTEER ACTION AWARD

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to LensCrafters, a Cincinnati, OH, corporation in the Second District, which on Thursday, April 21, 1994, received the 1994 President's Volunteer Action Award from President Clinton for their "Give the Gift of Sight" partnership with the Lions Club.

The President's Volunteer Action Award is one of the most prestigious honors that one can receive for community service. Those of us in Cincinnati know LensCrafters for its voluntarism locally, but this award appropriately recognizes LensCrafters nationally and internationally as well.

Since the "Give the Gift of Sight" annual eyeglasses collection and recycling program began in 1988, LensCrafters and the Lions Club have collected over 2 million pairs of old, unwanted eyeglasses and distributed them to the less fortunate all over the world. Every year, all 484 LensCrafters stores in the United States and Canada participate in collecting eyeglasses during January and February. The eyeglasses are then sent to the Lions Clubs national eyeglasses recycling center where they are cleaned, repaired and classified by prescription.

LensCrafters and the Lions Club annually conduct optical missions abroad to dispense the thousands of glasses collected. Mission destinations have included Costa Rica, Panama, Kenya, and Mexico, and have served over 33,000 people. The eyeglasses not dispensed by LensCrafters missions are given to Lions Clubs and other volunteer organizations around the world for distribution.

In the United States, LensCrafters has provided eye exams and new glasses to tens of thousands of Americans and Canadians each year through LensCrafters' charitable certificate program. In 1993, a new domestic program was added, the Give the Gift of Sight Hometown Day program. On the morning of November 30, 1993, 77 percent of LensCrafters employees and 99 percent of affiliated optometrists' offices delivered eyecare to 10,000 needy people. LensCrafters and the Red Cross have also partnered to provide eye exams and eyeglasses to victims of natural disasters. Following the Los Angeles earthquake, more than 3,000 pairs of free eyeglasses were provided to victims.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend LensCrafters for their unselfish generosity and for making a difference in the lives of so many people all over the world. LensCrafters' vision has set an example of community service for each of us.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER SEAN McDONALD

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a heroic young American, Sean McDonald—husband, father, and New York City police officer, who was recently slain protecting the lives and property of our citizens.

Sean was shot to death in my congressional district on the evening of March 15 as he sought to arrest two armed robbery suspects.

In little more than a year into his service, Sean had already won the admiration and respect of his superiors and fellow officers. The veteran sergeant who trained Sean as a rookie police officer was quoted as saying, "Cliches were all true about him. You'd tell him to do a job and he did it, never complained. A supervisor's dream. This kid was gold."

Sean's brother Andrew, also a policeman, was on duty that evening and was one of the first officers to reach the scene where Sean had been mortally wounded.

The 26-year-old officer leaves his wife, Janet, and their two children, Sean Jr., 3, and a year-old daughter, Kelly.

Ten thousand police officers from as far away as Boston stood in long silent rows on the streets outside the church where services were held for their slain brother. The mayor and other dignitaries eulogized Officer McDonald.

It was a fitting tribute indeed. But what a tragic loss for that family, to our community, and indeed to the Nation when these brave men in blue lose their lives maintaining the peace and safety of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our profound gratitude to Officer McDonald and to all those who serve in this noble occupation, and our deepest sympathies to the McDonald family and to all families who have lost a loved one in such tragic circumstances.

NEITHER RAIN, NOR SLEET, NOR SNOW, NOR FIRE

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I highlight the outstanding achievements of Charles Henning, as he accepts the Regional Hero of the Year Award from the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Each year, the National Association of Letter Carriers honors a national hero and three regional heroes for selflessness and heroism performed in an attempt to rescue those in dangerous, life-threatening situations. Soon, among his many friends, Charles Henning will accept the Central Region Hero of the Year Award for braving fire and smoke to save a victim from a grease fire.

Interestingly, the circumstances surrounding his award are as extraordinary as Charles himself. As Charles was completing his Saginaw mail route, he smelled smoke and heard the smoke alarm of a nearby basement apartment. It seems Sydney Oliver had inadvertently left the stove on while cleaning his apartment and, heating up, the grease ignited into flames. Unable to extinguish the flames, Mr. Oliver managed to call the fire department as fire and smoke spread throughout the apartment.

It was at this moment Charles approached the building, rushed inside to pull Mr. Oliver from the burning apartment, and then proceed to run door-to-door alerting others of the fire and evacuating remaining tenants. By the time 26 fire fighters arrived a few minutes later, the grease fire had become a three-alarm blaze.

There are individuals who during their lives will go beyond the call of duty to meet the call of human needs. We know that rain, sleet and snow do not sway these couriers from their appointed rounds. Charles Henning has valiantly added fire to his personal life.

Mr. Speaker, it is these acts of singular courage which effectively define the conscious of our Nation. I applaud the efforts of Mr. Henning, and urge my colleagues to similarly recognize his selfless courage.

ROBERTA G. TOOLE, FRIEND OF THE INDEPENDENT INVENTOR

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1994

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Roberta Toole had many friends across the country because she fought unceasingly for the rights of the independent inventor. Bobby, as she was known to her friends, died on February 28, 1994, at her home in University City, MO. She was executive director of the United Inventors Association and she had previously held a similar post with the St. Louis Inventors Association.

Bobby was the heartbeat for inventors throughout the country. She also lead a sup-

port group to help protect the rights of inventors. She was a firm and gentle support to everyone who knew her and worked with her. A friend, Bobby was remembered by inventors and people working with inventors all over the country. I ask unanimous consent that their statements be included in the RECORD.

Bobby considered the independent inventor community as an extended family. Yes, we were her friends, but friendship doesn't explain the intensity with which she fought for the rights of independent inventors everywhere. This is evident in the many tributes to her memory received from all over the Nation, some of which follow.

"Bobby Toole was a woman of tremendous creativity and energy, dedicated to bringing the issues and concerns of America's independent inventors to the highest policy levels possible. She was an impressive woman, and we, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, deeply regret her untimely and unexpected death on February 28, 1994."—Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

"She was a great American and did a great deal for the innovative spirit in America."—Donald Banner, Former Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

"All of us who knew her will miss her energy, dedication, and devotion to the needs of independent inventors."—Terry Levinson, DOE Inventions and Innovation.

"Bobby has worked tirelessly on behalf of inventors across America, working to enhance their image, to protect their rights and promote their success. She will be sorely missed."—Donald Job, UIA–USA President.

"I guess I won't be saying good-bye to good friend, Bobby Toole. She lives on in the national inventor support network she helped start. We will miss her, of course, but we'll continue to be inspired by her feisty courage and selfless dedication in support of America's inventors."—Don Kelly, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.

"Some know it's happening, some see it happen, others wonder what happened. Bobby made it happen."—Norman Parrish, National Congress of Inventor Organizations.

"She proved that one person can make a difference."—Joanne Hayes, Inventors Digest.

"Without her there never would have been a UIA. She was incredible."—Phil Knapp, New York Society of Professional Inventors.

"No one worked harder for independent inventors."—Don Costar, Nevada Inventors Association.

"If she had any faults—she devoted more of herself to independent inventors than she had to give."—Clayton Williamson, Kansas Association of Inventors.

"The hard work she has done in the last few years has been extraordinarily beneficial to the inventor community."—Maggie Weisberg and Mel Fuller, M & M Associates.

"Bobby Toole spent her final years in earnest pursuit of a better world for independent inventors, including publicizing the achievements of women and minority inventors. We've lost a great advocate and patriot."—Anne Kelly, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.

"Her dedication and efforts to further the cause of independent inventors will be greatly missed by the members of that community."—Dick Nichols, Inventure Place, Home of National Inventors Hall of Fame.

"A spark plug who brought energy, light, enthusiasm, and guts—she gave everything she had including financial resources to make the UIA a reality."—Jenny Servo, Dawnbreakers, Inc.